

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE PAPERS.

LAMBETH 1920 AND AFTER.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A.,
Vicar of St. Paul's-at-Kilburn.

LAMBETH 1920 can only be understood by what went before the Conference. The Conference did not meet to face conditions that had not been determined by the past. Reunion was not a subject suddenly flung into the arena of controversy. The situation was created by events that had deeply moved the civil and the ecclesiastical world. The War brought with it a keen realization of the brotherhood of man. The fellowship of the trenches made those who took part in it realize that there is much more in human brotherhood than they had previously recognized. Men are brethren, irrespective of social and educational conditions, in a manner that shows there is nothing truly great in man, but what is common to the race. And this yearning for a permanent manifestation of brotherhood found expression in many post-war organizations that had taken shape in the months between November, 1918, and July, 1920. Apart altogether from any ecclesiastical yearning there was a conviction that it was necessary for the well-being of humanity, to make all those within the range of our individual influence show more brotherliness, one to another, and thereby keep alive the comradeship that had left so deep a mark on the demobilized soldiers.

Kikuyu had brought Reunion into the field of practical politics, or if it is preferred, had driven reunion from the academic discussion by experts into the open forum of the Christian world. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) in his pamphlet "Kikuyu," after reviewing all the circumstances, gave as his verdict on the proceedings that culminated in the United Communion Service "Not Guilty, but don't do it again." The great protagonist of Catholicism as he saw it, Frank Weston, was looked forward to as the *enfant terrible* of the Conference. He had become the *malleus hereticorum* and had called into being the weapon of excommunication against those who differed from him. All admired his enthusiasm, his devotion and his passion for the salvation of his Africans. But united with this was a rigid Catholicity that proclaimed as plainly as it could be proclaimed, "No Bishop: No Church." Would he break up the Conference and carry with him a large section of the Bishops? This was the question on the lips of scores of the Diocesans who assembled. To their surprise he showed himself a thorough-going advocate of Reunion on his own terms, and even a more determined opponent of Modernism than he was a hostile critic of Kikuyu in its ecclesiastical aspect. He had written, "At Kikuyu, Modernist views were a far greater hindrance to Reunion

than mine." The Conference saw in him more the apostle of Orthodoxy than the enemy of Reunion.

To its surprise the Conference heard from him on the second day of its meeting a speech which determined the character of the Lambeth Appeal. "Each diocese should be a family, a real unit, and all dioceses should constitute a real unity. The unity we desire to see is one of organic life centred in an authority expressed in a College of Bishops, linked with the past and pointing to the future. Such a unity would be very different from the uniformity which England had tried and failed to maintain for four centuries, and very different from the federation of jealous and competing sects who favoured Kikuyu." Rome had set the example by her Uniate Churches, and no other solution was possible. The outlook of the Bishop was approved by the Conference, and the Appeal may be truly said to represent the ideals that inspired the attitude of the Bishop of Zanzibar at Kikuyu. This may seem a strange saying, but it is broadly true, when we see the interpretation given to the Appeal in the Episcopal pamphlet, "Lambeth and Reunion," written by Bishops Linton Smith, Woods and Weston. The chapter on "The Bishop" contains the following sentences: "Groups we must have, because we are human and human nature is what it is. But organic unity we must also have, because we are God's children and God is One. This unity can only be secured by the restoration of the bishop's office everywhere, and by the reformation of all of us who are bishops." "In conclusion, we desire to put on record that the Conference is not content that men should be consecrated bishops without a whole-hearted acceptance of the underlying meaning of episcopacy." And there is no doubt what this implies, for it has been plainly stated in this composite pamphlet. "This office has been kept filled down the ages, in an unbroken succession. The Church's rule has always been that no one can hold the office who has not been appointed to it by the laying-on of the hands of some already holding it. . . . A further claim made in the Appeal for the bishop is, that he is the appointed person to administer that apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, to which is attached a pledge of grace, as also to preside over or make arrangements for the Eucharistic worship in the one family of God." Here we see the restrictive meaning given to the ominous words, "The commission of Christ," on which so much has depended.

When the Appeal appeared, great was the enthusiasm of those who saw in it a splendid vision of the Great Church coming into being. Bishops expounded it as the ground on which Home Reunion could be brought about, and the Resolutions that seemed to many to stereotype existing conditions with their limitations on Intercommunion were explained as domestic instructions for the Anglican faithful. They were variously interpreted even on such a subject as the exchange of pulpits, and in consequence of the invitation a year later, given by the Bishop of Manchester to Nonconformist ministers to preach in the Cathedral, Dr. Weston withdrew from all connection with Lambeth because, in his opinion,

York and Canterbury were ignoring the restrictions and provisos which governed the scheme. Was it any wonder that here at home Lambeth was understood as the individual predilections of the interpreters desired?

Dr. Fullerton will deal with Lambeth 1920, and Home Reunion, and therefore I shall say no more on this aspect of Lambeth, being content to point out that a fundamental ambiguity lay at the root of the Appeal and Resolutions, which in the end paralysed every effort to bring about a Concordat between the National and the Free Churches.

A Greek delegation was present at Lambeth. Its presence there gave the Bishops the opportunity of discussing with eminent personages the attitude of the Greek Church. The utmost friendliness prevailed, but the Greeks never communicated with the English Bishops. There was brotherhood without participation of the Lord's Supper, and fraternization with the Orthodox thus begun paved the way for closer relations afterwards. The Appeal was sent to the Heads of the Orthodox Church and the delegation to Lambeth drew up a Report which was presented to the Holy Synod. The Report spoke in glowing terms of the desire for Unity, and emphasized the sacred duty that lay upon the Orthodox to continue doing all that could be done to make easy the way for such a God-pleasing work of union. A Committee of the English Church Union prepared a declaration of Faith, which was signed by Bishop Gore and 3,714 priests. This declaration maintained the unity of the Faith held by the Anglican and the Eastern Churches, which holds the Seven Rites commonly called Sacraments to be Sacraments; Apostolic Succession which confers on priests the power to offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for the living and the dead and to absolve sacramentally sinners who repent and confess their sins. "We affirm that, by consecration in the Eucharist, the bread and wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ, and as such are given to and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored." "We agree with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church that honour should be given to the holy and ever Virgin Mother of God and the Saints departed; that there is a legitimate use of sacred images; and that alike in our public and in our private prayers, we should ask for the benefit of the intercession of the Saints." "As for the XXXIX Articles, they are of secondary importance, and have to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part."

The Bishop of Durham, in a fiery article in the *Edinburgh Review* of April, 1923, wrote, "That Declaration is not only destitute of any authority, but it conflicts sharply with the official doctrinal standards of the Church of England. . . . The Synod of Constantinople was deliberately misled by the Anglo-Catholic statement of doctrine. The whole spirit and drift of that statement are quite

out of harmony with the English formularies." At any rate, the Eastern Churches who have pronounced on the question of Anglican Orders declare that as before the Orthodox Church "the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the 'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession."

The Greek Churches were represented at the Lausanne Conference on "Faith and Order." As the discussions proceeded there was a growing approximation of attitude between the majority of the Anglican representatives and those from the Orthodox Churches. Dr. Gore was the protagonist of this approximation. It is unnecessary to add that at Lausanne there was no united Communion, and it was plain to all that a union between the Greek and the Non-Episcopal Churches is impossible as long as the Greeks maintain their rigid attitude. But the attitude of the Greeks to the Church of England is of more immediate importance, and the address by the Metropolitan of Thyateira at the Cheltenham Church Congress leaves us in no doubt as to the present position of the Orthodox Church. Referring to the Lausanne Conference, he said that the Anglican view, as long as it kept on Catholic lines, found its chief supporters at Lausanne in the Orthodox delegation. The Orthodox refused all compromise, as did the Patriarchal delegation in London, because the proposed terms of agreement were so wide as not to be consistent with principles which the Orthodox Church considers to be fundamental. In making clear the attitude of the Orthodox to the Anglican Church, the Archbishop said: "Why should we not think that a time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body, so that it would appear in that form which would make reunion with our Orthodox Church possible. Meanwhile the duty of the Orthodox is not to break the definite bond which binds us to the Anglican Communion, but to help in such an evolution, through friendly intercourse and in a spirit of peaceful discussion." Probably it is in furtherance of this spirit that the Archbishop of Canterbury this month is paying official visits to Eastern Patriarchs.

It is all bewildering. How many Churchmen have any idea what the Orthodox Church stands for? I have quoted the English Church Union declaration, and anyone who reads it will wonder how far it is in agreement with the well-known Lambeth Quadrilateral which forms the basis of the Lambeth Appeal. No one who knows the history and tradition as well as the Formularies of the Church of England can find a place for many of the assertions of the Declaration within the four corners of the Formularies. The Declaration asserts that the very things in Mediæval Catholicity, that were swept out of the Church at the Reformation, are part of its belief, and if that be so, it is no wonder that Easterns should view with pleasure the "Catholic nucleus prevailing in the Anglican

Church." It can only do so by changing the whole character of our Church, and it is indeed one of the strangest of phenomena to find a Church approaching the Free Churches on one side with a statement that is an entirely different standard of doctrine to that presented to the Orthodox Churches. We have heard much of a Bridge Church—with one end of the Bridge resting on the land of error and the other on the land of truth. No wonder, with the conflict of ideals and teaching before him, Professor Heiler, who is generally supposed to have been the inventor of the term, has repudiated its application to the Church of England. He says that at Lausanne it was clearly revealed as being quite impossible as a Bridge Church, "its importance lies in the fact that it is the guardian of a fine type of ritualism and piety, and not in its organization." And now we find that the Church of Sweden, which glories in its Protestantism and calls Morning Prayer High Mass, is claiming to be the Bridge Church, for it is in communion with the Church of England on the one hand, and with the Lutheran Non-Episcopal Church on the other. No wonder Bishop Weston opposed the Lambeth Resolutions on the Swedish Church.

And passing by the Old Catholic Church which, although a most interesting Church, is not of major importance in the spiritual life of Holland or of Germany and Switzerland, we come to the great Roman Church—union with which is the ideal of so many who wish for Catholic Reunion. In "Lambeth and Reunion" the writers express their willingness for the sake of "Union all round" to accept Roman Consecration. We are not now concerned with the extraordinary parallel they give for this submission—the humiliation of our Lord. Only men blind to the plain meaning of the Humiliation of the Saviour can have put forward this argument, if they know anything of the Roman teaching and understand their own repudiation of that teaching as Bishops of the Anglican Communion. Advocates for a certain course of action, when they are enthusiasts, generally run blindfolded or in blinkers to the goal they have set before themselves. The Lambeth Appeal was sent to the Archbishop of Westminster and the Cardinal Secretary of State in Rome. No reply from Cardinal Bourne has been published, and the Secretary of State replied that he had the honour of presenting it to the Pope. The English Roman Hierarchy showed no undue zeal to respond to the Appeal, and Lord Halifax, with his impetuous zeal, undamped by his Canterbury experience with Archbishop Benson, saw in Cardinal Mercier one who might be prevailed upon to discuss the subject with him and a number of other Churchmen more or less in sympathy with his views. He obtained an introduction from Archbishop Davidson, and in a semi-official manner conversations between representatives of Rome and Canterbury were entered upon. I have no interest in discussing the exact amount of responsibility attaching to the conversations as official. They ended, as we all know, after the death of the patriot Cardinal, and the report published led to a repudiation of the action of the representatives of the Church of

England by a very large number of English Churchmen. The Conversations have passed into history. The Roman Catholic Church permitted observers to attend the Faith and Order Conference in Lausanne. Evidently the Roman Hierarchy in England did not view with any great pleasure the change of venue of Reunion Conversations from England to Belgium. Loyalty to the Pope kept them silent, but it was natural that they should believe themselves better fitted to form right opinions on the Church of England than even the most eminent of Foreign Cardinals. The Report of the Conversations was published after considerable delay, and it undoubtedly had considerable influence on English public opinion. Some of the friends of Archbishop Davidson say that he allowed the conversations to proceed, as he knew that they would end in failure and thereby would prevent any repetition of the attempt. This is unfair to the Archbishop, who acted as he acted owing to the pressure of Anglo-Catholic opinion which he did not wish to alienate, and his Grace may have had memories of Bishop Weston's repudiation of National Churches and his dream of a Catholic Church to which all nations may belong—a right vision if based on right thought. The Reply to the Malines Conference came quickly from the Pope. In his Encyclical *Mortalium animos* issued in January, 1928, Pius XI writes: "All who are truly Christ's believe, for example, the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican." "It is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics; for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it." "In this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. . . . Let them return to their common Father, who, forgetting the insults previously heaped on the Apostolic See, will receive them in the most loving fashion." "Submit and unite" is the motto of the Roman Church, which may change but cannot reform itself. An infallible Church can only reform by committing suicide, and all who believe that union with Rome can be obtained at any price short of absolute submission to its dogmas and discipline, live in a fool's paradise and follow a will o' the wisp. It is vain for the Orthodox Archbishop of Thyateira to declare: "We do not believe that the Vatican, on seeing that the union of other Churches is drawing near, will be able to persist in this irreconcilability and repeat the *non possumus* to the invitations of the other Churches. The hour will come, and the Pope will then be contented with the honours and privileges which all of us are quite ready to render him." The Church of England cannot unite with the Orthodox

Churches until "the Catholic nucleus" possesses the whole Church, and this, please God, it will never do, as the Church of England has no intention of abandoning its primitive Catholicity for Mediæval Catholicity. The Roman Church persists, and will persist, in its attitude as long as it clings to the traditions and autocracy. God can work wonders, and if Rome repents of its errors and faces towards the light, no one will rejoice more than the Protestants of the Church of England. Humanly speaking, we see no sign of this. The more the events that have occurred since Lambeth in connection with the Union of our Church with the unreformed Churches are studied, the more we are convinced that such Union can only take place by excluding once and for all any hope of our union with Reformed Christendom.

The situation is clear. Rome will not consider Union except at the cost of absolute submission. The Orthodox East only thinks of Union when the so-called Catholic nucleus has gained possession of the whole Church, and the better the East is known the less desirable is union with it in its unreformed state. It is a Church without missions, a Church without progress, and a Church that has indeed suffered persecution and at the same time has been persecuting, even in our own age. The Lambeth Appeal has awakened sympathy among those who craved in their distressful condition our sympathy. The biographer of Bishop Weston tells us that the scheme was his. "It was indeed a good scheme, but those who assented to it had not thought out all its implications, and those to whom it was sent had not seen the vision." We believe that we see the Vision of a Reunited Christendom with the Great Shepherd of the Sheep as its Chief Pastor; we see Him worshipped by those who share a common experience of redemption through His Death; we see them knit together in the Sacrament of Unity and His flock ministered to by those called by Him to His service holding the truth in love and the unity of One Spirit. Unity does not depend on organization, and when men recognize that they share the one Lord, the one Faith and the one Baptism, looking unto Him as their Head, founded on Him as their solid base, they will put everything in its proper place and manifest to the world that they are one Body in Christ.
