

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

CANTERBURY, UTRECHT AND ALEXANDRIA.

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

AMONG the many problems raised by the Report of the Lambeth Conference none is of more far-reaching importance than that concerned with Reunion with the Unreformed Episcopal Churches. And when the adjective "Unreformed" is employed it is at once seen to be only partially adequate, for the Old Catholics of Utrecht do not stand where they stood before 1870, and it would be wrong to generalize and say that all the Members of the Eastern Family of Churches have equally been opposed to the penetration of those Scriptural and Primitive principles that the Reformation restored to the Church. In the main, however, it is correct to say that the Churches represented by Utrecht and Alexandria hold fast by traditions that have been rejected by the Churches of the Reformation and have an ethos that is not similar to that of the Church of England before Tractarian ideals proclaimed themselves to be the teaching of the Church. In one respect Canterbury, Utrecht and Alexandria march hand in hand. They reject the nineteenth-century innovations of the Church of Rome, they refuse to accept the universal jurisdiction *jure Divino* of the Pope and cannot believe the dogma of Infallibility of the Pope to be in accord with Scripture, History or Reason.

Many who consider the situation created by the Lambeth decisions to be fraught with peril to the Protestant and Reformed character of our Church are just as keen as the Bishops for Intercommunion between our Church and the Old Catholics and Easterns. We hold that Intercommunion does not necessarily imply unity in all doctrinal details, much less uniformity in ceremonial. We are prepared to accept as brethren in Christ, and to meet with them at the Table of the Lord, members of Churches that hold dogmatic beliefs we reject and practise ceremonies that for us are connotative of erroneous teaching. We believe that those who profess and call themselves Christians and strive to follow in newness of Life our Blessed Lord and Saviour are one with us in Him. And we are convinced that the acts of intercommunion that take place will foster a spirit of brotherhood that will lead to a better understanding and the rejection of what can be proved to be false and the acceptance of what can be established as true. We make our own the words of Dr. Ellicott spoken in his Cathedral on December 10, 1875 :

" Will the ancient Church of the East remain unaffected by the course of events that now seem mysteriously disclosing themselves each year as it passes by ? May it not be fore-ordained by God that this ancient and slumbering Church shall soon awaken, as it were, to a new life, rise to a higher

and purer standard of doctrine, cast aside its superstitions and corruptions, and become that light to the waiting nations of the East that it once was in the earlier and purer days of its splendid history?"

For—unpopular as it is to say so—we have to admit that the Eastern Church is not free from corruptions and superstitions, and we are convinced that when these are abandoned it will have a great future. We can never forget that the development of religious thought and worship in the East owes much to the soil in which it took place, and a good deal that is foreign to us Westerns is commonplace to Orientals. We have no desire to force our Formularies on the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches.

Everything depends on the terms of Reunion and Intercommunion. At the present time Commissions are sitting preparing for discussions with the Eastern and Old Catholic Churches. We are told that in connection with the East nothing more is contemplated than the arrangement of terms of Intercommunion for Anglican strangers in Orthodox lands and the Eastern *diaspora* in Western lands. On the other hand, it is definitely said by a member of the Lambeth Committee that in connection with the Old Catholics "it seems not unreasonable to anticipate that quite close relations may be established with the Old Catholics at an early date." The words of the Lambeth Encyclical are clear:

"The Conference has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Commissions of theologians to confer with similar Commissions, if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and the Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these Commissions may find such a unity of faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches, that restoration of communion may become possible as soon as the appropriate assemblies of the various Churches may meet."

The Anglican Commissions have been appointed and they are official in the strictest sense. It is vain to argue that what they determine has no authority outside themselves. They have on them men who know that they represent officially the Anglican Communion and that what they decide will have the greatest weight with the Authorities of the Communion. It is hard to think that the Anglican Churches (we are now concerned specially with the Mother Church of England which represents considerably more than half the communicants and adherents of the Anglican Communion) will consider as not binding any concordat reached in so official a manner with the Orthodox and Old Catholic representatives. It is apparent to all who are familiar with the personnel of the Commissions that they are weak in the representation of the traditional Protestantism of the Church of England and that Anglo-Catholicism is strongly to the front.

It is perfectly true that the Chairman of both Commissions is Dr. Headlam, who in October 1922 (*Church Quarterly Review*) was charged with using "very bitter and even offensive expressions regarding the Orthodox Church, which can be excused only on account of the desperate position of their author, for I have encountered nothing similar in recent years even in pamphlets of a

distinctly polemical character." So wrote Professor Glubokovesky of Petrograd, and it now appears that Dr. Headlam was responsible for the "Terms of Intercommunion" drafted in 1920, with their acceptance of the teaching of the Second Council of Nicaea on the worship of Images, and "that neither Church should accuse the other of false teaching." In these "Terms of Intercommunion" there is not a word said about the XXXIX Articles.

But at the same time discussions took place with Greek Ecclesiastics, presided over by the then Bishop of Gloucester, who said, in reply to the suggestion from the Orthodox that the XXXIX Articles should be abolished :

"They were no Articles of faith, but Articles of a practical public State confession, as is shown by their vague character. There is no branch of the Church which has not forms that might be rejected, yet are difficult to reject. In the last fifty years the Thirty-nine Articles have fallen, while the Creeds have risen in public estimation." "We understand that the Abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles would be an advantage. It is true that with us these have much less force than the Prayer Book and the Catechism. In some sections of the English Church they are not used at all."

The last sentence requires elucidation. It is true that the Scottish Church, a Chinese Church and, it is said, the South African Church do not use the Articles, but all the greater and older Churches do, and the recent effort to abolish them in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States failed. And Dr. Headlam says they are obsolete! (*Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, 202.) No one wishes them to be imposed on other Churches which desire to be in communion with us, but is that any reason why other Churches should ask us to abolish them as a condition precedent to union?

But it may be said that the Lambeth Résumé of the Conversations between Anglican and Orthodox Ecclesiastics does not do this. The Anglican Bishops state there "that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer." And the entire Conference endorsed this as part of a "sufficient" account of the Doctrine of our Church. Let it not be forgotten that the Articles were designedly framed to interpret the Religion of the Church of England, they were compiled when the Book of Common Prayer was in existence—in practically its present form—and their interpretative value was endorsed by Charles I and Archbishop Laud. It is clear that the Protestantism of the Articles is the stone of offence in the eyes of the Easterns, and if we, or the Commission now sitting, to confer with Eastern delegates, affirm that the Articles can be considered "as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that universal Church of which the English Church is but a part," it is very easy for the Easterns to consider the rest of the English Church Union Statement, which we quote, addressed to them to be a "sufficient" or "genuine" account of English Church teaching.

The Lambeth Résumé also contains the words, "after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ." No wonder a Missionary Bishop writing on the subject is unable to explain words he does not like and believes capable of some theological explication. It also has the sentences, "in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Anglican Church prays that 'by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion' as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed."

We have to bear in mind that the Greeks received from the English Church Union a Memorial, signed by Bishop Gore, the Rev. J. A. Douglas and 3,713 Anglican Priests, which said :

"We the undersigned, therefore, hold that our Lord, through the ministry of the successors of the Apostles, has conferred on us and on all the members of the clergy of the Anglican Communion the Sacrament of the Order, with the purpose that we who are priests should . . . (inter alia). *b.* offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed." "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 and received by the faithful. We hold, therefore, that Christ thus present is to be adored."

When Dr. Henson, in 1922, read this declaration he wrote : "Can we rightly approach Protestant Churches with one standard of doctrine and the Eastern Church with another ?" We certainly in the Résumé approach the Eastern Church with a standard that is not that of the XXXIX Articles in those very points which up to the rise of Tractarianism and the spread of Anglo-Catholicism we were in agreement with them and in disagreement with the Eastern Churches. It is important to discover how the Résumé has been received. The Patriarch Meletios of Alexandria, when Patriarch of Constantinople in 1922, acknowledged the validity of Anglican Orders. The Patriarch of Alexandria and his Synod then entered a caveat or "precautionary negative." Now, after hearing the narrative of the proceedings in Lambeth, 1930, as a "genuine" account of the teaching of the Anglican Communion, the Synod welcomes the Summary (Résumé) as a notable step towards the Union of the two Churches. "And since in these declarations which were endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, complete and satisfying assurance is found as to the Apostolic Succession, as to a real reception of the Lord's Body and Blood, as to the Eucharist being *thusia hilasterios* and as to Ordination being a mystery" the Church of Alexandria acknowledges the validity of Anglican orders.

Something important had happened between the two Synods of Alexandria. A new Patriarch occupied the Chair and this in itself counted for much, but the all-important factor was the Lambeth Declaration. It is therefore necessary for us to inquire what is the Eastern Doctrine of the change wrought in the Elements by

Consecration and what is the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. We have seen how the English Church Union defined for the Constantinople Synod the "genuine teaching of the Church of England." The Patriarch of Alexandria refers to the genuine teaching of the Anglican Communion and finds it as defined by Lambeth. The Orthodox declare that they cannot have *communio in sacris* where the totality of faith is absent. And what is this totality? We are told on the one hand that it has been "precised" by the Oecumenical Councils, and yet the subjects to which reference is made in the Patriarch's letter were not dealt with by these Councils as acknowledged by the Eastern Church. Then we are told that on matters that are not of primary importance what is known as economy comes into operation and then we are informed (*Report of Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order, 134*) "it is impossible either to state precisely the scope or the organs of its exercise." All are agreed that Dogma does not come within its scope, and between a dogma and a theologoumenon it is at times hard to decide. We do not believe that any Orthodox Theologian would maintain that only beliefs "precised" by the seven Councils are dogmas. If this were the case then the XXXIX Articles would have importance only on the question of worshipping images.

"A Real reception of the Body and Blood" at once raises the question, Is Transubstantiation a belief, a dogma of the Orthodox Churches? Wilbois in *Russia and Reunion* tells us that the Russian word used as a translation of "metousiosis" must not be translated transubstantiation. This was the opinion of the Metropolitan Philaret, but Wilbois says that transubstantiation is identical with the Greek word, but the Orthodox reject the scholastic theory. Dr. Headlam informs us that the Greeks use the word (*The Doctrine of the Church, p. 298*). The Rev. C. Canellopulos, quoting Dositheos, says he used the term Metousiosis as a synonym for the terms used by the ancient Church. "The Bread is transmuted, transubstantiated, converted and transformed into the true Body itself of the Lord." We have read a catena of references and believe that Dr. Darwell Stone is in the main right when he says:

"The main fact to be noticed in the history of Eucharistic doctrine in the East from the sixth century to the present time is the continuance and unanimity of the teaching that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ, that the consecration is effected by the work of the Holy Ghost, elicited by the invocation of Him in the Liturgy, and that the Eucharist is a sacrificial presentation of Christ to God. In the earliest part of the period and often afterwards there is a tendency to confuse the outward and the inward parts of the Sacraments; from the eighth century onwards a distinction is clearly made that before consecration the elements are the image of the body of Christ, and that on becoming His actual body at the consecration they cease to be the image; in the fifteenth and later centuries elaborate distinctions are found between the substance and the accidents and between the natural and sacramental presence of Christ, and the word Transubstantiation is used" (*The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, vol. i. 192*).

The practice of infant communion sheds a light upon the teaching of the Eastern Church on the character of the consecrated elements.

This being the case, we naturally ask, did the Patriarch Meletios consider the teaching of the Anglican Church defined in the *Résumé* to be identical with that of his own Church? If so, is that the teaching of the Formularies of the Anglican Communion? The English Church Union plainly says it is. We do not think that it can be substantiated by any fair reading of the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

When we come to the question of the "Eucharistic Sacrifice" Canon Douglas is in a difficulty. He transliterated the words *thusia hilasterios* and in a footnote adds, "We do not translate it by propitiatory sacrifice or expiatory sacrifice, because, as generally used, these terms present conceptions which are not attached by the Orthodox to *thusia hilasterios*." Yet Canon Douglas signed the English Church Union declaration to the Orthodox Church that he believes we "offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the dead" and this to the average reader implies an expiatory sacrifice. Cyril Lucar was refuted by the teaching of the Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church in 1610. This Confession says: "This mystery is a propitiation and atonement with God for our sins both of the living and the dead," and it is offered on behalf of all orthodox Christians living and dead. The confession of Dositheos says: "It is a real and propitiatory sacrifice offered for all the orthodox, living and dead, and for the benefit of all." Makarios writes:

"In the Eucharist the body and the blood of the Saviour, which are offered to us as food, are offered also as a sacrifice to God for men. The sacrifice offered to God in the Eucharist is in its nature exactly the same as that of the cross; for to-day we still offer on the altars of the Church, the same Lamb of God who offered Himself of old on the cross for the sins of the world, the same flesh infinitely pure which suffered then, the same blood infinitely precious which was poured out. To-day also this mysterious oblation is invisibly accomplished by the same eternal High Priest who offered Himself on the Cross."

These quotations, which can be multiplied, are taken from Dr. Stone's work. In summing up his history on the subject, Dr. Stone tells us that

"the Eucharist is a sacrificial presentation of Christ to God. . . . The idea of the sacrifice during the greater part of the period is that of one sacrifice pleaded on the Cross in heaven, and on the altar, though in the latter part of it (from the sixth century to the present time) the connection between our Lord's heavenly offering and the offering of the Eucharist is but seldom expressed."

It is hard in the face of these facts to see how *thusia hilasterios* does not mean a propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice in the Orthodox Church. No other words can satisfactorily translate the terms. The task of the Archbishop's Commission will not be easy if it faces squarely and all along the line the vital ambiguities that, at present, are evident to the student of theology.

The Old Catholics deserve the sympathy of all who love freedom and believe in religious liberty. They are a small body, but the

numbers of a community are not the only question that arises when Reunion is considered. The Church in Utrecht was until comparatively recent years a Church that accepted the Roman position in doctrine and outlook without the Papacy. In the nineteenth century the cleavage with Rome became more pronounced, and on the publication of the Vatican Decrees a number of Swiss, German and other Continental Roman Catholics found themselves excommunicated, because they could not conscientiously accept the definition of Infallibility. They had the sympathy of the great historian Döllinger, who never joined them, but helped them in every way, and in proportion to their numbers they had attached to them a considerable number of the intelligentsia in these lands. The Old Catholic Church consecrated Bishops for them. The drift from Rome increased and when the Declaration of Utrecht—to be distinguished from the Pact of Utrecht which forbids the Consecration of Bishops without the consent of Utrecht—was drafted, the Churches had a definite orientation. There is a strong spirit of Protestantism about the Declaration, with reference to the specific doctrines rejected. But it lays down :

“ Considering that the Holy Eucharist has always been the true central point of Catholic worship, we consider it our duty to declare that we maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ under the species of bread and wine.”

What this means may be judged, that it is the practice of the Utrecht Church to communicate the laity in one kind and to give Benediction with the Reserved consecrated bread. The Church will have nothing to do with the XXXIX Articles, which it considers to be opposed to Catholic teaching.

In a Memorandum on Reunion with the Old Catholic Churches (*Archbishops' Committee on Faith and Order*, p. 148) the writer compares the Declaration of Utrecht with the Preamble to the Canons of the Church of Ireland which says, “ The Church of Ireland . . . doth hereby affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the primitive faith hath been from time to time overlaid,” but he does not quote “ and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.” Neither did he mention the acceptance by our Sister Church of the XXXIX Articles. And he did not quote the well-known words from the Preface to the Irish Book of Common Prayer :

“ As concerning the Holy Communion, some of our brethren were at first earnest that we should remove from the Prayer Book certain expressions which they thought might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine, concerning the Presence of Christ in that Sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly stated that the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner and that the mean whereby it is therein received and eaten is Faith ; but upon a full and impartial review, we have not found in the Formularies any just warrant for such teaching, and therefore in this behalf, we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the Twenty-eighth of the

said Articles. As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be reserved, lifted up, carried about or worshipped under the Veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto."

Are these quotations the reason for the strange change from "the Anglican Communion" to the Church of England in the third paragraph of Resolution 35 of the Lambeth Conference? "The Conference agrees that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England." There certainly is more than one thing in the interpretation of the teaching inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of Ireland. Intercommunion with the Old Catholics is desirable, but it can never be considered justified as long as they adopt their attitude concerning the XXXIX Articles and we accept that attitude as consistent with our teaching.

It is essential to notice two other statements in the Utrecht Declaration. Tradition is placed on a plane higher than we admit in the Church of England. It has been argued that the Tradition accepted by the Utrecht Church is so limited as to include nothing that cannot be proved by Holy Scripture. If so, why does the Utrecht Church normally administer the Holy Communion in one kind and admit Benediction? The position of the Church of England is clearly defined as to the unique authority of Holy Scripture, and the statements in the Articles on this question are plain and unambiguous.

The statement on the "Eucharistic celebration in the Church" is based on an interpretation of Hebrews ix. 11, 12 and Hebrews ix. 24 which has never been accepted by the Church of England and has been rejected by our best theologians. It is satisfactory to note that the Declaration explicitly denies that it is a continual repetition or a renewal of the expiatory sacrifice offered upon the Cross, but when it affirms that it is a representation of the one offering which our Lord makes in Heaven it adopts a view that has not the support of Holy Scripture, according to a natural interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the New Testament as a whole.

Our aim in this paper has not been to say anything that would depreciate the growth of friendship and the inter-relation of the Church of England and the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches, so long as such intercommunion does not demand from us the sacrifice of our own historical and Scriptural position. The Lambeth *Résumé* and Reports demand this as the basis, and we therefore are compelled to oppose any such step when it involves the sacrifice of our history and teaching. If we follow the lead of the *Résumé*, we shall find ourselves more isolated in Christendom than we have ever been, for we shall have replaced the drawing together of the Church of England and the Non-Episcopal Communion with whom we are in daily contact, for intercommunion with Churches that we seldom or never touch in so far as the life of the Church of England

at home and in the greater part of the Anglican Communion is concerned. But it is not so much on this account—serious as it is from the practical world religious standpoint—that we have been compelled to criticize, but from the conviction that the carrying through of the Lambeth policy involves, for us, the surrender of much that is of primary importance in our Protestant and Reformed teaching and an entire change in the ecclesiastical orientation of our Church. It is hateful for many of us to appear to oppose Christian Union in any form, but when we see the astounding ignorance of what the Old Catholics and Orthodox stand for, of the place they hold in Christendom and of the real character of the issues at stake, we pray that the Commissions now sitting may see that the time has come to cry halt, in the process of surrender, and to make it plain to the two Foreign Churches that the position adopted by Lambeth does not represent the real attitude of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, as a whole, but is, at the most, only sectional, and the result of the growth of a movement less than a hundred years old.

And we may add that so far from the XXXIX Articles being obsolete the Prayer Book Measure, 1928, has the clause (7, 3), "Every supplementary order or form of public prayer to which this section applies shall be in conformity with the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer." It is hard to reconcile this declaration with the statements to which we have referred in depreciation of the authority of the Articles.

From Camoldi to Christ (The Harrison Trust, 1s. 6d. net) is an account by Mr. Stephen Ouseley, formerly of the Order of Camoldi, and the Canons Regular of the Lateran, of the steps by which he was led to leave the Monastery and to renounce Romanism. The account which is given of the conditions of Monastic life in an Italian Monastery situated in a remote part of the Apennine Hills about thirty miles from Florence is far from attractive, and does not impress the reader with a sense of any deep or real piety on the part of the members of the Community. For an Englishman, the conditions of the life must have been specially irksome, and the pettiness of the regulations and the system of punishments must have proved abhorrent to a spirit not absolutely broken by the character of the discipline. The reading of the Bible proved in his case, as in the case of so many others, the means of his release from the superstitions of the Roman system. No doubt there are many inside the walls of Monasteries and Convents who would welcome release from the life, but they are probably unaware of any means by which they could support themselves if they came out. The Roman Church has a fund in England for the purpose of helping those who join their Church from the Protestant Churches. Many would be glad to know that there was similar support for those who leave the Church of Rome and become Protestants.