KIKUYU

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Easter, 1915

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1915

First Edition, April, 1915.
Reprinted, April, 1915.

KIKUYU

THE grave question which I have to handle respecting the work and the fellowship of Christian Communities in the Mission Fields of East Africa is one which calls in a peculiar degree for quietness of thought. And quietness of thought has of late been, for some of us, very difficult to secure.

The meeting of the Consultative Body, to which I shall presently allude, took place in the week ending August 1st, 1914. On that day the Nation trembled on the verge of War. At midnight on Tuesday, August 4th, war between Great Britain and Germany was declared, and throughout the eventful months since then our every thought and interest have been irresistibly swept into the maelstrom of the most fearful international conflict which the world has ever known. The demand upon my own time and thought and strength has been ceaseless and exacting, and it has until now been absolutely impracticable for me to prepare the statement which I had promised to make so soon as I could have before me for consideration the advice of the Con-

sultative Body upon some of the points at issue.

It has, indeed, been urged upon me in quarters entitled to respect that I should be justified were I now to leave the subject in the limbo whereinto it has in the march of larger events been pushed, and to hold my peace. But to follow that easy path would be to treat with unfairness or even breach of faith the three devoted missionary bishops whose patience I have already taxed unduly, and the Consultative Body whose advice I sought and gratefully received. Though larger and darker objects crowd the field to-day, both in Europe and in Africa, what we have learned to call "Kikuyu questions" are creatures of persistent life, and their future reappearance is assured.

On the other hand it is unnecessary for me now in making public what I wish to say, to re-tread in detail the ground which was trodden last Spring and Summer by so many controversialists. Discussions in abundance—in superabundance—took place. I think that on the whole they probably did good rather than harm. Thoughtful people have had their minds turned usefully to questions the difficulty of which is not obvious until exponents on either side have had their say. The literature on the subject is now voluminous, and some of it is of permanent value. To expedite the matter in its earlier stages was rendered impossible by accidental

causes long before the war with its overwhelming distractions intervened. It was in June, 1913, that the Missionary Conference at Kikuyu took place. The Bishop of Zanzibar's formal Letter to me charging the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with "propagating heresy and committing schism," by taking the part they took in the Conference and in the Service which marked its close, bears date September 30th, 1913. Before I could deal, as Metropolitan, with the accusation thus officially laid before me it was necessary for me to see the Bishops of Zanzibar and of Uganda. The Bishop of Mombasa was, on grounds of health, detained in India. I saw the Bishop of Uganda on November 28th and on several subsequent days, but the Bishop of Zanzibar was unable to reach England until February 6th, 1914. I saw him on the following day, and on February 9th I sent to him my answer to his formal appeal.[1] I shall, I think, help to make clearer what I have now to say and what is the standpoint which I occupy if I reprint a few paragraphs from what I then wrote :—

After careful consideration of the documents which have been laid before me, of the correspondence which has passed between myself and those concerned, and of the verbal statements made to me by the Bishops of Uganda and of Zanzibar, I am unhesitatingly of opinion that I

1 "The Missionary Conference in East Africa. The Archbishop of Canterbury's Answer to the 'Formal Appeal' made by the Bishop of Zanzibar." (Macmillan.) February, 1914.

should not be justified in allowing the enquiry, which is, I think, essential, to take the suggested form of proceedings against the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa for heresy and schism. . . . . The facts before me afford no case for such proceedings. . . . .

Questions have been raised of real and far-reaching importance, and although such "trial" for "heresy and schism" as has been suggested would, in the circumstances, be wholly out of place, it is right that these questions should receive deliberate consideration at the hands of those on whom special and central responsibility rests (pp. 6, 7).

I then called attention to the aid which a Metropolitan who bears such responsibility is able to obtain by means of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference; I described its constitution and character, and I continued as follows:—

The next meeting of the Consultative Body will take place, if all is well, in July of the present year. I propose myself, as standing in the relation of Metropolitan to the Bishops of Mombasa, Zanzibar, and Uganda (I name them in the order of their consecration dates), to lay before the Body, for consideration and advice, certain questions which arise out of what has taken place. I shall submit my questions in the following form, and I shall be prepared to accompany my own statement by any written or printed communication which may, for that purpose, be placed in my hands by any of the three Bishops concerned:—

1. In June, 1913, a Conference of Missionaries working in British East Africa was held at Kikuyu, and the Resolutions of Conference embodied a "Proposed Scheme of Federation of Missionary Societies" with a view to ultimate Union of the Native Churches. The Bishop of Uganda, as Chairman of the Conference, has

explained in a published Pamphlet that "nothing has as yet been settled." "From the first," he says, "it has been clearly understood that none of the signatories (of the proposed Scheme) claimed any power to decide. The utmost that has been done has been to submit to the authorities concerned what have seemed to the Missionaries in Conference to be feasible proposals in the direction of united action. No Church and no Society stands committed: the whole scheme is still *sub judice*." In accordance with this, the Bishop has formally submitted to me, as his Metropolitan, the draft Scheme. Some of its administrative provisions relate specially to the work of Missionary Societies as such, and have a technical character, necessitating their careful consideration by the authorities of the different Missionary Societies to which the signatories belong, as well as by others.

I desire to obtain the advice of the Consultative Body upon a larger question, namely: Do the provisions of the proposed Scheme contravene any principles of Church Order, the observance of which is obligatory upon the Bishops, the Clergy, and the layworkers of the Church of England at home and abroad? If so, in what particulars?

2. At the close of the Conference the Bishop of Mombasa, assisted by the Bishop of Uganda, celebrated the Holy Communion according to the Order prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. The Service was attended by a large number of the Missionaries who had taken part in the Conference, and many of those who communicated were not members of the Church of England, and had not been episcopally confirmed. All, however, had taken as the basis of possible federation "the loyal acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as our supreme rule of Faith and practice, and of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief."

I desire to ask whether, due consideration being given to precedent and to all the circumstances of the case, the action of the Bishops who arranged and conducted the admittedly abnormal Service in question was, in the opinion of the Consultative Body, consistent or inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England.

It is upon these questions that I shall now request the advice of the Consultative Body, having in view the exercise of my grave responsibilities as Metropolitan. Those responsibilities I shall endeavour to discharge, but the advice I ask for will be of real service and I feel sure that I shall not ask for it in vain (pp. 11–14).

The Consultative Body met at Lambeth on July 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st. They had before them, in relation to this matter, a large number of papers, pamphlets, and books, most of which had been circulated to them beforehand.[1] I was also able to lay before them many letters of an official or semi-official kind which had been written to me on the subject by Bishops and others engaged in the work of the Church either in the Foreign Missionary Field or in Christian countries. The Consultative Body had also the very real advantage of prolonged interviews both with the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda and with the Bishop of Zanzibar. After this detailed and careful consideration of the facts the Consultative Body drew up a reply to my questions. During the actual preparation of that reply I myself was, of course, not present, although I had taken

[1] See Appendix A., p. 39.

full part in the preliminary investigations which I have described. I append to this statement a copy of the advice which was then tendered to me.[1] It will be noticed that it is unanimous; bearing, with the exception of my own name, the signatures of all the Bishops who were able to take part in the proceedings of the Consultative Body.

I need scarcely say that to the advice thus tendered I have given the most respectful and grateful consideration.

I have already explained the delay which has occurred in the issue of my own statement to which that advice has been, in an important degree, contributory. My colleagues on the Consultative Body have helped me greatly, but the responsibility for what I am now writing is my own. It is, no doubt, difficult to define with accuracy or completeness the nature and limits of the relation which the Archbishop of Canterbury as Metropolitan or quasi-Metropolitan holds to the thirty-one Bishops in the Mission Field and elsewhere who do not technically belong to the Province of Canterbury and whose Dioceses have not yet been formed into independent Provinces.[2] Each of these Bishops, however, at

[1] See Appendix B., p. 42.

[2] For a list of these and for some information on the whole subject I may perhaps be allowed to refer to a Charge delivered by me in February 1912, and subsequently published under the title "The Character and Call of the Church of England" (Macmillan), pp. 4–6 and note A, p. 133.

his Consecration, took an Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and it will not be contended that that oath is devoid of meaning or that the relation so established is other than a real one. I have, for more than a quarter of a century, had opportunity of observing the successful and harmonious working of what is admittedly a temporary and provisional arrangement pending the due extension of our Provincial system to all parts of the Church. The difficult question of a possible Province in East Africa has been for some time under the careful consideration of those whom the formation of such a Province would, or might, affect. For the time being it is upon myself that special responsibility for action of a steadying and co-ordinating kind must rest.

The problem with which the Kikuyu Conference was concerned is not peculiar to East Africa. It calls for attention in many other fields of Missionary Service. It is rapidly becoming urgent in China, in Japan, in some parts of India, in Western Equatorial Africa, and in the Islands of the Southern Seas. It may be stated in elementary form thus : It is the paramount duty and privilege of those who are already Christians to promote the upbuilding of the Church of Christ among all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues. The Church so upbuilt must in every land be, or become,

what we call for shortness' sake a Native Church, a Church, that is, into whose structure the characteristics of the people of that land are for the common good of the whole Church of Christ taken up and interwoven. The message of the Lord Jesus Christ must not permanently be read by the Indian or Chinese or African Christian through European eyes, or be expressed in terms of European speech, or maintained and set forth by usages and forms of worship which are distinctively or exclusively of European origin. Still less must the growing Native Church—Chinese or Indian or African or Australasian—be hampered in its young life by schisms and divergences whose origin and meaning are due to what may almost be called the accidental happenings of English or Scottish life—political, social, and ecclesiastical—150 or 250 years ago. It would be ridiculous, but for its grave and pathetic harmfulness, to reproduce as a permanent element in the future Church of Eastern Africa divisions and nomenclatures which trace their origin and meaning to some distant chapter in our own local life. Upon that proposition there will scarcely, I think, be any difference of opinion. In so far as these historical "*schismata*" of ours are due to genuine and deep-rooted diversity of doctrinal teaching or belief they may, no doubt, come to have as real a *raison d'être* among Africans as among Europeans; but every sensible teacher

and guide, who is laying foundations for the African Church of future generations, will set himself to obviate or reduce them so far as by God's help, and with loyalty to truth, he can.

But the pioneer or founder who with this thought in his heart is facing his great task in Africa to-day finds himself confronted by a stern and incontrovertible fact. It is this. The germ or nucleus of the African Church of the future must needs be the group or groups of those who are already converts from Paganism or Islam, and these people have received and assimilated their Christian faith from streams of teaching which have come to them along different channels of transmission, and the characteristics of the different channels have become familiar to, and perhaps loved by, the several groups of converts. The denominational divisions are thus marked and strong notwithstanding the friendliness subsisting between the different bodies. How are these two elements in the problem—the steadying desire for a genuinely African Church in days to come, and the existing loyalty to denominational systems and traditions—to be reconciled ?

In trying to answer that question we instinctively look for precedents in the history of the Church of Christ. There are none. In the nineteen Christian centuries we find nothing which can fairly be called a precedent. Never before have teachers and guides in the Church of Christ

been called upon to handle that particular problem on a large scale and in concrete form. All the more are we bound to treat with anxious considerateness a thoughtful and painstaking endeavour on the part of experienced Missionary leaders who, in existing conditions, set themselves, experimentally and without the aid of precedent, to meet difficulties which are large and urgent. They are large because of the range and rapidity of missionary advance. They are urgent because of the extreme danger of needlessly stereotyping in infant Christian communities, whose plastic stage will not last indefinitely, the existing British lines of denominational division.

Our objective in this discussion or controversy is the planting and growth of a rightly ordered Christian Church of East Africa. So far, all who think about it are on common ground.[1] In trying to prescribe the lines of action which we can with loyalty and safety follow in advancing

[1] See, *e.g.*, the President of the English Church Union, Feb. 7, 1914. "The ultimate ideal of a United Native Church, constituted according to the Mind of Christ, is the end we must all have in view," and the pamphlet by Bishop Willis, "The Kikuyu Conference. A Study in Christian Unity," page 7. "The missionaries in East Africa have met in Conference, with a view to seeing how far, without compromising the position of any, it may be possible so to work in harmony with one another, and along converging lines, as to leave the way open, even though it be in the far future, for the ultimate formation of a united native Church in British East Africa. Whatever may be thought of the detailed proposals, it is difficult to see how anyone who has at heart the ideal of Christian unity can object to the aim."

towards that end among the difficulties which are described above, we are entitled and even bound to examine carefully the counsels given in successive Lambeth Conferences of Bishops, as to the relation of our Church to other bodies of Christians. Though drafted chiefly with a view to what is called "Home Reunion," these Resolutions and counsels are applicable to fields very far from home, and to conditions of Church life which are still quite immature. For that reason the records of what was said by the Lambeth Conferences of 1888, 1897, and 1908 are of real importance in appraising the action taken at Kikuyu in 1913, as the outcome of the preparatory meetings which had led to it.

The Conference of 1888 resolved in full session :—

> 12. That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate Reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

In the Conference of 1897 a strong Committee reported as follows :—

> We consider, however, that the time has now arrived in

which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves *originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*

The Encyclical Letter of that year contains the following sentence :—

> We recommend that committees of Bishops be appointed everywhere to watch for and originate opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian Bodies, and to give counsel where counsel may be asked.

In the Conference of 1908 the Committee on "Reunion and Intercommunion" used these words :—

> Your Committee deliberately refrain from entering into any details, believing that these can only be profitably discussed when the spirit of unity has drawn the two bodies into closer fellowship with each other. But they have given very careful consideration to the matter, and they wish it to be understood that, in their opinion, members of the Presbyterian Churches who have, or may have, a real desire for fuller union with the Churches of our Communion may be assured that the way to such an arrangement as has been indicated above is not barred by obstacles which cannot be overcome by mutual considerateness, under the guidance of Him who is the Spirit alike of unity and truth.

The following Resolution was passed in full session :—

> 75. . . . . Further, in the opinion of the Conference it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period

of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

Finally, the Encyclical Letter of 1908 contains these paragraphs, which seem to me to bear directly upon the sort of problem which East Africa presents :—

> The winning of the nations to Christ, in fulfilment of His own great commission to His Church, is a matter of much more general concern to Christian people than ever before, and we realise the imperative necessity for effective and visible co-operation among the workers. The waste of force in the Mission field calls aloud for unity. Nor is this less necessary for the effective conduct of the war against the mighty forces of evil in Christian lands. With the realisation of this need has come a new demand for unity, a penitent acknowledgment of the faults that hinder it, and a quickened eagerness in prayer that, through the mercy of God, it may be attained.

And again :—

> We must set before us the Church of Christ as He would have it, one spirit and one body, enriched with all those elements of divine truth which the separated communities of Christians now emphasise severally, strengthened by the interaction of all the gifts and graces which our divisions now hold asunder, filled with all the fulness of God. We dare not, in the name of peace, barter away those precious things of which we have been made stewards. Neither can we wish others to be unfaithful to trusts which they hold no less sacred. We must fix our eyes on the Church of the future, which is to be adorned with all the precious things both theirs and ours. We must constantly desire,

not compromise, but comprehension, not uniformity, but unity.[1]

It is certain that these utterances cannot be interpreted as setting the *imprimatur* of the Anglican Episcopate upon the details of the Kikuyu scheme of Federation. But, as it seems to me, they show indisputably that the endeavour to draw up such a scheme, provisionally and tentatively, was no haphazard notion invented by a group of enthusiastic and unbalanced missionaries. Rather was it, if I may quote the words of the two Bishops whose action is impugned, "an honest attempt to interpret what we believe to be the spirit and intention of the Lambeth Conference in regard to closer co-operation in the Mission field with the only Churches with which such co-operation is at present possible."[2]

The details of the Scheme of Federation may be fairly open to criticism or even to repudiation. Not so, by members of the Lambeth Conferences, the principle which actuated its promoters. I endorse the words of the Consultative Body upon the character and object of the Kikuyu Conference :—

The Central Consultative Body heartily appreciate the fact that the main object of the Kikuyu Conference, namely, the

[1] Lest anyone should suppose that these sentences may have been unfairly separated from their context, I have in an Appendix quoted the passages at full length. It is desirable that these utterances on the part of some of the most responsible of the Church's leaders should be better known. See Appendix C., page 48.

[2] "Steps towards Reunion," p. 52.

promotion of a brotherly spirit, and the adoption of practical steps towards unity, is wholly desirable. The Conference laid emphasis, before the natives of Africa and in the face of Islam, upon what unites rather than upon what separates bodies of Christians. It endeavoured to secure a clear understanding as to the mutual relations of Churches or Societies in the field, and working agreements on certain points. The attempt to bring to a common standard rules relating to probation and discipline, admirably serves the main object, and is in itself of great moral and religious value.

All this, with the mutual consideration involved, and with the united testimony borne to the faith which is enshrined in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, plainly makes for unity; and it is by such methods and by such a temper, more, perhaps, than by formal organisation, that the conditions may be realised in which the end of our efforts and our prayers—A genuine African Church—will be shaped by the Holy Spirit of God according to His Will.[1]

Further, it is fair to both sides in the present controversy that I should thankfully call attention to the large measure of agreement between them upon certain lines of policy. The Bishop of Zanzibar is as anxious as his Episcopal brethren to co-operate in some ways with Missionaries belonging to other denominations. Like Bishop Selwyn and Bishop Patteson in Melanesia, and some of our greatest Missionary Bishops in Africa and in the Far East, he is recognizing the demarcation of areas wherein the duty of evangelization is assigned to different denominations. "The relations," he says, "between our own

[1] See Appendix B., page 43.

Missions and those of other ways of belief and practice have always been most friendly. We have observed boundaries, we compete with no other Mission of any sort within our own limits." [1] And his sketch of a "possible plan of co-operation between Episcopal and Non-episcopal Churches" includes a "Form of Service of Spiritual Communion" which he thinks may under proper sanction be jointly used in connection with meetings of his proposed "Central Missionary Council of East Africa."

It is worth while to quote the sentences in which the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda welcome the measure of agreement between the Bishop of Zanzibar and themselves.[2]

79. The publication of "Proposals for a Central Missionary Council of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches in East Africa," by the Bishop of Zanzibar, offers a definite and alternative scheme. The simple *non possumus* attitude, which acknowledges the difficulty, and neither offers nor accepts any solution, leads unswervingly to one goal—confusion, the deliberate introduction into a new country of all that we deplore at home, and need never have abroad. The Bishop of Zanzibar's proposals are a welcome evidence of a sincere desire to grapple with a problem of which, as a Missionary Bishop, he cannot but be conscious. If we are constrained to disagree with some of the suggestions, it is from no lack of appreciation of the motive and the spirit that inspired the proposals.

80. With very much of the Scheme we are in entire

[1] *Ecclesia Anglicana*, page 18.
[2] "Steps towards Reunion," page 46.

agreement. The clear desire to co-operate, to the utmost of his power, with "non-episcopal Churches," frankly acknowledged as such; the desire to meet in the representative Council on equal terms with an equal number of episcopal and non-episcopal representatives both in the Council and in its Executive; the desire to join in prayer with those from whom, on certain matters, he profoundly differs, all show how far is the Bishop of Zanzibar from forgetting a problem which, to an onlooker at Home, may seem trivial, but to the worker on the spot is urgent. And the suggested form of Prayer for the Council's meeting shows the true spirit of the man.

The statements and quotations contained in the last few pages point indisputably to the conclusion that to arrange when possible for occasional Conferences of an interdenominational kind, is not only permissible but is positively enjoined by successive Lambeth Conferences. It amounts to something like an obligation everywhere, but the obligation is greatest and most urgent in the Mission field.

It is in the working out of details and not in the main idea of co-operation that difficulties and differences present themselves. They turn partly on the question whether the Church of England in addition to the emphasis she deliberately sets upon our Episcopal system has laid down a rule which marks all non-Episcopalians as *extra Ecclesiam*. The threefold ministry comes down to us from Apostolic times, and we reverently maintain it as an essential element in our own historic system and as a part of our Church's

witness to "the laws of ecclesiastical polity."[1] We believe it to be the right method of Church government, a method which no new generation in the Church of England would be at liberty to get rid of, or to treat as indifferent. We believe further that the proper method of Ordination is by duly consecrated Bishops, as those who, in the words of the Article, "have publick authority given to them in the Congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's Vineyard." But to maintain that witness with all steadfastness is not the same thing as to place of necessity *extra ecclesiam* every system and every body of men who follow a different use, however careful, strict and orderly their plan.[2] The words and acts of

[1] For the meaning of this phrase, see Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, Bk. iii., Ch. i. (14) "And of such properties common unto all societies Christian, it may not be denied that one of the very chiefest is Ecclesiastical Polity. Which word I therefore the rather use, because the name of Government, as commonly men understood it in ordinary speech, doth not comprise the largeness of that whereunto in this question it is applied. For when we speak of Government, what doth the greatest part conceive thereby, but only the exercise of superiority peculiar unto Rulers and Guides of others? To our purpose therefore the name of Church Polity will better serve, because it containeth both Government and also whatsoever besides belongeth to the ordering of the Church in public. Neither is any thing in this degree more necessary than Church Polity, which is a form of ordering the public spiritual affairs of the Church of God."

[2] See for example the reference made by the weighty and representative Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 to certain features in the existing Presbyterian system and usage, including the teaching of "many leading Presbyterian divines" as to "the transmission of Orders by a regular succession through the Presbyterate." The Committee quotes many authorities. See Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, pp. 183, 189–191.

many leading High Churchmen in Caroline days,[1] as well as the carefully chosen sentences and, it may perhaps be added, the significant silences in some of our formularies, throw a grave *onus probandi* upon those who contend for the rigid and uncompromising maintenance of the absolutely exclusive rule. On the other hand, the difficulty of showing that such a rule has ever been explicitly laid down by no means involves an approbation *en bloc* of the Federation Scheme drawn up at Kikuyu, and the Consultative Body has pointed out with perfect clearness three items of special difficulty which arise under that Scheme :

(1) The admission to our pulpits of men who have not been episcopally ordained ;
(2) The admission to Holy Communion of Christians who have not been episcopally confirmed ; and
(3) The sanction directly or by implication given to members of our Church to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of Ministers not episcopally ordained.

But before I refer seriatim to these three points

[1] For reference, as well-known examples, to the words and acts of *e.g.* Andrewes in 1610, Usher in 1641, Bramhall in 1643 and (?) 1661, and Cosin in 1650 and 1657, and for abundant quotations from divines of the 17th and 18th centuries upon the whole subject, see Dr. A. J. Mason's "The Church of England and Episcopacy," (1914), especially pages 70–73, 118–123, 179–195, 203–218, 223–233, 340–357. See also pp. 463–488.

I wish to say something about the meaning of "Federation."

The Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda have in their pamphlet "Steps towards Reunion" called attention to the limited character of such "Federation" as they advocate, pointing out how, in their view, it differs markedly from anything which can be called "Reunion." "No Union," they say (paragraph 43), "is proposed, but only a scheme of Federation which falls far short of organic union is brought forward." And again, commenting on the statement that "Any corporate Reunion with bodies who administer the Sacraments without Episcopal Ordination would tend to widen the breach of separation between ourselves and other ancient Churches and such an effect would be deplorable," they say (paragraph 88). "We entirely agree that 'such an effect would be deplorable.' But it is fair to point out that no such 'corporate Reunion' has been proposed. Federation, it need hardly be said, falls far short of organic Union."

On the other hand, considerable confusion seems to me to arise from the use in the pamphlet "Steps towards Reunion" of the word "co-operation," as though it were synonymous with or equivalent to "Federation." Paragraph 85 of the pamphlet runs as follows:—

> 85. It would be a sad sequel to any scheme of Federation, abroad, if the result at Home were the loss of unity within

our own Communion. But it is at least a question whether we have any right, in view of the New Testament teaching on unity, to let this consideration weigh. Either some positive principle forbids such co-operation, in which case there is an end of the question, or it is a *duty*, a matter of moral obligation, in which case to refrain from it, even with a view to the ultimate advantage of our own Communion, would be to do evil that good may come. We must do our immediate duty and leave the future to God.

But "Federation" and "Co-operation" are not the same thing. The Bishop of Zanzibar thus describes his own proposal as contrasted with the Federation Scheme of his brother Bishops. "The following Scheme sums up in brief outline what to my mind is the possible plan of co-operation between Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches." If there is to be a consistent use of words throughout this controversy, with its rival schemes, it is clear that "federation," while falling short, as above said, of "corporate reunion," must mean something more than "co-operation." And the Kikuyu Scheme shows it to mean more. If the Scheme becomes operative there is to be a central "Representative Council" which is to be not merely advisory and consultative but also executive, except in matters pertaining to the internal policy of the different Societies or Churches, and, according to the sixth of the Fundamental Provisions "the Function of the Council is to manage affairs until such time as the Native Church can do that for itself."

Now to create a Federation of that sort, whatever the internal autonomy of its various constituent parts, is obviously a step of supreme importance, and there is, I think, a very real difficulty in regarding it as possible that one section of a great Communion should thus federate itself with some of those outside, without thereby compromising or at least affecting the life and organisation of the whole Communion or Society whereof it is a part. Transfer the thought from Ecclesiastical to National life. Could Devonshire be federated, say, with Normandy without thereby compromising England? And would the difficulty be overcome by leaving to Devonshire such local autonomy as it has? Many, nay, I think, most, of the provisions in the proposed Scheme of Federation can, with perfect loyalty to our existing rules, be made effective under a system of co-operation and fellowship which may quite possibly pave the way for plans of formal federation and of ultimate union in a Native African Church. But a formal and quasi-constitutional Federation in British East Africa of different denominations whereof our Church is one, requires, as it seems to me, a sanction which must be more than local. The matter is exactly one of those which the Lambeth Conference of Bishops can appropriately discuss with a view to the enunciation by that large and representative

body of the principles which in its judgment must be authoritatively safeguarded, and perhaps of forms of rule and usage wherein a new departure may advantageously be made. The next Lambeth Conference will meet, if all be well, in the Summer of 1918, and a great deal may in the meantime be wholesomely done to give effect to the desire for friendly co-operation which underlay the Kikuyu proposals.

I return to the points of difficulty which I indicated above (page 20).

1. The proposed Scheme of Federation provides that

> "for the present all recognised as Ministers in their own Churches shall be welcomed as visitors to preach in other Federated Churches."

Does this rule in itself contravene any obligatory principles of Church Order? I do not think so, provided always—a proviso which is not apparent in the wording of the rule—that in Churches of our own Communion the authority of the Diocesan Bishop be maintained, and that the preacher whether he be minister or layman be duly accredited by the Bishop. That such is the intention of the promoters of the Scheme is implied by the manner in which the Bishop of Uganda expands or explains the sentence I have quoted. The words refer, he says, to one who is "a recognised Minister in his own Church."

[While] on the one hand [it is] clearly impossible, from the Anglican point of view, to recognise his orders as qualifying him for the ministry of our Church; on the other hand, he is, in almost every case, as things at present stand, the recognised leader of a Church, which, however far it may differ from our own, is unquestionably being used of God, and whose fruits among the heathen cannot be denied. Obviously, he cannot be asked, in an Anglican church, to assist in the administration of the Sacrament; but *is it* impossible that he should be granted that liberty which is given to an honoured Lay Reader among ourselves, of preaching when invited to do so? Such an invitation would obviously be purely voluntary, and neither could nor would be claimed as a right.[1]

If the conditions thus described be observed I see no reason to restrict the freedom of a Bishop in the Mission Field as to those whom he may invite to address his people, or as to the sanction which may be given to a Priest or Deacon of his Diocese to address in their own buildings, on due invitation given, Christians who belong to other denominations. No fundamental principle seems to me to be involved. It is a matter of local, and primarily of Diocesan, administration.

2. Similarly, with regard to the graver or more complex question of admitting to Holy Communion those who belong to other denominations and have not been episcopally confirmed, it is in my judgment right to leave large responsibility with the Diocesan Bishop. The rule and custom of the Church of England, in respect

1 "The Kikuyu Conference," page 13.

of its own members, are not doubtful. In contradistinction to the system in vogue in many Roman Catholic countries, the Prayer Book of the Church of England specifically lays it down in the final Rubric appended to the Confirmation Service that in all ordinary cases admission to Holy Communion shall follow and not precede Confirmation. But the rule is one which must be open, as the very wording of the Rubric shows, to exceptions, and the character and range of the exceptions may rightly be subject to Episcopal discretion. No careful student of our Church's history will maintain that the rule, or direction, which dates back to a Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Peckham in the thirteenth century,[1] has been consistently or rigidly observed during the last six hundred years. Its original purpose seems to have been to stay, by what was virtually a sentence of excommunication upon the disobedient, the then prevalent neglect of Confirmation, and from the nature of the case, it had at that time no bearing upon others than the Church's children. The Rubric in question, as has been usefully pointed

[1] "Confirmationis insuper sacramentum multi negligunt temerarie, quia desunt forsan ad talia vigiles hortatores, adeo ut plures, immo innumeri sint inveterati dierum malorum, qui nondum confirmationis gratiam receperunt : cui negligentiae damnabili obviantes, Statuimus, ut nullus ad Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Dominici admittatur, extra mortis articulum, nisi fuerit confirmatus, vel nisi a receptione confirmationis fuerit rationabiliter impeditus."—Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, App. page 27 (ed. 1679).

out,[1] "is the last of a series of rules laid down for the guidance of Churchpeople with regard to their children. First baptism is not to be deferred; then the children are to be instructed in the Faith, etc.; then they are to be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed; finally until they have been confirmed they are not to be communicants. Those rules must be taken together. They bind, or ought to bind, the conscience of the parent, and so far as their execution depends on the action of the clergyman, his observance of them is part of his professional duty, legally enforceable."

In view of what passed in the Savoy Conference of 1661,[2] it is difficult to say that the discussions in the Conference were then regarded as having no bearing upon the admission of those who were not ordinarily conformists. But even at that date the question of the admission of such persons to Communion arose very much less frequently than it does to-day. Looking carefully at present-day facts and conditions, I have no hesitation in saying that in my opinion a Diocesan Bishop acts rightly in sanctioning, when circumstances seem to call for it, the admission to Holy Communion of a devout Christian man to whom the ministra-

[1] See an article on "The Confirmation Rubrics" in *The Times*, July 17th, 1914.

[2] See Cardwell's "History of Conferences on the Book of Common Prayer," pp. 329 and 360.

tions of his own Church are for the time inaccessible, and who, as a baptised person, desires to avail himself of the opportunity of communicating at one of our Altars. The proposed Scheme as worded would require of the would-be recipient the loyal acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as our supreme rule of Faith and Practice: of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief: and, in particular, belief in the absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the Word of God: in the Deity of Jesus Christ, and in the atoning death of our Lord as the ground of our forgiveness.

Each case or group of cases must be considered on its merits and the conditions will doubtless vary in different lands. If testimony be required in favour of the need, the workableness, and the advantage of such "ordered liberty" it is forthcoming in abundance from Bishops of ripe experience and recognised authority. Such testimony is borne not in England only or chiefly, but in all parts of the world, pre-eminently in Scotland, in India, on the Continent of Europe, and in the United States of America. In the words of the Consultative Body, it "seems to be eminently a matter in which the administrative and pastoral discretion of the Bishop may well be exercised, especially, though not exclusively, in the Mission Field."

3. I turn to what someone has described as "the other side of what is presumably a reciprocal rule"—namely, the sanction directly or by implication given to members of our Church to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of Ministers not Episcopally ordained. To imagine that the occasional admission of non-episcopalians who in special circumstances seek the Holy Communion at our hands carries or implies a corresponding readiness to bid the members of our Church, when temporarily isolated, seek the Holy Communion at the hands of any Christian Minister though not Episcopally ordained, who may be within reach, to whatsoever denomination or system he belongs, is gravely to misapprehend the position and to run the risk of creating serious confusion. I realise that the proposed Scheme of Federation as a whole may be interpreted as prescribing by inference some limitations which would qualify the phrase I have used above. But this is not enough. The perplexity, especially for simple and untutored people, would remain. And if such a principle were once laid down it would be impossible to limit its operation to British East Africa, the region covered by the proposed Federation Scheme, and so far as I can appraise and correlate the testimony given to me from China and Manchuria, from India, from Melanesia, and from Canada, the result of giving such

advice in general terms would be not only to create perplexity in administration, but to hamper and retard such measure of co-operation as is now happily in progress.

It is a satisfaction to me to point out that the question is at present of an academic rather than a practical kind, for it became apparent in our personal communications with the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda that they are so conscious of the difficulties and perplexities which might arise that they have no wish or intention to give that advice to African Christians belonging to their Dioceses.

No student of the question of our relation to other parts of the Church of Christ will forget that in almost every utterance which the Church of England has made on the subject—either corporately or by its representative men—emphasis is laid on the distinction between "regular" and "irregular"[1] ordination, and this without any attempt to lay down limits as to the operation of the grace of God vouchsafed to those who minister his Gospel to the souls of men.

There is no branch of Christian polity the handling of which requires more reverent caution

[1] I purposely avoid the words "valid" and "invalid" as I have always found myself unable, without a feeling of intolerable presumption, to give to that phrase the meaning which in popular parlance it would seem to carry. The word "invalid" has, except when applied to physical health, drifted far from the original force of the Latin adjective.

than does this. If, for the sake of securing what looks like a gain in the direction of Church Unity, or of attaining in the Mission Field a nearer prospect of a Church in the true sense "Native," we were to treat the question of a threefold ministry as trifling or negligible, it is obvious that we might do irreparable ill to the future life of the Church of Christ in that region of the earth. Putting the matter at its lowest, the contribution which we make to the Church of the future must be of our very best. It must, so far as we can secure it, be "thoroughly furnished" in effectiveness of spiritual power. Consciously to be party to anything less or lower would be intolerable, because on our part it would be disloyal. I do not say that the acceptance of what has been proposed (and, as the proposers think, safeguarded) would of necessity bear that character. But the danger would be neither distant nor unreal.

It remains for me to say something about the second of the two matters upon which I sought the advice of the Consultative Body: the special celebration of Holy Communion at the close of the Kikuyu Conference. In the controversies of last Summer that Service was frequently referred to as though it had been the deliberate inauguration of a new plan or system of Co-operation or Intercommunion between the different

Churches working in the Mission Field. Such a description of it was not, I think, unnatural in view of the language used by the eager and able Presbyterian writer whose widely published account [1] of the Service, whereat he had himself been present, was to the best of my belief the first intimation which any of us received on the subject. Mr. Norman Maclean described the occasion (including Conference and Service) as one of "epoch-making import." "The Missions in British East Africa have solved the problem of how to coalesce Episcopacy and Presbyterianism." In speaking of the celebration of Holy Communion, "it was," he says, "a day the impulse of which will be felt throughout every Mission-field in the world."

The earnest ring of Christian devotion which characterises Mr. Maclean's article must have a charm for almost every reader who cares about African Missions. It is interesting, however, to compare his eloquent tribute to the "new departure" with the quiet account of its concluding Service given to us in detail by the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda. The celebration of Holy Communion on which so much attention has been concentrated had no place in the programme of the Conference, and nothing was further from the thoughts of the Bishops, or apparently of others, than that they were thereby inaugurating

[1] In the *Scotsman* of August 9th, 1913.

a new policy or initiating a new plan of Intercommunion. It was simply a spontaneous act of devotion to their Lord on the part of a group of keen Christian workers who in the midst of a vast heathen country had been taking counsel as to the best mode of making known the Gospel of Jesus Christ and of upbuilding His Kingdom among men, and who desired before they parted to unite in the deepest act of Christian fellowship. Which of us will be eager to declare that if he had been one of them on that day, laden with the sense of isolation which belongs to a Missionary's life in heathendom, and with no other thought in his mind than that of carrying the Gospel message to the heathen folk among whom his life-work lay, he would have felt it to be impossible or incongruous to take part in that quiet Communion Service with brother workers who in spite of all differences were loyal like himself to "the Holy Scriptures as our supreme rule of faith and to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as a general expression of fundamental Christian belief"? It was far from being the first time that in the Mission Fields of Africa or of the Far East non-Episcopal Missionaries have participated in such a Service, when the celebrant was a Missionary Bishop or a leading Presbyter of our own Church, and in commenting upon the action of the Bishops and Clergy at Kikuyu it is unfair to forget that fact.

On the other hand, from the very story and stir of the controversy which has arisen, and from the character of the public utterances on either side which started it, the fact is pressed on our attention that a Service of the kind described, admittedly abnormal, admittedly irregular, is liable nowadays, to a degree undreamed of a few years ago, to acquire a character which it never claimed, and to be looked upon as a notable "demonstration" in favour of a particular ecclesiastical policy at a time when such lines of policy are the subject of keen and almost world-wide debate. The world grows smaller every day, as communication multiplies apace, and the remotest Mission Field, whether in Arctic or in Torrid Zone, may any day be startled to find that it is not only an inherent and conscious part of a far wider whole, but that, for help or harm as the case may be, a fierce light beats upon its every corner, and local words and acts have for the first time to be weighed in their bearing upon central plans and policies, central laws and liberties, central responsibility and central rule. Once realise this and every official act is set in a new light or regarded from a new standpoint. The closing Service of the Kikuyu Conference is a clear case in point. We are everywhere at work upon the question of Reunion, and it taxes the wisest among us to weigh aright the different elements of a problem upon the

right solution of which so much depends for Christendom and for the world. I have already, in speaking of the proposed Scheme of Federation, touched on some of its perplexities, and there are others which, when the Lambeth Conference of 1918 meets, must come under discussion. In the meantime no thoughtful man will, I think, contend that an independent solution should be attempted in one tract of mission fields by inaugurating therein a system of free intercommunion on the part of the Missionaries of different Churches. Nothing of the sort was intended at Kikuyu. Whatever settlement is to be reached must be reached deliberately and under the guidance of central authority; and anything which could be described as an attempt to "rush" a solution would be harmful beyond words. I need hardly add that the question of such open Communion on special occasions is of course entirely independent of the question which I have discussed earlier as to the exercise of temporary or occasional "hospitality" towards individuals deprived for a time of the ministrations of their own Church, be they French Protestants in the seventeenth century or Scotch Presbyterians in the twentieth. To mix the two questions is only to confuse matters. I believe that we shall act rightly, and that the wisest and strongest Missionaries believe that we shall act rightly, in abstaining at present from such

Services as the closing Service held at Kikuyu, now that in a world of quick tidings and of ample talk they are shown to be open to the kind of misunderstandings which have arisen.

The subject of Reunion and Intercommunion is with us day by day: it is not going to be forgotten: our efforts are not over: we ask continuously for Divine guidance towards "the haven where we would be." We do not, I am persuaded, ask in vain.

RANDALL CANTUAR.

Lambeth,
Easter, 1915.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

The following is a memorandum as to books, pamphlets, documents and letters laid before the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference, July 27th, 1914, in relation to the questions under consideration in connection with the Conference at Kikuyu.

In addition to the original pamphlets, namely:

(1) "Ecclesia Anglicana, for what does she stand?"; an open letter from the Bishop of Zanzibar to the Bishop of St. Albans;
(2) "The Kikuyu Conference"; by the Bishop of Uganda;
(3) "Proposals for a Central Missionary Council of Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Churches in East Africa"; by the Bishop of Zanzibar,

the following documents had already been circulated among the members of the Consultative Body before the meeting:—

(1) The Archbishop of Canterbury's Answer to the "Formal Appeal" made by the Bishop of Zanzibar.
(2) A confidential letter from the Bishop of Zanzibar to the Archbishop of Canterbury—circulated by the Bishop's desire to the members of the Consultative Body.
(3) "The Case against Kikuyu"; by the Bishop of Zanzibar.
(4) "Steps towards Reunion"; statement by the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda.

(5) Church Missionary Society Papers—
  (*a*) "Proposals of Committee for a Federation of Societies in E. Africa," drafted by the Africa Committee of C.M.S.
  (*b*) Resolutions of the General Committee of C.M.S. thereon, June 30th, 1914.
(6) A Memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury signed by certain Bishops, Clergy and Laymen.
(7) Memorandum by the Archbishop of Capetown.
(8) Memorandum by the Archbishop of Sydney.
(9) "The Church of England and Episcopacy," by Dr. A. J. Mason. 1914. Cambridge University Press.

The letters and papers which, in addition to the foregoing, were placed before the Consultative Body by the Archbishop of Canterbury included the following :—

(10) Letters and Memoranda from Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States with regard to the Rules and Customs of the Church in the matter.
(11) Synodical Resolutions of the Bishops of the Church in India and the substance of the advice given by successive Metropolitans.
(12) Letter from the Bishop of Madras as to the practice of his own Diocese.
(13) Statement by the Primate of Ireland as to the practice of the Church of Ireland in regard to the admission of unconfirmed persons to Holy Communion, and reference to the final Rubric in the Confirmation Service of the Church of Ireland.
(14) Statement by the Primus of the Church in Scotland as to a recent discussion by the Scottish Bishops on the subject.
(15) Copy of Instructions issued by the last and re-issued by the present Bishop of Gibraltar for Churches within his jurisdiction.
(16) Letter from the Bishops of Bloemfontein and

Kimberley supplementing the Memorandum of the Archbishop of Capetown referred to above.

(17) Extracts from directions given to his Diocese by the Bishop of Singapore.

(18) Memorandum by Bishop Scott (late of North China) on the treatment of the question in the Dioceses of the Church in China.

(19) Letter from Bishop Tugwell of Western Equatorial Africa, enclosing a Resolution of his Synod and stating the usage followed in his Diocese.

(20) Certain letters from Diocesan Bishops in England.

APPENDIX B. (*see page* 6).

The Answer of the Central Consultative Body to the Questions Submitted to them by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Your Grace has addressed to us two questions concerning the recent Missionary Conference at Kikuyu in East Africa. We have thought it best to give our answer to these questions in the form of the following statement.

I.

In replying to your Grace's first question with regard to the "Proposed Scheme of Federation of Missionary Societies," we clearly recognise that the Scheme was not drawn up with a view to immediate publication; that it was intended to be merely tentative; and that it was meant to serve as a series of proposals to be submitted for consideration to the recognised authorities of all the bodies concerned, and in particular by the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in view of his metropolitical relation to them.

The Scheme is thus to be regarded as a stage in negotiations still incomplete, rather than as an arrangement that has been definitely adopted. Accordingly, in many cases, the terms used in the Scheme have not taken matured and settled form.

Bearing this in mind, the Central Consultative Body heartily appreciate the fact that the main object of the Kikuyu Conference, namely, the promotion of a brotherly spirit, and the adoption of practical steps towards unity,

is wholly desirable. The Conference laid emphasis, before the natives of Africa and in the face of Islam, upon what unites rather than upon what separates bodies of Christians. It endeavoured to secure a clear understanding as to the mutual relations of Churches or Societies in the field, and working agreements on certain points. The attempt to bring to a common standard rules relating to probation and discipline, admirably serves the main object, and is in itself of great moral and religious value.

All this, with the mutual consideration involved, and with the united testimony borne to the faith which is enshrined in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, plainly makes for unity; and it is by such methods and by such a temper, more, perhaps, than by formal organisation, that the conditions may be realised in which the end of our efforts and our prayers—a genuine African Church—will be shaped by the Holy Spirit of God according to His Will.

But the proposal of "Federation" evidently goes much further than such particular agreements as those of which we have just been speaking. It opens manifold questions. It is of a constitutional or semi-constitutional character. For "Federation" has, word and thing, political associations, and federal authority often is, or increasingly becomes, dominant over the federated units. Declarations of "autonomy" do not sufficiently meet this difficulty.

It is probable that the arrangements proposed are largely due to the special circumstances and conditions of particular dioceses. But the effect of the proposal may be far-reaching.

Plainly, for example, it is not without its bearing on the characteristic position of the Anglican Communion and on the harmony of the different convictions which by the goodness of God and the power of His Spirit have been held together within it.

Further, what is done in one part of our Church, though it may there have been intended only to meet local needs, is likely to be followed in other places, and even to become

the starting-point for further movement in the same direction.

It therefore appears to us that such a constitutional scheme is quite distinctly the kind of change, or step in advance, which ought not to be made by a diocese or group of dioceses without opportunity given to the whole Communion, through the Lambeth Conference, to advise upon it, at least in its main principles.

This recommendation of reference to the Lambeth Conference does not in any way mean that we suggest the postponement of the whole matter for four years. The parties who met at Kikuyu have formulated a number of suggestions for common action. Many, probably most, of these can be carried out by the method of mutual agreement. They tend to unity without any compromise of independence.

There are, however, some proposals in the Scheme, which require the most anxious consideration :—

(1) It is proposed in the Scheme that "all recognised as ministers in their own Churches shall be welcomed as visitors to preach in other federated Churches." We see no essential difficulty in inviting a minister or lay person not of our own Communion to address our people, provided that the Bishop inviting him or authorising the invitation is satisfied as to his qualifications. We concur in the Bishop of Uganda's statement that "such an invitation would obviously be purely voluntary, and neither could nor would be claimed as a right."[1] But the terms of the proposal to which we have called attention do not seem to us sufficiently to safeguard this principle.

(2) A graver question is that which arises as to the admission to Holy Communion in Anglican Churches of Communicants belonging to other denominations.

The principles accepted by the Church of England as bearing on admission to Holy Communion (apart from the moral conditions laid down in the formularies of the Church)

[1] "The Kikuyu Conference," page 13.

start, it need hardly be said, from the presupposition that the candidate for admission is a baptised person.

Further, it is the undoubted rule of the Church of England that those who are to be admitted to the Holy Communion must have been "Confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

In strictness this forbids admission to the Holy Communion till the requirements of the Church have been complied with; and here it should not be forgotten that the Church regards Confirmation not merely as a condition of admission to Holy Communion, but as an apostolic means of grace by which the life of the baptised is strengthened for Christian service through the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, the lack of Confirmation cannot be held, as the lack of Baptism must be held, to render a person incapable, so far as man can judge, of sacramental communion.

The evidence is abundant to show that exceptions to the rule have been allowed in special cases by many Bishops of weight and learning and of diverse theological positions, in all parts of the Anglican Communion.

But this relaxation has been a matter of episcopal discretion exercised expressly in view of special circumstances, and therefore, in our view, has not compromised the Church's witness to her principles.

Few rubrics, moreover, are so rigid as to admit of no exception; nor can the rubric in this case be so interpreted as to prevent the admission to occasional communion of individuals who from peculiar circumstances are deprived of the ministrations of the Churches to which they belong.

This seems to be eminently a matter in which the administrative and pastoral discretion of the Bishop may well be exercised, especially, though not exclusively, in the mission field.

(3) It appears to be implied in the proposed Scheme that members of our own Church resident in districts assigned to the care of a non-episcopal mission would

communicate in the churches of that mission. This seems to us to be a question on an altogether different level from that with which we have just been dealing. It needs separate treatment, and it is one upon which our advice is expressly asked.

We are not here called upon to consider individual cases. We are confronted by definite proposals, to which two Bishops of our Communion have been parties, for arrangements of a general character between different religious bodies. In these it seems to be implied that members of our Church would be encouraged or even expected to communicate in non-episcopal Churches.

We are bound to say that we cannot regard any such arrangements as consistent with the principles of the Church of England. In saying this we associate ourselves with the words used, though in a different order, by the Committee of the last Lambeth Conference on "Reunion and Intercommunion": "It is no part of our duty, and therefore not our desire, to pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions. But Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it, and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves."

II.

We go on to deal with your Grace's second question. The Communion Service at the end of the Conference at Kikuyu does not come within the scope of the considerations which we have previously advanced about exceptional cases of admission to Holy Communion. For there was on that occasion no such necessity as we were then contemplating. It was an act of a different nature, unpremeditated, and prompted by an impulse of a deeply Christian kind. We desire to abstain from any expression of judgment about it. We can well believe that for the purity of its motive, and for the love that was in it, it was acceptable to

Him to whom it was offered, and whom its participants united to adore.

But after saying this, we are bound to add that any attempt to treat it as a precedent, or to encourage habitual action of the kind, must be held to be inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England. It would be a very serious alteration of the terms of communion, made not by any deliberate and corporate resolution of the Church, but by the sporadic action of individuals. However well intended, it would be subversive of Church order. It would perplex the minds and distress the consciences of multitudes of loyal Churchmen. So far from promoting unity, it would, in our judgment, rather imperil the measure of unity which we now possess, and the prospects of the fuller unity for which we pray. Inspired by the laudable motive of charity towards those from whom we are unhappily separated, it would be grievously hurtful to charity among ourselves.

In the advice which we have given to your Grace, we have had chiefly in view the case of Native Converts in the Mission Field, but we see no reason, for the purposes of our reply, to distinguish between them and European Christians living among them.

COSMO EBOR:
J. B. ARMAGH.
E. JAMAICA,
Archbishop of the West Indies.
S. P. RUPERTSLAND,
Primate of all Canada.
WALTER J. F. ROBBERDS,
Bishop of Brechin, Primus.
EDW: WINTON:
R. S. COPLESTON, Bishop.
FREDERIC WALLIS, Bishop.
H. E. RYLE, Bishop.
A. EXON:
HY. GIBRALTAR.

APPENDIX C. (*see page* 12).

The Lambeth Conferences of 1888, 1897, 1908.

1888.

In the Lambeth Conference of 1888 a large Committee of Bishops, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Alfred Barry, then Archbishop of Sydney, drew up a Report upon "Home Reunion." After recounting successive discussions which had taken place on the subject in the Convocation of Canterbury, the Report continues as follows:

"From various Synods of the Colonial Church similar, and even stronger, expressions of a desire to make some movement on the part of the Anglican Communion in this direction have been brought before the Committee. The General Synod of the Church in Australia and Tasmania, in 1886, "desired to place on record its solemn sense of the evils of the unhappy divisions among professing Christians, and, through His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, respectfully prayed the Conference of Bishops to be assembled at Lambeth in 1888 to consider in what manner steps should be taken to promote greater visible unity among those who hold the same Creed." A Resolution was passed in almost the same words by the Diocesan Synod of Montreal; and similar Resolutions by the Provincial Synod of Rupertsland, and the General Synod of New Zealand. At the Session of the Provincial Synod of Canada in 1886, a Joint Committee was appointed, to confer with any similar Com-

mittees, which might be appointed by other Religious Bodies, on the terms upon which some honourable union might be arrived at.

But the most important and practical step has been taken by our brethren of the American Church in the General Convention of 1886, in accordance with the prayer of a petition signed by more than a thousand Clergy, including thirty-two Bishops. At that Convention a Committee of the House of Bishops presented a remarkable Report, which, after stating emphatically that the Church did "not seek to absorb other Communions, but to co-operate with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance schism, and to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ"; and that she was prepared to make all reasonable concessions on "all things of human ordering and of human choice," dwelt upon the duty of the Church to preserve, "as inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as therefore essential to the restoration of unity," the following:—

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the Revealed Word of God.

"2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

"3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

"4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The Report concluded with the following words:—

"Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorised response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly Conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of organic Unity of the Church, with a view

to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

This Report was adopted by the House of Bishops, and communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and, at the instance of the latter House, it was resolved—

"That a Commission consisting of five Bishops, five Clerical and five Lay Deputies, be appointed, who shall at their discretion communicate, to the organised Christian Bodies of our country, the Declaration set forth by the Bishops on the twentieth day of October; and shall hold themselves ready to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian Bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church."

After consideration of these significant documents, and of memorials from certain Associations which have already done good service in this cause, it was decided by the Committee that they were more than justified in recommending to the Conference that some steps should be taken by it in the direction specified in the Resolution constituting the Committee.

II. In considering how this could best be done, it appeared to the Committee that the subject divided itself naturally into two parts; first, the basis on which the united Church might, in the future, safely rest; secondly, the conditions under which present negotiations for reunion, in view of existing circumstances, could be carried on.

The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest.

But, in regard to the first portion of the subject, the

Committee were of opinion that with the chief of the Non-conforming Communions there would not only be less difficulty than is commonly supposed as to the basis of a common faith in the essentials of Christian doctrine, but that, even in respect of Church Government, many of the causes which had originally led to secession had been removed, and that both from deeper study and from larger historical experience, there was in the present day a greater disposition to value and to accept the ancient Church Order. It did not, indeed, appear to them that the question before them, which was of the duty, if any, of the Anglican Communion in this matter, was to be absolutely determined by these considerations; but they seemed, nevertheless, to give important encouragement to the Church in the endeavour to do what might appear to be her duty in furthering this all-important matter.

Accordingly, after careful consideration, they determined to take as the basis of their deliberations on this part of the subject the chief articles embodied in the Report of the Committee of the House of Bishops in the American Church; and after discussion of each, they submit them to the wisdom of the Conference, with some modifications, as supplying the basis on which approach might be, under God's blessing, made towards Reunion :—

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

2. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

3. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

The Committee believe that upon some such basis as this, with large freedom of variation on secondary points of doctrine, worship, and discipline, and without interference with existing conditions of property and endowment, it might be possible, under God's gracious providence, for a reunited Church, including at least the chief of the Christian Communions of our people, to rest.

III. But they are aware that the main difficulty of the subject lies in the consideration of what practical steps can be taken towards such reunion under the actual religious conditions of the community at home and abroad—complicated, moreover, in England and Scotland by legal difficulties. It appears to them, moreover, clear that on this subject the Conference can only express an opinion on general principles, and that definite action must be left to the constituted authorities in each branch of our Communion, acting, as far as possible, in concert.

They therefore respectfully submit to the Conference the following Resolution :—

"That the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, be earnestly requested to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other chief Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter."

In pursuance of that Report the Conference adopted the following Resolutions :—

11. That in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion :—

(A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to Salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

12. That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate Reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.

The Encyclical Letter of the whole body of Bishops attending the Conference contains the following :—

After anxious discussion we have resolved to content ourselves with laying down certain articles as a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion. These articles, four in number, will be found in the Appended Resolutions.

The attitude of the Anglican Communion towards the

religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this:—We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction, possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realised, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender.

But we gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our Communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world, there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore towards Christian fellowship. The Conference has shown in its discussions as well as its resolutions that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences.

1897.

Nine years later, in 1897, a Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference of that year, "to consider and report upon the subject of Church Unity," after dealing with "the Churches of the East," wrote as follows:—

On the Latin Communion.

As regards the Church of Rome, a series of documents has been issued by Pope Leo XIII, expressing his desire for the union of Christendom, but unfortunately asserting as its only basis the recognition of the papal supremacy as of divine right. In the last of these documents the Pope proceeded to an examination of the position of the Church of England, and called forth an answer from the Archbishops of the English Church. Though controversy is rarely a method of promoting unity, there are grounds for thankfulness in the courteous tone in which much of this controversy has been conducted; in the abandonment by the Pope of much irrelevant and spurious matter which previously rendered discussion hopeless; in the limitation of the sphere of controversy to definite points; in a large amount of subsidiary literature, embodying the results of much research; and in the desire shown on both sides to understand and not consciously to misrepresent one another. If this spirit increases, even controversy will not have been in vain; and we await the issue of such controversy with entire confidence.

The Committee do not propose to submit any resolution to the Conference on this branch of their subject. They desire to adopt, as the substantial expression of their own opinion, the words of a Committee on Home Reunion of the Lambeth Conference of 1888:

> "The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethen of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest."

APPENDIX C

ON OTHER CHRISTIAN BODIES.

I.

The question of unity with Christian bodies, other than the Eastern and Roman Churches, is one which has awakened among the members of this Conference a deep and most affectionate interest, and has led them to consider once more on what basis such unity might be established.

At the Lambeth Conference of 1888 the following important resolution was passed on the subject:—

That in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion—

(*a.*) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to Salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(*b.*) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(*c.*) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(*d.*) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

And now to-day we can only reaffirm this position as expressing all that we can formulate as a basis for conference.

It may be well for us to state why we are unable to concede more.

We believe that we have been Providentially entrusted with our part of the Catholic and Apostolic inheritance bequeathed by our Lord, and that not only for ourselves, but for the millions who speak our language in every land—possibly for humanity at large. Nearly a century ago the Anglican Church might have seemed to many almost entirely

insulated, an institution, in Lord Macaulay's language, "almost as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas." Yet at that time an eminent Roman Catholic (Count Joseph de Maistre) declared his conviction that the English Church was endowed with a quality analogous to that possessed by chemical *intermedes* of combining irreconcilable substances.

This quality of our Church we cannot forget and dare not annul. We feel we should not be justified in placing "new barriers between ourselves and the ancient historical Churches." Nor, in a different direction, do we believe in mere rhetorical calls to unity. Nor would we surrender in return for questionable benefits the very elements of the peculiar strength and attractiveness of our own system—its quiet adherence to truth, its abstinence from needless innovation, its backbone of historical continuity. We cannot barter away any part of our God-given trust, because we feel that such action would involve an amount of future loss and forfeiture which we cannot estimate at the moment.

For these and other reasons we cannot concede any part of our essential principles.

II.

Yet, if this, our inevitable attitude, seems discouraging to many loving hearts, those who are watching for the day of reunion to whiten upon the clouded sky are not without tokens of the coming dawn.

Let us glance for a moment at our four principles. We rejoice to see—1. The general and loving acceptance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to Salvation and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

2. It is cheering to find that not only the Apostles' Creed but also the Nicene Creed is received by so many holy and gifted minds among our separated brethren. In the Nicene Creed—that lasting safeguard against all forms of speculation which call in question either the perfect manhood or the true Godhead of our Blessed Lord—they acknowledge the essential Christianity necessary for eternal life, more

particularly the full truth concerning the person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. As to the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself: many to whom the question has been referred not only assent to the necessity of the unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution and of the elements appointed by Him; but, in accordance with our Prayer Book, see in the one ordinance the Sacrament of life, in the other the Sacrament of growth.

4. The historic Episcopate not unnaturally raises graver difficulties. Yet in America many of our Presbyterian brethren appear to have been not unwilling to remember that in England in 1660 their forefathers would have been prepared to accept episcopacy with such recognition of the laity as now exists in the United States and in the Irish and many of the colonial Churches. We naturally turn to the Established Church of Scotland, which approached us at the beginning of the present Conference with a greeting so gracious and so tender. That body has amongst its sons not a few who are deeply studying the question of the three Orders in their due and proper relation.

III.

As we approach the conclusion of our task, we wish to advert to two subjects which should stand out high and clear above all else:—(1) the Divine purpose of unity; (2) the existence of conditions in the Church and spiritual world. The first as our authority for working, the second our encouragement to work.

(1) We are thankful that the subject of Christian unity is gaining an increasing hold upon the thoughts, and, we believe, upon the prayers, of Christian people. The day is passed in which men could speak of the Church of God as if it were an aggregate of trading establishments, as if our divisions promoted a generous rivalry, and saved us from apathy and indolence. Men of all schools of thought are realising the grievous injury which has been done to Christianity by the separations which part holy men and women of various Christian bodies from each other.

(2) We find an ever growing hope of reconciliation in the historical phenomenon of *circumstances* generating a *condition* in the world of thought.

Such *condition-crises* sometimes occur. Their history is this. For a long period, two strains of thought, two currents of opinion, two sets of ideas, exist in a community. Of these, one at the outset is greatly in excess of the other; but that other has in it the true principle of growth, and so at last the two elements stand in equilibrium. Then the balance turns irresistibly, and the hopeless minority of one century becomes the triumphant majority of another. At the present time we are led to believe that this principle may be applied to "Home Reunion."

Circumstances, which are but God's preparation, produce the *condition* which is God's advance. We look forward in faith and hope to the sure coming of a time when this condition will arise by the anti-sectarian and conciliating work of God the Holy Ghost in the life of Christendom.

The *circumstances* of our Christendom are rapidly producing the *condition* which is antagonistic to separation. The circumstances to which we refer are such as these: larger and more liberal views of the interpretation of Scripture; movements which enlarge and correct men's knowledge of primitive Church history; the overthrow of metaphysical systems which deprave and discolour the attributes of God; belief in and love of the living, ascended Christ, giving earnestness and beauty to Christian worship; thought critical, ethical, æsthetic—these things are bringing about the *condition* in which union will be as natural as disunion has been for some centuries.

In this renewed spirit of unity we trust that our beloved Church will have a large share. We speak as brothers to these Christian brothers who are separated from us. We can assure them that we fail not in love and respect for them. We acknowledge with a full heart the fruits of the Holy Ghost produced by their lives and labours. We remember the fact, so glorious for them, that in evil days they kept up

the standard at once of family virtue, and of the life hidden with Christ in God. We can never forget that lessons of holiness and love have been written upon undying pages by members of their communions, and that the lips of many of their teachers have been touched with heavenly fire. We desire to know them better—to join with them in works of charity. We are more than willing to help to prevent needless collisions, or unwise duplication of labour. We know that many among them are praying like many of ourselves, that the time may be near for the fulfilment of our Master's prayer that "they all may be one." Surely in the unseen world there is a pulsation of joy among the redeemed; some mysterious word has gone forth among them that Christ's army still on earth, long broken into fragments by bitter dissensions, is stirred by a divine impulse to regain the loving brotherhood of the Church's youth. May we labour on in the deathless hope that, while in the past, unity without truth has been destructive, and truth without unity feeble, now in our day truth and unity combined may be strong enough to subdue the world to Christ; and the Muse of the Church's history may no longer be hate but love. May He grant us (in Bishop Jeremy Taylor's words) "uniting principles, reconciled hearts, and an external communion in His own good season."

Time ripens, thought softens, love has a tender subtlety of interpretation. Controversy in the past has been too much the grave of Charity. We have much to confess and not a little to learn.

IV.

When we come to consider the practical steps which are to be taken towards re-union, we feel bound to express our conviction as to the magnitude and difficulty of the work which lies before us; a work which can only be accomplished by earnest, and, so far as possible, united prayer to our Heavenly Father for the help of the Holy Spirit that we may be delivered from all hatred and prejudice, from everything that can hinder us from seeing His holy will, or prevent us from accomplishing His divine purpose.

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 adopted the following resolution :

"That this Conference earnestly request the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that *they hold themselves in readiness* to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate re-union, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter."

We consider, however, that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves *originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession.*

In pursuance of that Report the Conference of 1897 adopted the following resolutions :—

34. That every opportunity be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians, as a fact of revelation.

35. That this Conference urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

40. That the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies, and to give counsel where counsel may be asked in this matter. That these Committees confer with and assist each

other, and regard themselves as responsible for reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect.

These Resolutions were recommended to the Church in an Encyclical Letter from which the following is an extract :—

On the Unity of the Church our Committee has not been able to propose any resolutions which would bind us to immediate further action. A Committee has been appointed to open correspondence with a view to establish a clearer understanding and closer relations with the Churches of the East. The Archbishop of Canterbury has been requested to appoint Committees to look into the position of the *Unitas Fratrum* and the Scandinavian Church, with both of which we desire to cultivate the most friendly possible relations. We recommend also that every opportunity be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation. We recommend that Committees of Bishops be appointed everywhere to watch for and originate opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian Bodies, and to give counsel where counsel may be asked: these Committees to report to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this matter.

Above all, we urge the duty of special intercession for the Unity of the Church in accordance with the Lord's Own Prayer, as recorded in the Gospel of St. John.

1908.

Again, eleven years later, in 1908, a great Committee of Bishops presented to the Conference of that year a weighty Report on "Reunion and Intercommunion." Section VII of that Report runs as follows :—

Presbyterian and other Non-Episcopal Churches.

Many circumstances have led your Committee to pay special attention to the relations between the Presbyterian Churches and the Churches of the Anglican Communion. To many Presbyterians we owe a deep debt of gratitude for their contributions to sacred learning. We are equally indebted to them for many examples of holiness of life. With regard to their Churches, although their characteristics appear to vary in different countries, they have in many ways a special affinity with our own Communion. Wherever they have held closely to their traditions and professed standards of faith and government, as formulated at Westminster, they satisfy the first three of the four conditions of an approach to reunion laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1888. Even as regards the fourth, though they have not retained "the historic episcopate," it belongs to their principles to insist upon definite ordination as necessary for admission into their ministry. Their standards provide that "the work of ordination" should be "performed with due care, wisdom, gravity, and solemnity" "by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting," by the presbytery; they regard and treat ordination as conferred by those who have themselves been ordained and are authorised to ordain others. Many leading Presbyterian divines maintain the transmission of Orders by a regular succession through the Presbyterate. Facts such as these seemed to point to the Presbyterian Churches as those among the non-episcopal bodies with whom it would be most natural and hopeful at the present time for our own Church to enter into closer relations. Indeed, your Committee have been informed that in Australia conferences have been already held between committees of the General Synod of our own Communion and of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church with a view to possible reunion.

Your Committee fully recognise that a condition precedent to any product of reunion would be the attainment of a general agreement in doctrine and practice which would violate no essential principle of the Churches of our Com-

munion. They admit that they are not satisfied that, except possibly in Australia, there is as yet evidence of a strong desire on the part of any of the Presbyterian Churches for a closer union with the Anglican Churches. The question of the recognition of Presbyterian orders seems to these Churches to present an insuperable obstacle. But the Committee feel that, before another Lambeth Conference can meet, the course of events may change the situation. In view of the possibilities of the future, they think that it would be a help to the cause of union to state that in their opinion it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those of A.D 1610.[1] Further arrangements would be necessary for the period of transition between the present condition of separation and full union on the basis of episcopal ordination. The Committee believe that such arrangements might be framed as would respect the convictions of those who had long and faithfully fulfilled their ministry in Presbyterian orders, without any surrender on our part of the essential principle, laid down in the Preface to our Ordinal, that those who are to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Churches of the Anglican Communion must have been episcopally ordained. In process of time the two streams of Christian life would mingle in the one Church, strengthened by the benefits which each of these contributory streams would be able to bring to the other.

Your Committee deliberately refrain from entering into any details, believing that these can only be profitably discussed when the spirit of unity has drawn the two bodies into closer fellowship with each other. But they have given very careful consideration to the matter, and they wish it to be understood that, in their opinion, members of the Presbyterian Churches who have, or may have, a real desire

[1] In so far as these precedents involve consecration to the Episcopate *per saltum*, the conditions of such consecration would require careful investigation and statement.

for fuller union with the Churches of our Communion may be assured that the way to such an arrangement as has been indicated above is not barred by obstacles which cannot be overcome by mutual considerateness, under the guidance of Him who is the Spirit alike of unity and truth.

Another remark may remove misunderstanding and make for peace. Anglican Churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves and for any Communion of which they are members. But it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions.

Although for the reasons stated the Committee have given special attention to our relations with Presbyterian Churches, they have throughout their deliberations considered carefully and earnestly the relations between other non-episcopal Churches and the Churches of our Communion. With many of them, to whose ministers and members we owe, as to Presbyterians, many debts of gratitude for their learning and piety, and in whom we recognise manifold fruits of the Spirit, we desire to be associated in friendly intercourse and common service for the Kingdom of God. The Committee believe that few things tend more directly to godly union and concord than co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people. It is in the common service of humanity, in the name of Him who is its Lord, that the ties of friendly relationship are most readily created and most surely strengthened.

Further, in the opinion of the Committee much could be done to promote a more cordial mutual understanding, which is the necessary preliminary to all projects of reunion, if the members of our Communion would take pains to study the doctrines and appreciate the position of those who are separated from us, and would be careful to avoid in speech or act anything savouring of intolerance or arrogance.

Towards this end, the Committee recommend that private meetings of ministers and laymen of our own and other Churches should frequently be held, such as those which have taken place under the auspices of the "Christian Unity Association" in Scotland, in which, by common study of the Word of God, by frank and friendly discussion, and by united prayer, they could at once realise and deepen the sense of union in the fellowship of Christ. Meanwhile the Committee would commend to the Church an ideal of reunion which should include all the elements of divine truth now emphasised by separated bodies; in a word, the path of efforts towards reunion should be, not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth, and the goal not uniformity but unity.

Finally, your Committee, recalling the words of the Report of the Committee on Church Unity appointed by the Lambeth Conference, 1897,[1] and of the Resolution of the Conference, No. 40,[2] venture to suggest that the constituted authorities of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of different Christian bodies and meetings for united acknowledgment of the sins of division, and intercession for the growth of unity. Believing as they do that the Spirit of our Lord has been at this time calling us

[1] "We consider that the time has now arrived in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should not merely make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communities in the English-speaking races, but should themselves originate such conferences and especially arrange for representative meetings for united humiliation and intercession."

[2] "That the Bishops of the several Churches of the Anglican Communion be urged to appoint Committees of Bishops, where they have not been already appointed, to watch for opportunities of united prayer and mutual conference between representatives of different Christian bodies and to give counsel where counsel may be asked in this matter. That these Committees confer with and assist each other and regard themselves as responsible for reporting to the next Lambeth Conference what has been accomplished in this respect."

with special clearness to "consider seriously the dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions," they easnestly trust that one result of the present Conference may be a sustained effort to carry out this proposal in a spirit of humble faith, expectant hope, and patient charity.

JOHN SARUM: *Chairman.*

The following were Resolutions passed in the full Conference of 242 Bishops :—

58. This Conference reaffirms the resolution of the Conference of 1897 that "Every opportunity should be taken to emphasise the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians as a fact of revelation." It desires further to affirm that in all partial projects of reunion or intercommunion the final attainment of the divine purpose should be kept in view as our object; and that care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it.

59. The Conference recognises with thankfulness the manifold signs of the increase of the desire for unity among all Christian bodies; and, with a deep sense of the call to follow the manifest guiding of the Holy Spirit, solemnly urges the duty of special intercession for the unity of the Church, in accordance with our Lord's own prayer.

75. The Conference receives with thankfulness and hope the Report of its Committee on Reunion and Intercommunion, and is of opinion that, in the welcome event of any project of reunion between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-episcopal Church, which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the episcopate on lines suggested by such precedents as those

of 1610. Further, in the opinion of the Conference, it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of episcopal ordination) which would respect the convictions of those who had not received episcopal Orders, without involving any surrender on our part of the principle of Church order laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

76. Every opportunity should be welcomed of co-operation between members of different Communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people.

77. The members of the Anglican Communion should take pains to study the doctrines and position of those who are separated from it and to promote a cordial and mutual understanding; and, as a means towards this end, the Conference suggests that private meetings of ministers and laymen of different Christian bodies for common study, discussion, and prayer should be frequently held in convenient centres.

78. The constituted authorities of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion should, as opportunity offers, arrange conferences with representatives of other Christian Churches, and meetings for common acknowledgment of the sins of division, and for intercession for the growth of unity.

The Encyclical Letter of the 242 Bishops contains the following :—

There is no subject of more general or more vivid interest than that of Reunion and Intercommunion. This interest is indeed not new. The peculiar position of our Communion, with its power and hope of mediating in a divided Christendom, has long been recognised by members of our own Churches and by others. This position is to us a continual call to service, as was abundantly acknowledged by the Conferences of 1888 and 1897. But this year's Conference has met in circumstances which pressed upon us this same call to service with a new

insistence. The winning of the nations to Christ, in fulfilment of His own great commission to His Church, is a matter of much more general concern to Christian people than ever before, and we realise the imperative necessity for effective and visible co-operation among the workers. The waste of force in the Mission field calls aloud for unity. Nor is this less necessary for the effective conduct of the war against the mighty forces of evil in Christian lands. With the realisation of this need has come a new demand for unity, a penitent acknowledgment of the faults that hinder it, and a quickened eagerness in prayer that, through the mercy of God, it may be attained.

The careful Report of our Committee and the detailed Resolutions may seem to some but cold in comparison with the warmth of the desires of many hearts. But these readers should remember the grave responsibility which attaches to the composition of such documents, and the necessity of accuracy, candour, and self-restraint, if the cause of unity is to be advanced by them.

Such Resolutions and Reports cannot be summarised; they must be studied. It will be observed that, in regard to every one of the Churches or groups of Churches to which our attention has been directed, we have tried to indicate some lines of definite practical approach. Wherever we have had reason to think that such an advance would be welcomed, we have gone far to meet our brethren. Where we have felt it absolutely necessary to sound a note of warning, we have tried to speak the truth in love.

Our Resolutions represent, for the most part, the present situation of our public relations with churches more or less widely separated from us. They may seem to show the remoteness rather than the nearness of corporate reunion. But before that consummation can be reached there must come a period of preparation. This preparation must be made by individuals in many ways, by co-operation in moral and social endeavour and in promoting the spiritual interests of mankind, by brotherly intercourse, by becoming

familiar with one another's characteristic beliefs and practices, by the increase of mutual understanding and appreciation. All this will be fruitful in proportion as it is dominated by a right ideal of reunion. We must set before us the Church of Christ as He would have it, one spirit and one body, enriched with all those elements of divine truth which the separated communities of Christians now emphasise severally, strengthened by the interaction of all the gifts and graces which our divisions now hold asunder, filled with all the fulness of God. We dare not, in the name of peace, barter away those precious things of which we have been made stewards. Neither can we wish others to be unfaithful to trusts which they hold no less sacred. We must fix our eyes on the Church of the future, which is to be adorned with all the precious things, both theirs and ours. We must constantly desire, not compromise, but comprehension, not uniformity, but unity.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY R. CLAY AND SONS, LTD.,
BRUNSWICK STREET, STAMFORD STREET S.E., AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

ices,
tion.
by a
ch of
ched
com-
ened
our
God.
hose
ards.
hich
the
the
ntly
nity,