

# The Anglican Church and episcopacy : the problem of Christian reunion in the foreign mission field

Autor(en): **Way, Albert**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift : neue Folge der Revue internationale de théologie**

Band (Jahr): **4 (1914)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **26.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403846>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## **The Anglican Church and Episcopacy.**

The problem of Christian Reunion in the foreign mission field.

---

The Church historian who sets out to write the story of the 19<sup>th</sup> century will probably note the expansion of the English Church as one of its most striking features. Less than a hundred years ago this Church would have seemed to an observer on the Continent to be simply a national product of the Reformation period, a reformed Christian body which had indeed maintained its continuity of organisation, but which was dependent for its special character and its somewhat isolated position in the "Protestant" world upon its connection with the State. He could not possibly have foreseen that at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it would have been found to have burst through all the fetters of nationality and state support, and to have planted itself, with its own particular and distinctive presentation of Christianity, in almost every part of the world. In addition to the 60 bishops in the United Kingdom, there are now 2 dioceses in Europe, 30 in Asia, 23 in Africa, 141 in America, 28 in Australasia, all of which are in full communion with the sees of Canterbury and York, and almost all of which are entirely independent of the authority of the British king and Parliament. Of these dioceses a large majority represent the expansion of the Anglo-saxon race and minister primarily to the spiritual needs of English-speaking peoples, although, particularly in South Africa and the United States, a large part of their activities are directed towards the coloured populations. Some fifty, however, are directly missionary, and represent the deliberate effort of English churchmen to extend the frontiers of the kingdom of Christ, and to plant in

these new regions not only the historic faith in Jesus Christ, but ecclesiastical institutions identical with those of “the Mother Church” in the British isles.

These institutions include the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, with the Apostolic Succession carefully preserved and maintained, the administration of Baptism with the proper form and matter, and of Confirmation by the Bishop, and a vernacular liturgy drawn directly from pre-reformation formularies. The three creeds of the undivided Church, as fixing the sense in which the doctrines of Holy Scripture are to be accepted, are the foundation upon which these institutions are based, and are recited regularly in public worship. This whole unified scheme of doctrine and practice is embodied in the “Book of Common Prayer” of which, it is well to notice, the “39 Articles” do not form any integral part, although generally bound up in the same volume. The Prayer book has now been translated into no fewer than 120 languages.

The new spiritual life of thousands of souls, otherwise entirely unaffected, it may be, by English culture and tradition, is thus being built up on a framework of Christian devotion and doctrine, which owes its peculiar character to the special circumstances of English history in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Since that time, as is well known, the Church of England has been always something “*sui generis*” in Christendom. She has never been able to be labelled decisively either Catholic or Protestant. To outsiders she has always seemed something anomalous, although they have often thanked God for her existence, and have looked wistfully towards her as bearing perhaps beneath all her curious inconsistencies the seed of a great hope.

It is worth while quoting here the words of one of the most impartial English writers upon the Reformation period, not himself a member of the Church of England. “It is plain”, he says, “that from the first”,—he is speaking of course only of the movements beginning in the 16<sup>th</sup> century—“two distinct elements have been present in the English Church, sometimes struggling for the mastery, sometimes living peacefully side by side, and that it is contrary to historical fact for either to assert itself in such a way as to exclude the other. I am only adopting the theological nomenclature of the day, and at the same time conforming to historical fact, when I call these elements Catholic and Protes-

tant. It is the peculiarity of the English Church that she is both. She constitutes an historical phenomenon quite different from that presented by any of the Reformed churches of the Continent. The development of Lutheranism, the development of Calvinism, have been simple and homogeneous. It is possible to speak of the Lutheran Church of Germany, of the Calvinistic Church of Scotland, in terms that shall be applicable to either as a whole. But only within narrow limits can we apply descriptive epithets to the Church of England which will not be angrily repudiated by one of her two opposed, yet equally characteristic, parties . . . So founded, and animated by such a spirit, the Church of England has always held, and still holds, a middle and a *mediating* place in Christendom.”<sup>1)</sup>

This statement of the special character of the English Church has been necessary in order to make clear the questions which have arisen lately in some of her missionary dioceses, and have raised the question whether her unity can be any longer maintained upon its present basis. Her distinctive character in relation to other reformed churches has come from her retention of the historic episcopate, while her internal unity has been secured up till now by refusing to define *in what sense* it has been retained. Is it simply regarded as the best form of Church government, or is it felt to be an indispensable instrument for ordaining ministers of the Eucharist? “Evangelicals” and “Catholics” have been able hitherto to live together in the same outward organisation because the Church has refused to commit herself to any categorical answer to this question. The divergence of religious types which are thus being held together is exhibited perhaps even more clearly in the mission field than at home. Missionary work is financed for the most part by societies which represent one or other tendency in a rather marked degree, and the districts in which their influence is respectively exercised tend, in consequence, to show a Christianity either predominantly “Catholic” or predominantly “Evangelical”. Unity has been maintained hitherto by insisting upon a uniformity of *practice only* in those matters on which there is disagreement between these two parties. Thus, while all have been committed

---

<sup>1)</sup> Charles Beard: “Hibbert lectures for 1883 on the Reformation in its relation to modern thought.” P. 323.

to an *ex animo* belief in the historic facts in the creeds and the doctrinal truths implied in them, an attitude of not-denying and a willingness to adopt a uniformity of practice has been accepted as sufficient in regard to the secondary, derivative doctrines of the sacraments and the ministry. The “Evangelicals”, so long as they accepted Episcopal confirmation and ordination, and have used the prescribed forms for the administration of the sacraments, have been free to hold and teach their own opinions as to the meaning and value of sacraments. “High Churchmen” or “Catholics”, on the other hand, so long as they did not depart from the formulae and the practices of the Prayer Book, have, as the result mainly of the Oxford movement, triumphantly vindicated their right as loyal members of the Church to hold the full Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and to teach the value of auricular confession. Hitherto, then, it has been possible for men of widely different religious views and temperament, and congregations emphasising widely different aspects of Christian truth, to live together—to the great advantage of both—in the same visible society, using the same forms of devotion, and obeying the same ecclesiastical rulers. However illogical it may seem in theory, the Elizabethan Settlement, as it is called, has in fact succeeded in its purpose of securing the external unity of the national Church.

The English Church is now, however, committed, as we have seen, to a far larger task than that of supplying a unified national Church for those who are all agreed to accept in general the authority of Holy Scripture. She has been called to move out far afield from her narrow insular boundaries, and to plant the faith and fellowship of the universal Church in vast new countries which we trust will one day become the homes of a reunited Christendom. No one who really believes in the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ, and in the gift to His Body of God the Holy Ghost, can imagine for a moment that the divisions which have originated in the earthly environment of the Church in Europe in the Middle Ages are going to be stereotyped and reproduced for ever in the new civilisations which are everywhere struggling up into life. Christendom, therefore, at large, has a right to ask of the English Church whether she really knows what she is doing and whither she is going. Is this Church polity of hers anything more than a temporary working compromise of merely

historical interest, or does it in any way embody principles which might serve as a basis for the true union of the evangelical and institutional elements in Christianity, and so pave the way for a future reunion of all believers in one visible society? The Church of England does indeed, in Beard's words, hold a peculiar and a middle place in Christendom. But is this also a "mediating place"? Does her system suggest a practicable policy by which to guide our efforts towards *reunion*?

To Christians on the Continent reunion, if indeed it is thought about at all, seems such a very far-away ideal, that to talk about a policy in regard to it sounds perhaps rather unreal. The Catholic and Protestant points of view are there, of course, far too sharply contrasted for reunion to be in any way a living idea, while the Old Catholics, who might theoretically at any rate be mediators, are entirely absorbed in the task of maintaining their own independent position. In the new Christian communities of the mission field, however, the thought of reunion occupies a very different place. Faced as they are by a united and often aggressive heathenism, the divisions between believers in Christ are coming more and more to be felt as a burden too grievous to be borne, and thinking men would welcome eagerly any suggestion for a policy by which they might eventually be removed. The Roman Catholic Church with all her vast stores of spiritual power and her great numerical strength, must unfortunately be left in this matter on one side. We know, alas, only too well, what *her* policy of reunion is, with its deliberate insistence that Churches not in visible communion with the Papacy are necessarily in schism. Until, therefore, she wins us over to her point of view or abandons what we feel to be wrong in it, she must of course be left to go on her own way alone.

Great however as her numbers are, there are yet multitudes of genuine worshippers of Jesus Christ in these newly awakened countries who do not belong to her. Those who have not given some special attention to the matter have probably no idea of the numbers of natives both in China, India, and elsewhere who have become Christians through the agency of missionaries other than those of the Roman Church. As they grow into self-consciousness, these large organised communities of Christian people find that they have no interest whatever in the controversies and animosities of European Christians which have caused them to

be organised as Lutherans, or Presbyterians, or Baptists, or Church of England, as the case may be. They wish to think of themselves, of course, simply as Christians, in contrast with the Hindus or Mahommedans or Devil-worshippers around them, and they realise that Christians were intended by our Lord to form one visible society. What is there, they ask, to prevent our ignoring all these European distinctions, and federating ourselves into a single homogeneous society? This is the demand which is surging up ever more and more insistently in the ears of missionaries all over the world, and which calls for the most eager sympathy and for the wisest consideration of all who believe in the kingdom of God. Every advance in material civilisation makes this need for external unity among Christians to be felt more strongly. As railways are built, native Christians tend to move about like everybody else in search of work, and naturally want to enter into fellowship with other Christians in each fresh place where they settle. If they find that their particular denomination does not happen to be represented, they cannot see why they should not be admitted on perfectly equal terms to communion with any other organised body of believers.

The need for formulating some policy to meet this growing demand and to form, if possible, a mould within which a united African Church of the future may be cast, was the origin of a conference of missionaries belonging to a number of different bodies which meet at KIKUYU—a mission station 300 miles inland from the island of Mombasa, on the East coast of Africa—in June, 1913. This part of the Continent consisting of three British Protectorates, — Nyasaland, Uganda (governed by its own native king), and British East Africa —, and parts of German and Portuguese East Africa, has been the scene of a quite marvellous mass movement towards Christianity during the last 40 years. The average number of adults baptised in the Church of England mission in Uganda each year since 1897 has been no fewer than 4000. At one of the mission stations of the Presbyterian body further South, in Nyasaland, it is calculated that more than 7000 native Christians attend divine service every week. Of this part of the country it was said in a recent book: “In this land there is nothing more wonderful than the Pax Britannica. Over these valleys and hills the tides of war used to roll unceasingly. No life, no property was safe for an hour. Today, Nyasaland is the most peaceful part

of the Empire. And the peace is kept by a British force of five officers and 130 native soldiers. That is the great miracle. But the miracle has been wrought because before the British soldier there came the soldiers of the Cross, the ambassadors of the Prince of Peace. It is their power that has wrought the miracle. These regions have been transformed from barbarism to civilisation by missions, and no white man would be in these regions to-day were it not for missions. You may wander for days in Uganda and you never see any sign that you are anywhere but in a Christian country. Today half the population of Uganda are Christian, and all the power and all the future lie in Christian hands.”<sup>1)</sup>

In the earlier days the work of the missionaries met with violent opposition, and many natives as well as white men have laid down their lives for the faith. One of the most barbarous of the persecutors was King Mwanga of Uganda. The rapidity with which things have been changed by Christianity may be gauged from the fact that his son Dandi, who has now succeeded him, during a visit to London in 1913 made an official visit to some new buildings of one of the missionary societies, and laid a foundation-stone with the words, “In the faith of Jesus Christ we lay this stone”.

In Uganda, the Church of England is represented exclusively by “Evangelicals”. At Zanzibar, further down the coast, and in Nyasaland—the field of the so-called Universities-mission, founded in 1860 by Oxford and Cambridge men as the result of an appeal from the great explorer, David Livingstone—her representatives are exclusively “Catholic”, and the fundamental differences of attitude between these two sections of the Church has been shown decisively by their relation to this Kikuyu conference, and the scheme for a federation of all the non-Roman missions put forward by it.

It is proposed that all these missions shall regard themselves, for the time being at any rate, with a view to a future united Church of East Africa, as forming a body of federated states, so to say, within the one Kingdom of Christ. Any body of Christians would be eligible to belong to this federation which accepted the following “basis of membership”:

(1) The loyal acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as our supreme rule of faith and practice; of the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds as

---

<sup>1)</sup> Maclean, *Africa in Transformation*. Nisbet, London. PP. 94, 212, 250.



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.

(2) Recognition of common membership between the churches in the federation.

(3) Regular administration of the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's supper, by outward signs.

(4) A common form of Church organisation.

Christians moving about from one district to another would be welcomed to Holy Communion in any Church of the federation, and, while the Eucharist would not be administered by anyone except the authorised ministers in each particular body, it is expressly laid down, that "all who are recognised as ministers in their own churches shall be welcomed as visitors to preach in other federated churches". In regard to the form of organisation, a uniform system of parish and districts councils, it is hoped, would be established, which would lead eventually, according to the hopes of many who were present at the Conference, to the general acceptance of the Episcopal form of government. "The missions in British East Africa have solved the problem of how to combine Episcopacy and Presbyterianism", wrote a Presbyterian who was present. For the present, the various bodies are to work towards this eventual unity of system by respecting each other's spheres of work, refusing to make converts from each other's members, and by agreeing that candidates for the ministry, after going through a prescribed course of study, "shall be duly set apart by lawful authority and by the laying on of hands."

If the Church of England were to enter such a federation, it would mean that, contrary to the rules of her Book of Common Prayer, some of her own members would be allowed to receive the Sacrament from ministers who had not been ordained by a bishop, and that persons not confirmed by a bishop would be admitted to her altars. But before going on to discuss the difficulties which have thus been raised, leading, of course to the question whether the Church may find that in these new circumstances the Elizabethan settlement is no longer able to hold her together, it is worth while stopping to note the wonderful new spirit implied by these proposals. They rest, of course, entirely on Protestant presuppositions in regard to the nature of the Church, and express

a rather old-fashioned, pietistic form of religion. But how different from the kind of Protestantism with which we are familiar in Europe today! The religion of these men is no mere carrying-on of a traditional orthodoxy, or chilly rationalising of a burnt-out faith, it is a fresh and eager grasping of spiritual realities, full of hope and enthusiasm! These proposals breathe no spirit of careful diplomatic compromise, trying to find some minimum of agreement between contending factions. They are the work rather of men who have an experience of brotherhood, and mean to go all lengths in their power to make it a realised fact. They are united, not by any common antagonism, but by a common positive hope. The common aspirations of missionary zeal, the common experience of the working of God's Spirit among them, have made them able to rise above all petty and secondary differences, and to draw together on the basis of a positive religious conviction which is shared by all alike. There has certainly been nothing like it in the Protestant world since the Reformation.

It must be remembered too that this Kikuyu conference does not stand alone. The same spirit is at work in many parts of the world, among those who have the missionary cause at heart. The so-called World Missionary Conference in Scotland in 1908 bore very striking witness to this, and "the Edinburgh spirit" has become a sort of watch-word to denote the eager determination to work for reunion without compromise. There is no stronger or more generous-hearted spiritual movement in the world today than this, and the first thought of any Christian when he hears of it—however rapidly the doubts and questionings about its fulfilment may begin to multiply in his mind—must unquestionably be one of warmest thankfulness and sympathy. It represents a movement which no one could possibly wish to thwart. If God's call comes to some of us "to put on the brake", let us be sure at any rate first that we are within the moving vehicle, and that we check it only in order to secure its safety!

Now we come back to the Church of England. How is she going to meet this entirely new situation, where it is no longer a question of holding together a national Church, but of laying down a policy for the reunion of divided Christians? Is she going to be able to show that she does really occupy a "middle and a mediating place in Christendom?" These proposals for a fede-

ration of Protestant bodies have revealed very clearly the fundamental nature of the differences which—although very largely concealed in the ordinary life of the Church at home—separate the “Evangelicals” and the “Catholics”. The “Evangelicals” have hailed them with delight. They represent exactly the kind of unity for which they are longing, and with which they think they would be satisfied. At the Kikuyu conference the Bishop of Uganda was in the chair, and was indeed one of the prime movers in the whole matter. In a widely-circulated pamphlet he has explained the reasons for his attitude.<sup>1)</sup>

He looks on Episcopacy as being the most ancient and the best form of Church government, and he fully hopes that the African Church of the future will possess it. It is in that sense and in that sense only, that he believes it was retained and insisted upon by the English Church at the Reformation.

The “Catholics”, on the other hand value Episcopacy, not as being the best form of Church government, but as uniting the provinces of the Church of England with the universal Church, and securing to them the Apostolic ministry and sacraments. They value it not because it is ancient or effective—that would not necessarily make it a vital question of *principle*—but because it is essential to the Catholic conception of the Church. Accepting it simply in the Bishop of Uganda’s sense is equivalent to asserting that the English Reformers had yielded to the Protestant heresy about the individualistic nature of the Church, and they firmly deny that this sense is compatible with the Book of Common Prayer. The opinions of the “Evangelicals” on this subject, they maintain, have been tolerated, but never sanctioned by the English formularies. “It is quite true”,—wrote the well-known theologian, Bishop Gore, in an “Open Letter” to the clergy of the diocese of Oxford upon “the basis of Anglican fellowship” (published by Mowbray, London)—“it is quite true that the Church of England imposes upon the clergy no obligation to hold the dogma that only episcopal ordinations are valid, and only priestly consecrations of the Eucharist, and that bishops are of the *esse* of the Church, but it has acted, so far as concerns its corporate action, always in such a way as to satisfy those who hold these

---

<sup>1)</sup> “The Kikuyu conference, a study in Christian unity, together with the proposed scheme of federation.” Longmans, London.

doctrines, and to impose a severe restriction upon the action which those who do not hold them would naturally wish to take”.

The Bishop of Zanzibar, accordingly, who had deliberately taken no part in the Kikuyu conference, brought the matter to the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities in England in a pamphlet entitled, “Ecclesia Anglicana, for what does she stand?” (Longmans.) He went so far as to ask that the bishops who had agreed to these proposals should be tried before the bishops of the Province of Canterbury on the charge of heresy and schism. This charge he has subsequently modified to “grave irregularity”. His own attitude towards the subject of united action on the part of separated bodies of Christians he has since made more explicit in a scheme for a “Council of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches”, which he says that he would gladly enter, provided that the Kikuyu federation were abandoned. (Longmans.) No definite action can thus be taken in the matter for some considerable time, and it is to be hoped that the whole incident, which has aroused an immense amount of interest and discussion, will induce English Churchpeople to think out and understand the far-reaching importance of the questions in dispute. The Bishop of Oxford, in the “Open Letter” already mentioned, appeals for “a great act of corporate thinking, by which we shall recognise again what our Anglican Church really stands for, and by what sort of loyalty it can maintain its cohesion and its power to grow and fulfil its mission in the world”. The Archbishop has now promised to refer the matter to the consultative committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference of 1908.

It will be seen that the whole controversy has brought out very clearly the two very different conceptions which prevail as to the place of the English Church in Christendom, and the nature of the “mediation” which she is able to offer. Her “Evangelical” section, as is clear from their attitude to these particular proposals, are inclined to ignore altogether, in their schemes for reunion, both the Roman and the Eastern Orthodox communions. Their eyes are fixed exclusively upon the disunion among the Protestant sects, and they believe that this may be overcome by winning them gradually to the acceptance of the Episcopal form of government. This would not, however, necessarily require the maintenance of the strict Apostolical succession, and would be compatible with quite Protestant views about the sacraments. The acceptance

of Episcopacy in this way would not afford any guarantee that the Church so organised was really continuous in intention and belief with the primitive undivided Church, and would not supply any basis for a further reunion with the Roman or Greek Church or even with the Old Catholics. Mr. Gladstone once pointed out pertinently the weakness of this sort of "Reunion". "Is it not", he asked, "rather a serious difficulty, from our point of view, if we are to begin our work of reunion by greatly widening the gap which parts us now from five-sevenths of the Christian world"!<sup>1)</sup>

The "Catholic" section, on the other hand, believe that Episcopacy, as they understand it, does ensure, when combined with the acceptance of the sacraments, scriptures, and creeds of the primitive Church, that the local Church so organised is completely obedient to the whole apostolical tradition, and has potentially a real continuity of organic life with the one universal Church. From our leading theologians in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, as well as from the Tractarians, we have learnt to believe that the episcopate is essential to the Church's life, not because it is the best form of government, nor because it has been in the Church from the first, but because it ensures ministers for the Eucharist who are the accredited officers and organs of the whole body. It maintains the apostolic principle that "the breaker of the bread" at every altar all over the world should have an authority derived not from that congregation, nor from any group of congregations, but from our Lord Himself through the Apostles.

"The Eucharist", says one of the most recent of Anglican theologians, the son of a Canadian Archbishop, "is the great central fact in the origin and development of the Christian ministry. The presbyters or priests are those who possess the authority of the whole Church to represent it at the breaking of the bread; the bishops are those who possess the authority of the whole Church to confer this representative character upon others; the deacons are Christian ministers who lack just this representative capacity. The fundamental relation of the three orders to each other has never varied, because the relation of the three to the Eucharist has never varied. . . . . When Churchmen are eager for the return

---

<sup>1)</sup> Sparrow-Simpson: "The Relation of the English Church to the non-Episcopal Communion." Modern Oxford Tracts. Longmans.

of their brethren to the Eucharist of the historic ministry, it is not because they wish to push their own peculiar form of Church government at the expense of others, but because the Church cannot be what it ought to be without that return.”<sup>1)</sup>

If there is ever to be real reunion of Catholics and Protestants there must on the part of the latter be first a “return” to something which has been abandoned, a recovery of something which has been lost. Our true relation therefore, we believe, to the Protestant world, is to give back what has been lost, to provide a rallying point for this needed “return”, and not just to supply a constitution for a federation. We should be throwing away just the one contribution which we have to make to a reunited Church if we were to agree to “recognise a common membership” between ourselves and any Protestant bodies who might wish to federate themselves with us. Christendom as a whole, we feel, demands of us that we should refuse to offer Episcopacy to our Protestant brethren on the terms which seems satisfactory to the “Evangelicals”. We shall be “mediators” then in Christendom, just in so far as we identify ourselves with the “Catholic” element in our Reformation settlement, and try by persuasion to win Protestants to see what it really involves. Catholic-minded Anglicans all the world over are beginning to see more and more clearly that this is the real significance of our seemingly isolated and peculiar position in Christendom. Sneered at by Roman Catholics, condemned often by Protestants as exclusive and reactionary, we are yet maintaining a principle which is seen to be of vital and far-reaching importance by all who will open their minds to understand it. We are rapidly—thank God!—shaking ourselves free from all that is merely national and insular in our religion. We have no wish to turn all Christians into Anglicans. But if the condition for reunion is—as it surely must be—that the whole truth about Christ should be maintained, and that all the Baptised should be striving through the Eucharist to be united with one another “in Him”, then the question of securing a valid ministry is of supreme importance, and for this we believe that our principles supply the solution. When the conditions for true unity have been satisfied by our obedience to the truth, then the actual

---

<sup>1)</sup> Hamilton: *The People of God*, vol. 2. P. 207, 219. Oxford University Press.

realisation of corporate reunion can safely be left to the power of God the Holy Ghost, acting not through the rigid discipline of a centralised system, but through the spontaneous cohesion of mutual love.

That this may prove to be the true significance of the Church of England is coming to be realised by many even of those who do not share our beliefs. Some years ago, the Presbyterian university at Shantung in China were asked to admit students from the Anglican mission to their college. It was explained by the Anglican authorities that their students must have a separate chapel and one of their own clergy to minister to them, and to give them religious instruction. The authorities at first refused to allow them this special treatment, but were induced to change their minds by the representations of an American Presbyterian, who had come to understand the principles which underlay this seeming exclusiveness.

“Those of us”, he pleaded, “who are not Anglicans should do that justice to their principles which we expect them to do to ours. The Anglicans have a noble vision of the union of the people of God, union which is to include all the historic branches of the Christian Church—Protestant, Roman and Greek. For that union they ardently hope and earnestly pray. They recognise as we do the impossibilities involved in the policies of the Vatican and the Holy Synod. But they nevertheless believe that a time will come when these impossibilities will no longer exist. They firmly hold that the Anglican Church affords the best basis that is now known for the reunion of Christendom. They therefore conceive it to be their sacred duty to preserve that basis inviolate, at least until some better one appears. They seem unyielding to Non-conformists because they feel that any impairment of their position to suit a particular communion on one side would jeopardize to that extent the ultimate acceptability of their position to communions on the other side, and that they have no alternative but to adhere to their historic Church through good and evil report, in the confidence that in time the scattered and separated groups of Christians will find in that Church their common point of rally and reunion . . . . While then we may not share the conviction of many Anglicans that reunion will come on the basis of their Church, we are not prepared to stand aloof from them because they adhere with unflinching fidelity to the Church which they reverently

believe is called of God to be the unifying principle of a divided Christendom. Let us rather work with them, honouring their loyalty to their faith as we expect them to honour ours, and joyfully believing that the Spirit of God will in His own time and way bring us all to the desired haven of Christian fellowship."\*)

His pleading carried the day, the Anglican students were given the special conditions asked for, and the arrangement has been found to work very satisfactorily. The Protestant professors and students have the opportunity of seeing the meaning and value of Catholic principles and practices at first hand, in the lives of men with whom they are in intimate daily contact, and see that they do not conflict either with freedom or with fidelity to the Scriptures. If the Anglican Church everywhere would quietly and deliberately adopt this line of action in all her relations with the non-episcopal bodies, not going out of her way to condemn them, but firmly maintaining what we "Catholics" believe to be her true principles, she will be found, we believe, in the last day to have acted the part of a true peace-maker. If on the other hand she is ready, on account of immediate practical difficulties, to merge her independence in any kind of Protestant federation, she will be untrue to her vocation, and will deserve the fate of "the salt which has lost its savour".

*Pusey House, Oxford.*

Albert WAY.

---

§) Dr. A. J. Brown in the "Constructive Quarterly" for December 1913.

---