

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1953

### Anglican and Orthodox Reunion

Milton Rudnick

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Rudnick, Milton, "Anglican and Orthodox Reunion" (1953). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 183.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/183>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

ANGLICAN AND ORTHODOX REUNION

---

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Church History  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Milton Rudnick

June 1953

Approved by:

*Jaroslav Pelikan*  
Advisor

*[Signature]*  
Reader

52860

51749

BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1953  
no.3  
c.2

51749

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	111
Chapter	
I. FACTORS WHICH ENCOURAGE ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX REUNION ATTEMPTS . . . . .	1
II. REUNION NEGOTIATIONS . . . . .	11
Cyril Lucar . . . . .	11
Non-Jurors . . . . .	12
Oxford Movement . . . . .	15
Interburial. . . . .	17
Bonn Conferences . . . . .	20
Orders . . . . .	22
III. REUNION NEGOTIATIONS (CONTINUED) . . . . .	26
Anglican and Eastern Association . . . . .	26
Ecumenical Conferences . . . . .	29
Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius	33
Conclusions . . . . .	35
IV. DOCTRINAL ISSUES RELEVANT TO ANGLICAN AND ORTHODOX REUNION . . . . .	38
Incarnation . . . . .	40
Sacraments . . . . .	43
The Eucharist . . . . .	45
Doctrinal Authority . . . . .	47
Veneration of the Saints . . . . .	51
V. PROBLEMS RAISED BY ANGLICAN AND ORTHODOX REUNION . . . . .	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	65

## INTRODUCTION

The circumstances which have separated the Church of England from the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the past continue to make reunion between the two extremely difficult. Sheer geography opposes such reunion. Thousands of miles lie between their respective centers of activity. It is only on the periphery that they meet. This situation precludes normal wide-spread contacts and acquaintance among the peoples of the two churches. Contact of this nature is almost indispensable to genuine reunion. Even more significant than the geographical separation is the fact that Anglicanism and Orthodoxy spring from two different branches of the Christian Church, the East and the West -- branches which have been growing apart for more than twelve centuries. Finally, the two churches have been subjected to divergent national and cultural influences. The languages, thought patterns, and tempers of each are so strange to the other that simple communication of ideas between them presents serious problems.

Yet, during the last four centuries repeated efforts at reunion have been carried on between them. Progress in these efforts is apparent particularly since the last decade of the Nineteenth Century. This paper will study the Anglican-Orthodox relations with regard to reunion. The first section will deal with the factors which encourage reunion efforts. Then we will briefly sketch the actual

negotiations themselves, as they have taken place since the Seventeenth Century. The next section will discuss the doctrinal issues involved in Anglican-Orthodox Reunion. Our concluding section will deal with the principal problems which are raised by Anglican-Orthodox Reunion Attempts.

By the Anglican Church this paper refers to the Church of England, and the independent churches of the dominions and elsewhere, which are in communion with her. By the Eastern Orthodox Churches we mean the nineteen autocephalous churches and their daughter churches of emmigration or exile, which are united in the Orthodox liturgy, in their subscription to the declarations of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, and in their acknowledgment of the leadership of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch.

## CHAPTER I

### FACTORS WHICH ENCOURAGE ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX REUNION ATTEMPTS

The Anglicans and the Orthodox are able to approach reunion with a clean slate. Although they come from branches of Christendom which have been in controversy, as individual church bodies they have been spared this. As a matter of fact the history of their relations is one of surprising cordiality and courtesy. This means that reunion attempts between these churches need not begin by trying to heal the smarting wounds of past controversy and competition, and by trying to break down solid barriers of defense which have been raised between them. On the contrary, in this case, reunion attempts can proceed upon a foundation of past friendliness. Bishop Henson characterizes this important factor as follows:

When from the Church of Rome we pass to the Churches of the East, we are conscious of entering into a different ecclesiastical atmosphere. Here most of the obstacles to mutual understanding are absent. There are no bitter memories of long continued strife, no accumulations of controversy, no continuing exasperation of proselytizing activities on both sides, no strong tradition of patriotic suspicion, no evil legacies of polemical hatred.

Among these obstacles which Bishop Henson observes to be happily absent from Anglican-Orthodox relations, one especially

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Hensley Henson, The Church of England (London: Cambridge University Press, 1939), p. 242.

calls for further comment. That is, the fact that proselytizing has not marred their relations. Orthodoxy is, by its very nature, not a proselytizing church. Even people who are considered to be heretics by Orthodox, if they sustain any marks of Christianity at all, are not made the objects of their missionary enterprises. This is often interpreted by Protestants as a lack of missionary zeal, but incorrectly so. It is understandable that a church which is loathe to proselytize is particularly sensitive about being proselytized. Since the Nineteenth Century missionary revival the entire Orthodox world has been victimized by proselytizing Protestant and Roman missionaries. This has created a general bitterness and suspicion within Orthodox Christians against Protestants and Roman Catholics. Attempts at reunion on the part of these churches is often met with a negative attitude by the Orthodox, who fear that such overtures are merely the cloak for proselytizing intentions. The Anglicans alone have remained free from this stigma. In their overtures and courtesies toward the Orthodox they have deliberately avoided even the appearance of proselytizing. In Egypt the Anglicans have gone so far as to discourage people who wish to transfer to them from other Christian Churches (especially Orthodox) and have named the witness to non-Christians as the distinctive mark of Episcopalianism.<sup>2</sup> This attitude of the Anglicans, which

---

<sup>2</sup>S. A. Morrison, "The Churches of the Near East and the World Council of Churches", Ecumenical Review, I (Spring, 1948), 277-284.



stands in striking contrast to that of the Protestants and Roman Catholics, has done much to endear them to the Orthodox and to make the Orthodox receptive to their reunion proposals.

Not only are the Anglicans and the Orthodox at peace with one another, they also have a common opponent -- the Church of Rome. It is difficult to estimate the magnetic power which this situation exerts. In the conscious thinking of the participants and in the reunion discussions themselves, it is probably not very great. Alone, this situation could hardly draw the two churches together. However, its ability to strengthen the other factors is certainly considerable:

In the conflict with the Papacy the Eastern Churches might seem to be the natural allies of the Church of England. An episcopal church in the West which had repudiated the Pope's jurisdiction could not but have common ground with the churches in the East which had never acknowledged it. In point of fact, English churchmen have realized the polemical value of Eastern Christianity. Their perception of the obligation of Christian fraternity has in their case not been unassisted by the motive of controversial advantage.<sup>3</sup>

From the time of the Reformation, elements within the Church of England have sought to preserve her catholicity and to advance it in the face of opposing tides of Protestantism, which roll in from the Continent. Until 1896, when the Pope condemned Anglican Orders, and even after this to a limited extent, these elements looked to Rome as a goal and source of catholicity. After 1896, however,

---

<sup>3</sup>Henson, op. cit., p. 242.

catholic attention was diverted almost entirely in the direction of the Eastern churches. From their Orthodox brethren, with their unassailable episcopacy, these Anglo-Catholics wanted their orders recognized. In addition to this they wanted to nourish their own catholicity through communion with the ancient fountain of the East. Within these catholic hearts there has always burned, in varying degrees of brightness, the hope of reunion with the Orthodox Church. From time to time this hope has resulted in action. It has always been a favorable factor toward the union of the two churches because the East interprets this revitalized interest in the church and in tradition to be a return to orthodoxy:

. . . . the Episcopal Church is, of all the Protestant world, the nearest to Orthodoxy. Among the many tendencies in Anglicanism the Anglo-Catholic movement becomes more and more important; it is persistently devoted to the reestablishment of ancient tradition and thus comes nearer to Orthodoxy.<sup>4</sup>

Oppression, both spiritual and political, has been the lot of Orthodox peoples from the time of the Muslim Conquest until our own day. The Balkan countries and those of the Near East have been the traditional buffer between the Christian and the non-Christian forces. Almost continuous national and international upheavals have characterized their history. At present it is these Orthodox nations which are bearing the brunt of communist antagonism. In the

---

<sup>4</sup>Sergei Nikolaevich Bulgakov, The Orthodox Church, translated by Elizabeth S. Cram, edited by Donald A. Lowrie (New York: Morehouse Publishing Company, pref. 1935), p. 217.

frequent, extreme need into which their position places them, the Orthodox people have often appealed to the English Church for relief. In every case their appeal met with sympathy and with some measure of assistance. Programs of aid for the Eastern Churches have been a regular part of the Anglican pattern. It is natural that the Orthodox respond at least with courtesy to the overtures of their benefactors. Such acts of generous Christian kindness have left a profound impression upon Orthodox lay people, as well as upon their grateful hierarchy. That Anglican relief measures have been important in promoting the cause of Anglican-Orthodox reunion is evidenced by the following paragraphs which appeared in a Greek periodical after the return of the Constantinople delegation from the 1920 Lambeth Conference. After referring to the religious reasons which make the Orthodox desire unity with the Anglicans, the writer continues:

But there is also another reason which more urgently disposes the people of our race, our Orthodox Church, to turn eager eyes toward the Church of England and those who profess its faith.

This reason is the exceptionally friendly attitude of that Church towards ours, and the exceptionally good feeling of the chivalrous English nation towards Greeks in general.

This feeling cannot but find an echo in our sensitive and grateful spirit, and dispose us toward everything English, and cannot but strengthen and increase our desire for religious and ecclesiastical union with them.

---

<sup>5</sup>John Albert Douglas, The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern-Orthodox Especially in Regard to Anglican Orders (London: Faith Press, 1921), p. 110.

Individuals and officials of the Orthodox Churches on numerous occasions have expressed their desire to effect reunion with the whole Christian world.<sup>6</sup> Their desire for this pan-Christian union is based on an awareness of common threats and challenges which face all Christians, especially since the First World War. Prompted by this desire the Orthodox have participated in the most important ecumenical world conferences.<sup>7</sup> Their relations with the Anglicans also are of the utmost significance to the Orthodox in their approach to reunion with the rest of Christendom. This fact became clear at both the Lausanne and Edinburgh Conferences on Faith and Order, at which times the Orthodox expressed the belief that the size of the gatherings and the range of viewpoints represented at these conferences greatly lessened the possibility of reunion. They suggested that smaller reunion conferences of the more like-minded churches be carried on first, and that such strategy would greatly speed up the reintegration process. From this we see that the Orthodox conceive of their reunion efforts with Anglicanism to be the first stages of their reunion with all Christian people. This, in effect, is what Bulgakov says:

We may hope that the reunion of Orthodoxy and of the Episcopal Churches of England will be an accomplishment

---

<sup>6</sup>Expressions of this nature are to be found in the Patriarchal Encyclical of 1921; the resolution of the conference of Orthodox Theological Professors held in Athens, 1936; the encyclical of the Holy Synod of Greece, 1946; and the statement on ecumenism made by the Orthodox Youth Conference held at Bossey, 1949.

<sup>7</sup>A more complete discussion of Orthodox participation in the ecumenical conferences will be given in a later section of this paper.

of the not too distant future, and that this movement will be a decisive phase in the re-establishment of the unity lost to the Church, and of peace between the East and the West.<sup>8</sup>

To this point we have considered the non-theological factors which seem to encourage Anglican Orthodox reunion attempts. Now we shall take note of some theological factors which also are favorable to this end. First of all, there is in the Orthodox faith that which recognizes non-orthodox Christians and sees the mission of Orthodoxy to be ecumenical, at least in the sense that it realizes an obligation over against them. This ecumenical awareness manifests itself, of course, in various degrees of intensity. A typically mild, non-committal statement of this is as follows:

. . . . Orthodox writers point out that besides the close unity in which the Orthodox Churches in all parts are bound to one another, there exists another and a wider unity in which are included all Christian societies which call on the name of the Lord. All Christian communities . . . . preserve a considerable part of the universal tradition, and, as a result of this, share in Orthodoxy.<sup>9</sup>

Much more positive and dynamic is the view of Father Florovsky:

The task of a contemporary Orthodox theologian is intricate and enormous. He has much to learn still before he can speak with authority. And above all he has to realize that he has to speak to an ecumenical audience. He cannot retire into a narrow

---

<sup>8</sup>Bulgakov, op. cit., p. 217.

<sup>9</sup>Angus Dun, The Meanings of Unity, Report Number One, prepared by the commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship (Commission IV) for the World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937 (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937), p. 2.

shell of some local tradition -- simply because he is Orthodox, i.e., the Patristic tradition is not a local one, but basically an ecumenical one. And he has to use all his skill to phrase this ecumenical message of the Fathers in such a way as to secure an ecumenical, a truly universal appeal.<sup>10</sup>

Father Florovsky states this ecumenical view in most emphatic terms when he compares Eastern and Western Christianity to Siamese twins, which can never really be separated, and which can not be understand while they are apart from one another. "The point is that both the West and the East are incomplete, while disrupted."<sup>11</sup> The difficulty, or at least the tempering agent, which an Orthodox ecumenical spirit encounters is the unyielding conviction of Orthodoxy that it alone is the true Church. Often this conviction is wrongly equated with the Roman Catholic belief that reunion can be realized only by complete submission of all parties to their Pope and doctrine. There is, however, a great difference between the Roman and the Orthodox method of relating the doctrine of the true Church to the issue of reunion.

While the Roman Church most often exhibits a proud and domineering attitude toward other Christians, the Orthodox attitude is marked by a spirit of congenial inquiry. "Theirs is a conservatism which can shew itself surprisingly

---

<sup>10</sup>George Florovsky, "The Legacy and the Task of Orthodox Theology," Anglican Theological Review (April, 1949), p. 70.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 66.

flexible. . . . Its stress is upon truth rather than upon authority."<sup>12</sup> The Orthodox conceive of themselves as the true Church; they believe that as such they have been entrusted with the faith of the Church. This faith was delivered to the Church by Christ and the Apostles. The Church at all times must take care to preserve this faith in its purity, so that what it hands on to succeeding generations is nothing less than the truth. However, the Faith of the true Church, though unalterable, is to be explained and interpreted to each generation. This explains one basis on which Orthodox can engage in ecumenical activity -- to witness to, and interpret, the true Faith.

There is one further purpose which can be served by Orthodox participation in doctrinal discussion with other Christians, namely, to recognize unity where it already exists. As an earlier quotation will bear out, the Orthodox acknowledge that other Christians have retained some measure of the true Faith. By honest and sincere discussion of their respective positions the Orthodox and other Christians should try to discover these areas of agreement and be ready to recognize unity where it is to be found. Comparing this attitude with that of the Roman Church, French observes:

There is a wide difference between one bishop's saying, 'all Christians must submit to my jurisdiction,' and the Orthodox 'if you hold the same faith as we, you are indeed one with us.' 'The Faith' is primary,

---

<sup>12</sup>R. M. French, The Eastern Orthodox Church (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1951), p. 165.

everything else is secondary, and it is of the first importance to grasp this point of view.<sup>13</sup>

Of importance in this connection, though not strictly speaking a theological factor, is the Orthodox principle of economy, which permits them considerable ecumenical freedom. This principle of economy is the power and authority of the Church to act at her discretion in those matters which belong neither to the realm of dogma nor are governed by ecumenical canons. As

. . . . prudent steward she is at liberty to and is bound to act for the good of the Household, with regard both to those who are within the Household and those who are within the chaotic heterodox world without.<sup>14</sup>

Individual, personal consideration is here provided for the many opportunities for ecumenical action between the Orthodox and other Christians. It is by virtue of this principle that the Eastern Churches are able seemingly to overextend themselves in reunion enterprises.

From these factors we see that Orthodoxy contains within itself not only the possibility but even the inspiration for reunion attempts with Anglicans and with all Christendom.

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Douglas, op. cit., p. 55.



## CHAPTER II

### REUNION NEGOTIATIONS

#### Cyril Lucar

As the following discussion will indicate, reunion negotiations between the Anglicans and the Orthodox have been initiated almost exclusively by the former. Interestingly enough, however, the very first move which might be described as a reunion overture originated with the Orthodox. The perpetrator of this overture was the great patriarch, Cyril Lucar. On many occasions he indicated his Protestant interest. Among those Protestant leaders with whom he corresponded was George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury. To Archbishop Abbot, the patriarch made known the severe suffering of the Greek people under their Janizary tormentors. After Charles I of England rescued them from the Janizaries, Cyril Lucar, in 1628, sent King Charles the priceless "Codex Alexandrinus" as an expression of gratitude. Subsequently, he even drew up and published a confession in which Calvinistic doctrine was upheld. Some Orthodox writers claim that evidence on this point is not conclusive. As proof they cite the fact that although the Synods of Constantinople (1638) and of Jassy (1642) both repudiated this confession, they did not associate

Lucar's name with it.<sup>1</sup> However, the vast majority of non-Orthodox historians maintain that such a position is indefensible. Succeeding generations, in particular the Orthodox of today, reject this confession as part of the "pseudomorphosis" of the Seventeenth Century, at which time Orthodoxy became a partaker of Protestant heresy. This first negotiation for reunion was, therefore, of no abiding value, and even exerted a negative influence.

#### Non-Jurors

When the Puritan revolution, opposed as it was to the Catholic tradition, drove many of the Catholic party into exile, it set into motion the factors which resulted in the next attempt at Anglican-Orthodox reunion. For many of these oppressed Catholics sought haven in the Christian East, and there experienced their first personal contact with the Orthodox Church. The relationships set during this period of exile, resulted later in the correspondence between the Non-Jurors<sup>2</sup> and the Eastern Patriarchs, 1716-25. During this period relations of a practical nature were being carried on between the Church of England and the Orthodox. As was so often the case, the Greek Church

---

<sup>1</sup>Constantine Callinicos, A Brief Sketch of Greek Church History, translated by Katherine Natzio (London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1931), p. 141.

<sup>2</sup>The Non-Jurors were those Anglican bishops of Scotland who in 1688 refused to relinquish their loyalty to the Catholic Monarch, James II, or to swear allegiance to Protestant William III. Because of this they and their descendants remained separated from the English Church and received the name "Non-Jurors".

was suffering under the Ottomans, and several Eastern prelates had come to England seeking assistance. But theological discussions did not begin until 1716 when the Non-Jurors wrote a letter to the East "in the name of the Orthodox and Catholic remnant of the British Church."<sup>3</sup>

Their hope was that, if they could effect reunion between themselves and the Eastern Churches, they might draw the entire Church of England into the reunion with them.

During the next nine years the Non-Jurors sent three letters, and received two replies from the Orthodox bishops. When the Archbishop of Canterbury informed the Orthodox that the party with whom they were corresponding was schismatic, they declined to answer the last letter.

The attitude of the Non-Jurors in their negotiations with the East was one of complete equality and of confidence in their own catholicity. The Non-Jurors made it perfectly clear that they were unwilling to sacrifice a single particle of their Anglican position. Such a bold approach was quite remarkable, coming as it did from such a small, schismatic fragment. In their first letter, after listing twelve points of agreement and five practical steps leading to reunion, the Non-Jurors mentioned five points of disagreement which would have to be settled before any reunion would be possible:

The Anglicans could not accept (a) the equal authority of Ecumenical councils and the Holy Scriptures; (b) the type of veneration offered to the Mother of God by

---

<sup>3</sup>Nicolas Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942), p. 76.

Eastern Christians; (c) the direct invocation of the Saints; (d) the adoration of the consecrated elements at the Eucharist; (e) the use of ikons.<sup>4</sup>

It was five years before the Easterners replied to the Anglican letter. In the reply the Orthodox were lavish with compliment, but inexorable in their position. They considered the Anglicans to be Protestant heretics and resented their presumption in claiming to be on the same plane with the Orthodox. As far as unity was concerned, they made it plain that it could be realized only by their total submission to Orthodox tradition, doctrine, and practice.

In their reply to the Orthodox the Non-Jurors defended their Catholicity and even showed how the Orthodox of their time had departed from ancient tradition. The final word from the East was the strongly Roman decisions of the Synod of Bethlehem, 1672. Completely unmoved, the Non-Jurors restated the points of their former letter, and the correspondence died when the Orthodox failed to answer this letter.

This hopeful attempt at reunion was doomed from the start. Neither the Orthodox nor the Non-Jurors were in a position to consummate the reunion, even if agreement had been reached. The Orthodox prelates were hopelessly dominated by the Turkish rulers. On the other hand, the Non-Jurors were predicating their action on a reunion with

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

the Church of England which never transpired. Finally, and most difficult to surmount, was the fact that both parties -- and all Christian bodies of that day -- had no concept of the development which had taken place in the life of the Church. Each believed that his own tradition was, to the last detail, what the Lord of the Church had instituted, and that every other body was guilty of heretical innovation. This pervading misconception left little hope for the success of reunion discussions.

#### Oxford Movement

The Catholic revival which accompanied the Oxford Movement of the Nineteenth Century was preoccupied chiefly with the Catholicism of Rome. The extent of this preoccupation is witnessed to by the fact that a number of prominent Tractarian leaders eventually entered the Roman fold.<sup>5</sup> However, the renewed interest in the Church and in ancient tradition which this catholic emphasis created, also moved the Anglicans in the direction of the Orthodox Church. Several major negotiations, in fact, took place at this time. Most significant and most remarkable of these were the efforts of William Palmer, a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and a deacon in the Church of England. During a six months' study of the Russian Church (1840-41) Palmer made application for reception of the Eucharist. The grounds for

---

<sup>5</sup>The most prominent of these were John Henry Newman (1801-90), Frederick W. Faber (1814-63), and Henry E. Manning (1808-92).

his request was that he was a catholic Christian of another branch of the Church and that he held the Orthodox faith. The issue raised by Palmer's request was identical to that raised by the Non-Jurors. Zernov formulates this issue as follows:

. . . . which were the elements of its teaching and practice that the Eastern Church considered such an essential part of Catholic tradition as to be binding on all Christians, and which might be treated as local customs, legitimate in themselves, but having no claim to be of divine authority, and therefore not obligatory for Western Christians.<sup>6</sup>

The Russian Synod was quite upset by Palmer's request and the issue that it raised. Finally, they replied by saying that an individual wishing to communicate with the Russian Church could have no exceptions to the customary rules. That is, he would have to be a member of the Russian Church. Even if such exceptions were in order, the restricted condition of the Russian Church at that time made the approval of such exceptions impossible. Not to be discouraged, Palmer later offered to sever his connections with the Anglican Church, if the Orthodox Church would receive him. When this failed, Palmer finally became a Roman convert. However, he maintained his interest in Orthodoxy and continued his study of Russian Church history, even as a Roman Catholic.

Several notable points of advance are apparent in the Palmer attempts over against those of the Non-Jurors. Palmer's advantage over the Non-Jurors was that he was ready

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 81.

to accept Orthodox doctrine in toto and was not trying merely to select basic minimums. As a result of Palmer's request the Orthodox theologians were moved towards a new liberality, which no longer demanded complete uniformity.<sup>7</sup> In fact, the Orthodox themselves began to develop a keen interest in reunion. In spite of these areas of improvement, Palmer's effort, too, was destined to fail. For Palmer was acting as an individual, and the Orthodox can think only in terms of group unity. In addition to this, the Russian Church was beset by the hampering restrictions of the State and was therefore unable to act in his favor, even if it were inclined to do so.

#### Interburial

Ironically, as Zernov observes, ". . . . the first corporate act which the Anglicans and Orthodox were able to achieve was not intercommunion, but interburial."<sup>8</sup> Though, it must be admitted, this was a small victory it was, nevertheless, a victory. When seen in its context, this concession of the Patriarch Gregory VI assumes major historical significance. This event had its beginning

---

<sup>7</sup>Alexes Khomiakov was both the founder and guiding spirit of this movement. Regarding him Zernov says, "The problem raised by Palmer helped Khomiakov to realize that reunion between the East and West required research into the doctrine of the Church. His stimulating essay, The Church Is One, was the first creative attempt by a Russian theologian to face the problem of a divided Christendom." Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 86.

in 1862 when the Episcopal Church of the United States broke the silence caused by the Crimean War<sup>9</sup> and officially requested intercommunion with the Russian Church. The occasion for this request was the situation in both Alaska and the United States, in which Orthodox Christians, separated from their church, were communicating with Episcopalians. In the interest of this proposal and of reunion in general, the American Graeco-Russian Committee was appointed in 1862. Shortly thereafter (1863) the English Church followed suit by organizing the Eastern Church Committee. This committee received valuable support from a society called the Eastern Church Association, the goal of which was to promote reunion with the East.

Among the numerous discussions which were held during this period, the one between the American priest, Young, and Metropolitan Philaret was most promising (1864). At that time Philaret asked questions under the following five points:

- (1) The place which the Thirty-Nine Articles occupy in the Anglican Church.
- (2) The Filioque clause.
- (3) The uninterrupted succession of Anglican ordination.
- (4) The Anglican attitude to Church tradition.
- (5) The seven Sacraments.<sup>10</sup>

The Metropolitan seemed so pleased with Mr. Young's answers,

---

<sup>9</sup>When the British sided with the Turks against Orthodox Christians in the Crimean War (1854-55), the cordial atmosphere built up during previous negotiations was shattered, and discussions ceased.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 85.



that high hopes for unity were entertained for a time. These hopes faded somewhat the next year when the Russian priest Vassiliev came to England and stalemated with Dr. Pusey over the Filioque Clause. More promising was the case of the Anglican priest, Denton, who went to the Serbian Church, also in 1864, and was even permitted to receive the Eucharist with the Orthodox. Nicholas Damalas, an Orthodox theologian, visited England and wrote a book entitled The Relations of the Anglican Church to the Orthodox. This represents the first Orthodox endeavor to draw up terms of reunion. The principal objection of this book was to Article Twenty-One (of the Thirty-Nine) in which ancient patriarchs are accused of apostasy. Finally, Archbishop Alexander Lycurgos had some agreeable discussions with the Anglicans in 1869, when he came to England to consecrate a church.

Contacts such as these inspired so much hope within the Anglicans that already in 1869 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Tait, wrote Gregory VI Patriarch of Constantinople a letter:

. . . . in which he expressed the desire that there should be reciprocity in the sacrament of Baptism, the Eucharist, and in the burial<sup>11</sup> of the dead, between the Anglicans and the Orthodox.

The congenial reply of the Patriarch authorized cooperation in only the last point, the burial of the dead.

Thus we see that the achievement of interburial is actually the first step towards more complete sacramental cooperation.

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 86.

## Bonn Conferences

The conferences at Bonn, Germany, 1874-75, were organized by the Old Catholic sect<sup>12</sup> and were participated in by Old Catholics, Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and a few German Evangelicals who merely observed the proceedings. The purpose of the first conference was to formulate a common Catholic Confession and to establish intercommunion and federation between the three churches without, however, attempting amalgamation. Real advance was not achieved until the second conference, at which time the notorious Filioque problem was satisfactorily solved between the Anglicans and the Orthodox. Here, six Articles on the Procession of the Holy Spirit "were adopted which stated the doctrine to the satisfaction of each."<sup>13</sup> The 1874 conference

---

<sup>12</sup>The Old Catholic sect was formed in 1871 by former Roman Catholics who rejected the Dogma of Papal Infallibility (1869-70) and resented the machinations of the Jesuits. Dr. J. J. I. Von Dollinger was one of the leaders of this movement and the President of both Bonn Conferences. See: Gaius Jackson Slosser, Christian Unity: Its History and Challenge in All Communions, in All Lands (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1929) p. 245 f.

<sup>13</sup>With regard to the Filioque dispute between the East and the West Zernov, op. cit., pp. 94-97, claims that this controversy did not originally have doctrinal significance. Though the innovation was adopted by the West at the Council of Aix in 809, it was not disputed by the East until fifty years later when Photius needed a counter-charge to defend his irregular elevation to the see of Constantinople. At this time he accused the Pope, who was challenging his elevation, with the double procession heresy. From that time forth this issue became a club in the hands of both branches of the Church. Their quarrels would begin with some non-theological matter, and soon someone would reinforce his argument with

did agree on Fourteen Theses, "which still have considerable importance in any plan for union between the Eastern Orthodox, the Old Catholics, and the Anglicans."<sup>14</sup>

In view of this remarkable doctrinal agreement which the Bonn Conferences revealed, it is difficult to understand why nothing more ever came of them. Zernov points out that the success of these conferences was jeopardized by the previous activity of a small band of Anglican converts to Orthodoxy. Led by Overbeck, this group was attempting to unite the Anglo-Catholics with the Eastern Church by splitting them from the Church of England. They were even successful in gaining some Orthodox approval to their scheme. This circumstance beclouded the reunion scene for some time and loaded the air at Bonn with strong feelings of antagonization. Still bogging down discussions on this occasion was also the fact that neither the Anglicans nor the Orthodox knew much about the other.<sup>15</sup>

Although reunion was once again frustrated by ignorance and lovelessness, the successes of these conferences were very important. Direct negotiations were not held for some time following, but Anglican theologians of the Eastern Church

---

the charge of heresy on the Filioque point. The Orthodox of today admit that their objection is not to "double-procession," but to an innovation being placed into an ecumenical creed by a local conference. At Bonn it was first realized that there was, in actuality, no doctrinal disagreement on this point.

<sup>14</sup>Slosser, op. cit., p. 247.

<sup>15</sup>Zernov, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

Association continued to study and write of the Christian East, and thereby to make ready for the next major effort.

### Orders

Until 1896 reunion attempts between the Orthodox and the Anglicans were sporadic. On various occasions there would be a burst of activity, but that would be followed by a lull lasting from a decade to a century. But, the Papal condemnation of Anglican orders in 1896 had a catalytic effect upon the situation. It was this move of the Roman Church which finally caused Eastern theologians to study the Anglican position and history. On the other side, this declaration squelched Anglican hopes of reuniting with Rome, and turned their interest more completely to the Church of the Eastern Christians. The stimulus of the Papal condemnation of Anglican Orders stepped up the relations between the Anglicans and the Orthodox to such an extent that they have never since lapsed into a permanent lull.

Prompted by this stimulus, three major Orthodox theologians made a study of Anglican Orders, and each decided favorably toward them, with some qualifications. First, and perhaps most important, was that of Prof. V. Sokolov, published in 1897. In his opinion, Anglican Orders could be recognized if several points concerning the Eucharist could be cleared up.<sup>16</sup> A year later Prof. Bulgakov wrote a monograph on this

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 88.

question of Anglican Orders. He concluded that the historical succession of Anglican bishops was uninterrupted. However, final settlement of the issue, according to him, would have to depend on the belief of the Anglican hierarchy with regard to the number of Sacraments and the meaning of the Sacrament of Orders itself.<sup>17</sup> Some years after this Professor Chrestos Androutsos wrote The Validity of English Ordinations from an Orthodox Catholic Point of View (English translation published, 1909). In this book Androutsos incorporated the fruits of long research. He was, moreover, speaking with authority. For, he was under the commission of the highest authority of the Orthodox Church, the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim, who intended this statement to be an invitation to reunion.<sup>18</sup> The question which this book discusses is whether individual priests of the Anglican Church might be received into the Orthodox Church in their orders, if they were found to be in dogmatic union with the Orthodox. As far as the visible succession of Anglican bishops was concerned, he considered that to be unassailable. However, the liberal tendencies of many Anglicans made him less certain about the invisible part -- their faith. To clear up his doubts on this point he felt it would be necessary for a number of High Anglican bishops to declare

---

<sup>17</sup>John Albert Douglas, The Relations of the Anglican Churches, with the Eastern-Orthodox Especially in Regard to Anglican Orders (London: Faith Press, 1921), pp 64 f.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 14 f.

themselves on the following questions: (a) The Seven Sacraments; (b) The necessity and power of Confession and Absolution; (c) The Real Presence and Unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist; (d) The infallibility of the Ecumenical councils. After thus outlining the points of discussion, Professor Androutsos concluded with this encouraging remark:

If the High Church (party) define these dogmas correctly and lay down the rest of its doctrine in an Orthodox manner, all doubt would be taken away as to the succession of English Ordinations, and at the same time, solid foundations would be laid for a rapprochement and for a true union with the Eastern Church -- a work well pleasing to God and one of blessing from every point of view.<sup>19</sup>

Inspired by this statement Canon Douglas wrote a book<sup>20</sup> in which he proposes that a letter be sent to Androutsos in answer to his questions. In this letter he includes comment on several significant issues pertaining to Anglican-Orthodox reunion in addition to those which Androutsos raised. By May, 1922, three thousand, seven hundred fifteen Anglican clergy had signed the letter and it was sent to the Ecumenical Patriarch.<sup>21</sup> Apparently it achieved the desired effect. For, in August, 1922 Meletios, then the Patriarch of Constantinople, declared in the name of his Synod that Anglican Orders were just as valid as Roman Orders. This decision was sent to the

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 14

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Herbert Hensley Henson, The Church of England (London: Cambridge University Press, 1939), p. 243.

other Eastern Churches and Jerusalem and Cyprus conformed. Subsequently, Alexandria (where Meletios later moved) also concurred. In 1936 an Anglican delegation went to Roumania. There agreement was reached and the recommendation was adopted to recognize Anglican Orders. Official action necessary to their recognition was prohibited by the war. Probably the only factor hindering the recognition of Anglican Orders by all the churches has been the absence of the Russian Church from the Orthodox scene.<sup>22</sup> With the successful completion of these negotiations we see another milestone reached in Anglican-Orthodox reunion endeavors. As the Archbishop of Canterbury explained early in 1923, this recognition does not authorize intercommunion or mutual administrations. "The importance," he said, "lies in the preparation thus made by the Declaration for further advances."<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Zernov, op. cit., p. 90.

<sup>23</sup>Slosser, op. cit., p. 321.

## CHAPTER III

### REUNION NEGOTIATIONS (CONTINUED)

#### Anglican and Eastern Association

A slight regression is necessary in order to cover the beginnings of the Anglican and Eastern Association. From 1923, at which point we had arrived in our discussion of negotiations regarding Anglican orders, we return to 1906 when the Anglican-Eastern Churches Union was founded. Eight years after its establishment, a merger was effected with the older Eastern Churches Association and the new organization was called the Anglican and Eastern Association. It is this series of organizations which has done much to maintain friendly contact with the East and to keep interest alive in the Anglican-Orthodox attempts at reunion. The latter has been accomplished through the scholarly periodical, The Christian East, which this society published from 1910 to 1928.<sup>1</sup> Until 1919 the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association assumed full responsibility for entertaining and escorting the many Eastern dignitaries who visited

---

<sup>1</sup>In 1928 the Anglican and Eastern Association was amalgamated with the newly founded Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. At this time also The Christian East was succeeded by the journal of that society, called The Journal of St. Alban and St. Sergius from 1928 to 1934, and Sobornost from 1934 until the present. The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius will be discussed more completely later in this chapter.



England. After that they worked in coordination with the Eastern Church Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In a published report<sup>2</sup> a description is given of the visits of Orthodox dignitaries during the period, 1914-1921. During their visits many of these Eastern Churchmen expressed their esteem of the Anglicans by limited participation in their worship services. For the Orthodox, such acts are more than just courtesies. They indicate a disposition favorable to unity. It is unquestionable that the hospitality and friendly interest of the Anglican and Eastern Association has helped to remove the prejudice and suspicion of the Orthodox, and has prepared them for sympathetic participation in doctrinal discussions.

Also deserving of mention is the work done by the society during the First World War to assist Serbian Orthodox students. Arrangements were made to select groups of theological students and to bring them to Oxford for their training. Such a move was of great help to the Serbian Church because their seminaries had been closed and no funds were available to provide for the training of badly needed clergy. Not only were students brought to England and provided for, but outstanding Orthodox theologians were also brought, so that the training received

---

<sup>2</sup>The Anglican and Eastern Churches: A Historical Record, 1914-1921 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921).

by the students would be genuinely Orthodox. This program also serves the purposes of unity. In addition to gaining the gratitude of the Serbian Church, the society has thereby made it possible for numbers of Serbian clergy to become thoroughly acquainted with the Anglican Church and, therefore, in a position to take an intelligent part in reunion negotiations.<sup>3</sup>

During the period 1914-1921 a number of small, unofficial conferences took place between individuals of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. At these conferences theological discussions were held on topics relevant to reunion. Most of these discussions were under the sponsorship of the society. Although the results of these conferences were necessarily of limited consequence, the above mentioned report has this to say about them, "the discussions and conclusions arrived at were not only of great interest, but of excellent promise for the future of our relations, and of an approach to intercommunion."<sup>4</sup>

Finally, a word should be said about the work of John Birbeck, an outstanding member of the Anglican and Eastern Association. During his contacts with the Russian Church he won the confidence and respect of those Christians and did much to interpret the Anglican Church to them. Of

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 21-24.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 59.

Birbeck, Zernov writes that he:

. . . . knew Russia better than the majority of her own people, and gave his whole life to the promotion of better understanding between the Anglican and Russian Churches.<sup>5</sup>

### Ecumenical Conferences

The Modern Ecumenical Movement began with the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910. At first, the Ecumenical Movement appeared to be assuming "Pan-Protestant" characteristics. However, certain farsighted individuals within the movement guided its development in such a way that the catholic churches--Roman, Orthodox, and others--would also find participation possible and inviting.<sup>6</sup> After the Edinburgh Conference ecumenical activity continued in several different movements. Two of these movements gained the participation of the Orthodox Churches. They were the Life and Work Movement, devoted to practical Christian action, and the Faith and Order Movement, which concerned itself with the theological issues raised by Christian reunion. The Anglicans participated in all phases of the Ecumenical Movement.

The Catholic element of the Ecumenical Movement is provided chiefly by the Anglicans and the Orthodox,<sup>7</sup> and

---

<sup>5</sup>Nicolas Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942), p. 89.

<sup>6</sup>John R. Mott was prominent among these men.

<sup>7</sup>It must be remembered that certain of the participating Lutheran bodies, notably the Church of Sweden, exhibit a considerable catholic interest and emphasis.

from the very beginning the presence of each has been a source of encouragement to the other. Of these two it is ordinarily only the Orthodox who are thought of as being shy about ecumenical action. Macfarland reminds us that, perhaps, the Anglicans were even more reluctant than the Orthodox, and that it was the latter which drew in the former. He recalls that the Archbishop of Canterbury found it necessary to deliberate for eight months before accepting the invitation to the Edinburgh Conference of 1910.<sup>8</sup> In another place he observes that even the famous Lambeth "Appeal to all Christian People" of 1920 was preceded in January of the same year by a Patriarchal Encyclical which was an eloquent call for Christian unity and cooperation.<sup>9</sup> Finally, commenting on the factors which altered the Anglican attitude from one of reluctance to one of enthusiastic participation in the movement, Macfarland says, "First of all, the increased participation of the Eastern Orthodox Churchmen relieved the fear of so called 'Pan-Protestantism.'<sup>10</sup> Mindful of their own Catholicity and careful not to jeopardize their promising relations with the Eastern Churches, the Anglicans were, in a number of

---

<sup>8</sup>Charles Stedman Macfarland, Steps Toward the World Council; Origins of the Ecumenical Movement as Expressed in the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1939), p. 66.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

instances, willing to let the Orthodox make the first move toward a wider ecumenicity.

Most certainly the stream of encouragement often flowed in the other direction as well. An early instance of this took place immediately after the war in 1919 when the planners of the First Faith and Order Conference (principally American Episcopalians) sent five bishops through Europe and the East, renewing invitations to the forthcoming conference:

They went to Athens, Smyrna, Constantinople, Sofia, Bucharest, Belgrade and Roumania, and were everywhere cordially received, especially by the Eastern Orthodox Churches.<sup>11</sup>

Throughout all of the Faith and Order Conferences<sup>12</sup> the presence of the Anglicans has been a source of comfort to the Orthodox. Especially during the many intense discussions of the ministry, when the Orthodox have felt conscience-bound to assert their position over against the Protestants, this was the case. Their situation would have been unbearable, at least extremely discouraging, without the likeminded company of Anglican Churchmen. No doubt the consolation was reciprocal, but we have stressed its significance to the

---

<sup>11</sup>William Adams Brown, Toward a United Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 59.

<sup>12</sup>The World Conference on Faith and Order met first in Lausanne, 1927. The second meeting was held at Edinburgh in 1937. At that meeting plans were made to begin effecting a merger with the Life and Work Movement. This took place at Amsterdam in 1948 and was called the World Council of Churches. Since that time Faith and Order has been a commission of the World Council. As such it met at Lund in 1952.

Orthodox because they are pledged to a much more outspoken and inexorable stand than are most Anglicans. This kind of mutual support was experienced between the two churches whenever the issue at stake was something of the catholic tradition. Archimandrite Cassian relates this experience at Edinburgh:

Frequently we Orthodox were at one with our Anglican brethren and differed from the other members of the Section, for instance, in regard to the conception of the sacraments and of the invisible church.<sup>13</sup>

In general, the contacts between the Anglicans and the Orthodox at the Life and Work Conferences<sup>14</sup> were not of particular significance to their union relations. Of passing interest, however, is the fact that the Orthodox have always found their participation in Life and Work much more in keeping with their ecumenical approach, than their participation in Faith and Order. At Lausanne Archbishop Germanos, speaking in behalf of the entire Orthodox delegation made this point clear to the conference when he reminded them that the Orthodox Church recommended:

. . . . that before any discussion of the reunion of the Churches in faith and order, a League of Churches should be established for their mutual

---

<sup>13</sup>The Second World Conference on Faith and Order; Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937, edited by Leonard Hodgson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939), p. 132.

<sup>14</sup>The Universal Christian Conference for Life and Work met twice, first at Stockholm in 1925 and later at Edinburgh in 1937. Since its amalgamation with Faith and Order into the World Council of Churches, no meeting has been held.

cooperation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom.<sup>15</sup>

That the Orthodox and Anglicans should grow closer together during their common participation in the Ecumenical Movement was inevitable. Consequently, this phase of their relations merits attention. However, recent years have seen the Orthodox' participation in the Ecumenical Movement dwindle to almost nothing.<sup>16</sup> It appears, then, that this aspect of Anglican-Orthodox relations is of decreasing importance.

#### Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius

By its self-imposed limitations, the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius should not be discussed under the general heading of "Reunion Negotiations." For, ". . . it was not, as its members said again and again, any kind of negotiating body between the two Churches."<sup>17</sup> However, our use of the word "negotiation" is somewhat broad, referring to contacts of various kinds which may have exerted a binding influence upon the two bodies.

The Russian Academy in Paris<sup>18</sup> was the birthplace of this fellowship. From the very beginning (1928) the

---

<sup>15</sup>Faith and Order: Proceeding of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927, edited by H. N. Bote (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1928), p. 382.

<sup>16</sup>Reasons for this will be discussed in a later chapter.

<sup>17</sup>Roger Lloyd, The Church of England in the Twentieth Century (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950), II, 278.

<sup>18</sup>This academy was founded by Russian exiles during the

fellowship was encouraged and aided by the Student Christian Movement. Composed of clergy, laity and students of both the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, this group was dedicated to prayer for their union, and to joint experience of Eucharistic Worship. During their conferences the members of the fellowship eat, worship, and discuss together the problems raised by Anglican and Orthodox reunion.

Because its purposes overlap with the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, it is not difficult to understand why the two societies merged at the founding of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius in 1928. One promising feature about this fellowship is the fact that the initiative for it came from the Orthodox themselves. In this fellowship people from both churches share an equal responsibility and interest. Heretofore the situation was such that, if any Orthodox participated in these societies, they did so as guests of the Anglicans. This fellowship represents the one organized endeavor of our day in which Anglicans and Orthodox are joined to promote unity by prayer and spiritual communion.

During the first five years of its existence the Fellowship carried on its purposes peacefully and without

---

Bolshevist persecution and became the center of contemporary Orthodox thinking. Bulgakov, Florovsky and Berdyaev are some of the world renowned Christian thinkers who have been associated with the Paris Academy. The ecumenical interest of this school and the attempt of its leaders to relate Orthodoxy to modern man make it of great significance to any study of contemporary Orthodoxy.



much excitement. Then, in 1933, Professor Bulgakov of Paris could no longer keep from expressing his dissatisfaction over the policy which the Fellowship had adopted regarding the Eucharist. At the meetings of the Fellowship, the Anglicans and Orthodox were to share in the Sacrament only spiritually, but were not actually to intercommunicate. In the 1933 meeting, Bulgakov proposed a scheme whereby they could communicate together at these conferences. It was inevitable that such a proposal should come up sooner or later, for it was on the heart of many of the members. However, the plan itself was rather unrealistic, vague, and certainly premature. Discussion of this proposal bogged down the conferences for a number of years. It was never adopted and finally faded into the background. Objections to the proposal were very weighty. It would never be sanctioned by either of the churches. By forcing such an issue prematurely the Fellowship might well hinder rather than promote the cause of unity. Since this controversy subsided the Fellowship has returned to its normal, constructive activities.<sup>19</sup>

### Conclusions

In these two chapters we have surveyed the reunion negotiations between the Anglicans and the Orthodox from

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 277-286.

the Seventh Century to the present day. Certain conclusions may be drawn from a study of these negotiations.

First of all, it is apparent that considerable progress has been made in these negotiations. A better understanding exists between the two churches now, than in previous centuries. Problems have been solved -- the filioque and the question of Anglican Orders. Perhaps most important of all, the Orthodox are taking a more active role than ever in reunion negotiations. These facts are indicative of advance.

Secondly, it is important to note that the doctrinal issues change. During the Nineteenth Century the filioque was the main point of controversy. Almost immediately upon its solution in 1875 the question of Orders arose. Now, since its settlement, attention is being directed to Eucharistic doctrines and the Communion of Saints. Here we see a result of growth in understanding between the two Churches. Along with the new insights each Church is gaining of the other, new problems are also being discovered.

In the third place, comparatively little attention has been given in these negotiations to the social and national influences which have contributed to the differences between the two churches. This represents a serious lack, and one which must be overcome, if reunion attempts are to continue to be successful.

Finally, these negotiations have been inspired and carried on largely by individuals and small, interested groups within the churches. Until this interest and desire for union filters down into the main bodies of each Church, the possibility of union will remain in the distance.

---

<sup>20</sup>I am indebted to Zernov, op. cit., pp. 92-93, for much of the analysis offered in these conclusions.

## CHAPTER IV

### DOCTRINAL ISSUES RELEVANT TO ANGLICAN AND ORTHODOX REUNION

The basic factors which have separated the Anglican and Orthodox Churches are not theological but rather geographical, historical and influential.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, as a result of their differing backgrounds, the two churches have arrived at doctrinal positions which are frequently divergent and occasionally are even conflicting. During past negotiations these doctrinal issues have been the subject of serious discussion. At least one of the major questions, the filioque, has been conclusively settled by means of such discussions.<sup>2</sup> It is certain that doctrinal issues will occupy an equally prominent place in the course of future negotiations. For Archbishop Germanos is speaking from the very soul of Orthodoxy when he says:

It must in no way be supposed that the Orthodox Church can recognize a full and absolute Reunion, that is, a complete Communion in the Mysteries, in cases where agreement in faith does not exist.<sup>3</sup>

Anglican reunion enthusiasts have not always respected this fact, and have often antagonized the Orthodox by

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Supra, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>Angus Dun, The Meaning of Unity, Report Number One prepared by the Commission on the Church's Unity in Life

suggestions of theological compromise. However, in recent years Anglicans have become more thoroughly familiar with the intricacies of the Orthodox mind. Now the Anglican approach to reunion with the East is seldom one of compromise, but rather one in which they strive toward genuine doctrinal unity through discussion.

There is a problem common to both communions which makes it difficult for them to conduct conclusive doctrinal discussions. It is the fact that there is little doctrinal uniformity within either church. For Orthodoxy the only ultimate doctrinal formula is the Nicene Creed. Beyond that an Orthodox theologian may freely express any viewpoint he desires, just as long as it does not conflict with the Creed. The only further qualification is that such extra-credal views must be announced as private conjecture and not the mind of the whole church. Such latitude results in a wide variety of emphases. In the Church of England the official standard of doctrine is the Thirty-Nine Articles. However, this document is largely disregarded by Anglicans of today and exerts little influence on the theological thought of that body. Within Anglicanism, too, many conflicting points of view are tolerated. These conditions which hamper discussion between the two bodies also restrict any attempt to describe

---

and Worship (Commission IV) for the World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937 (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1937), p. 26.

the theological issues which reunion between them raises. Consequently, in this chapter it is possible to speak only in terms of trends and emphases. Fortunately perhaps for the cause of reunion, the differences which will be cited are generally not of conflicting dogmas. This situation permits both sides to adjust their viewpoints with much less difficulty than would be the case if dogmas were involved.

### Incarnation

The first doctrinal issue which we will mention, however, is one on which the two churches agree. Anglicanism and Orthodoxy both reflect an emphasis on the Incarnation and human person of Christ. In the case of the Orthodox this emphasis appears in the piety of the people as well as in the writings of the theologians. Examples of the former are to be found in the novels of Fyodor Dostoyevsky. Woven into the fabric of his stories are numerous references to Christ's earthly life and to the impact of that life upon people of our time. From the pen of theologians such as Zernov we read statements in which the Incarnation is called "the essence of the Christian revelation,"<sup>4</sup> and in which he speaks of Christian faith as being "faith in the Incarnation."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Nicolas Zernov, The Reintegration of the Church (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952), p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

Within this general emphasis a number of particular aspects of the Incarnation have been stressed. Some of the Greek Fathers propounded the theory to which much of Orthodoxy still clings that God was incarnate to transform and immortalize humanity by becoming part of it. Somewhat different is Zernov's idea, "For the East Christ is the Saviour because he showed the way of a new life and proved by his Resurrection the power and truth of his teachings."<sup>6</sup> Expressions such as these practically ignore the saving effect of Christ's death. Much closer to the western concept of the Incarnation is the view upheld by Androutsos:

All the truths and facts in the life of Our Lord have dogmatic value, for example, the truths of His sinlessness and of His Resurrection, . . . which are necessary bases for His work of saving the world. Only as Sinless could the Saviour reconcile God and man, and had he not risen from the dead His death would not have had atoning power and significance.<sup>7</sup>

Among the Anglicans the study of D. M. Baillie on the Incarnation is perhaps best known and most outstanding. Dr. Baillie stresses the importance of dwelling upon the historic and supra-historic facts of Jesus' human life. This must be done because Christian theology is not only a theology of the Word, but of the Word made flesh. Truly

---

<sup>6</sup>Nicolas Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942), pp. 52-3.

<sup>7</sup>Frank Gavin, Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought (Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1923) pp. 178-9.

to believe in Christ means to know Him for what He was -- a particular human being Who lived at a definite time and did specific things. Anything less than this is failure to take the Incarnation with complete seriousness.<sup>8</sup>

However, in his eagerness to direct attention to the historical Jesus, Baillie does not slight the atonement. In his own words:

. . . . throughout the whole Christian tradition the supreme human exigency to which the doctrine of the Incarnation had to be related and made relevant has been the need of salvation from sin, the forgiveness of sins.<sup>9</sup>

And, even more emphatic:

But we can now say about the Incarnation not only that it gives the Christian view of God, but that it also gives us that outcropping of the divine atonement in human history which makes His mercy effectual for our salvation. The Christian message tells us that God was incarnate in Jesus, and that His sin-bearing was in the Passion of Jesus.<sup>10</sup>

From the above examples it is clear that this emphasis on the Incarnation which the Anglicans and the Orthodox hold in common is only a general one. The specific manifestations of it reveal considerable dissimilarities. More than anything else this general emphasis indicates a closeness of spirit which leads Christians of both churches to cherish the meaning of the Incarnation to an exceptional degree.

---

<sup>8</sup>D. M. Baillie, God Was In Christ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 50-4.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 201.



## Sacraments

On several instances during reunion discussions between the Anglicans and the Orthodox, consideration was given to the number and nature of the Sacraments,<sup>11</sup> The differing views of the two churches on this subject may be traced to their respective concepts of grace. In characteristic Western fashion the Anglicans conceive of grace and salvation in terms of deliverance from the guilt of sin. For this reason the Anglicans usually think only of Baptism and the Eucharist, which give explicit promise of such parson, as being Sacraments in the strict sense of the term. While recognizing the value of the other Christian rites, they will not readily put them into the same category with the afore-mentioned two. An exception to this are the High Anglicans who do not hesitate to designate Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Marriage and Unction as Sacraments. However, if pressed, these Anglo-Catholics will usually admit that they use the term "Sacrament" in a broader sense, and that even they recognize the distinctiveness of the Sacraments of forgiveness.

For the Eastern Christians grace and the salvation which it effects constitute something much more extensive than the Western view does:

---

<sup>11</sup>Supra, p. 19 and p. 23 mention two of these instances.

. . . . it is visualized as a gradual transfiguration of the whole cosmos, culminating in theosis, or the deification in Christ of the members of the Church as representatives and spokesmen of the entire creation.<sup>12</sup>

Because salvation is transfiguration rather than forgiveness to the Orthodox, they have applied the term "Sacrament" to a rather large number of religious ceremonies. Until the Sixteenth Century no definite number of the Sacraments was prescribed. At that time, while under strong Roman influence, the seven sacraments of the West were appropriated. Before that time such acts as the blessing of water at Epiphany, the sign of the Cross, and the monastic life were also considered to be Sacraments.<sup>13</sup> In whatever way the transforming power of God is applied to any area of human life -- that is sacramental to the Orthodox.

It appears that the question of the Sacraments will not prove to be a serious obstacle to doctrinal unity between the Orthodox and the Anglicans. In the following paragraph Canon Douglas expresses considerable optimism regarding future agreement on this question. He refers to a question asked by Prof. Androutsos:<sup>14</sup>

To his first question, 'Does it receive the Seven Sacraments? most of those historic High Churchmen who are not identified with advanced teaching would

---

<sup>12</sup>Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians, p. 54.

<sup>13</sup>Gavin, op. cit., p. 278.

<sup>14</sup>Supra, p. 23.

certainly answer in the affirmative. There is also a growing tendency among Anglicans of all schools not to boggle at the application of the term Sacrament, to Confirmation and the other four. It is to be noted also that Prof. Androutsos does not ask for a statement of a scholastic character, but simply for an assurance that Anglicans accept Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Marriage and Unction of the Sick as Sacraments. Moreover, as will be seen from the passages which I have collected in my first Appendix, he could have no quarrel with our categorizing Baptism and the Eucharist as 'Sacraments of the Gospel,' the object of his question being simply to make sure that, as the Constantinople delegation told us on July 17th, 1920, we held the other five to be possessed of outward signs instituted by Christ or His Apostles and to convey Grace to the soul of the Faithful.<sup>15</sup>

### The Eucharist

Growing directly out of the preceding issue is the subject of the Eucharist. Concerning this Sacrament two major questions arise. The first of these has to do with the doctrine of transubstantiation. It has often been claimed that the Orthodox teaching on this point is equivalent to the Roman teaching:

Essentially there is no distinction in Orthodox teaching between the Orthodox doctrine of transubstantiation and the Roman doctrine, . . . both Roman and Orthodox Churches agree distinctly and explicitly in their doctrine of the Holy Eucharist and define it in the term and by the theory involved, as transubstantiation.<sup>16</sup>

As far as the High Anglicans are concerned, even if this

---

<sup>15</sup>John Albert Douglas, The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern-Orthodox Especially in Regard to Anglican Orders, (London: Faith Press, 1921), p. 71.

<sup>16</sup>Gavin, op. cit., p. 336.

were true, there would be no disagreement. For, most High Churchmen, according to Douglas, are willing to accept the Tridentine definition of transubstantiation. Nevertheless, for the encouragement of other Anglicans and for the sake of accuracy he explains that statements such as the one above are not true.

The Greek word which has been translated by "transubstantiation" is *μετουσίως*. Literally, this Greek word simply refers to the change which takes place in the Eucharist. It does not attempt to explain the manner in which this change occurs. However, when this word was translated into Slavonic by a word borrowed from the Latin, transubstantio, much of the loaded meaning of the latter was injected into it. Even a number of Eastern theologians were guilty of transferring the scholastic implications of substantia and accidens into the interpretation of this word. In this way Orthodox and Roman Catholic teaching merged unawares on this point.

A number of Eastern theologians became aware of this confusion and have expressed themselves clearly against identifying Orthodox teaching with the Roman concept of transubstantiation. Although they acknowledge the fact of the change, these Easterners reject all efforts to explain how it takes place. In his discussion Canon Douglas cites direct quotations from Philaret, Khomiakov and Mesoloras in proof of his contention.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Douglas, op. cit., pp. 72-77.

The second question with regard to the Eucharist has to do with its sacrificial nature. In what respect is the Eucharist a repetition of Christ's sacrifice? What do the Anglicans condemn in these words of Article Thirty-One?

Wherefore the Sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.<sup>18</sup>

According to Robinson the Orthodox view of the Eucharist is that it is a sacrifice insofar as it re-presents the sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross, so that the individual might participate in it and benefit from it.<sup>19</sup>

Such an explanation should be acceptable to almost every Anglican. There is, obviously, little correspondence between this concept and that of the Roman repeated, propitiatory sacrifice, which Article Thirty-One is set against. In view of this, the prospect of complete doctrinal unity between the Anglicans and the Orthodox in this point is exceedingly hopeful.

#### Doctrinal Authority

A fundamental difference exists between the Anglicans and the Orthodox on the question of doctrinal authority.

---

<sup>18</sup>The Book of Common Prayer (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1843), p. 418.

<sup>19</sup>William Robinson, "The Eastern Church and the Unity of Christendom," Christendom, XXI (Summer, 1938), 364-376.

Recognition of this difference appeared already with the overtures of the Non-Jurors to the East (1716-1725) in which they asked the Orthodox to concede the equal authority of the Ecumenical Councils and the Scriptures.<sup>20</sup> Particularly in recent years it has become apparent that the antithesis is not: Scriptures versus Councils or Tradition, as was frequently supposed. More correctly stated that antithesis is: concrete, documentary authority versus the living authority of the Spirit in the Church.

Consistent with its Western heritage, the Anglican Church looks primarily to the Scriptures as a source and norm of doctrine. Other ecclesiastical documents are authoritative as interpretations of the Scriptures. Leonard Hodgson describes the manner in which two major elements within Anglicanism arrange the scale of priorities in doctrinal authority:

Some, as represented by the bishops who put forth the canons ecclesiastical of 1571 (30), regarded the writings of the Fathers of the undivided Church as the classical commentary on the Scriptures, written when the Church was moulding authoritative statements of what it stood for. Thus for their successors there is a scale of priorities in doctrinal authority. First comes the biblical revelation as expressed in the Canon of Scriptures, the Creeds and the liturgical tradition. Next come the patristic writings as the classical commentary. The Anglican Articles and Homilies are to be interpreted as governed by these, and the Church is not bound by documents of the Continental Reformation or by the opinions of individual divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Others had less respect for the teachings of the early Fathers. As living nearer to the apostolic age they could be

---

<sup>20</sup>Supra, p. 14.

called in evidence, but patristic theology as well as mediaeval was subject to the judgment of Scripture. Those who held that such Reformation leaders such as Luther or Calvin had been given deeper insights than their predecessors into the meaning of the Bible attached more weight to their teaching than to that of the early Fathers. For them and their successors the first place in the scale of priorities is given to the Bible as interpreted by the reformers, and the patristic writings are of importance insofar as they anticipate Reformation insights.<sup>21</sup>

In the case of either tradition final doctrinal authority resides in specific documents. God's revelation has been received and recorded. It needs only to be studied in order to yield the content of faith and the meaning of God's will for each generation.

Such a concept is quite foreign to Eastern thinking. The reason for this is to be found in a unique emphasis in the Orthodox doctrine of the Church. In his penetrating essay on Eastern Orthodoxy Joseph Hromadka comments as follows on the Eastern view of doctrinal authority:

Secondly, the Church has the final norm and criterion of truth in herself. There is no higher authority beyond the Church since the Church is the primary reality, the source and fountain of all redemptive knowledge and life. Not even Christ should be understood and looked upon as authority to which the Church is subordinated. The Church is the Incarnate Christ, His life is her life; there is no dividing line between His God-manhood on the one hand and the Church on the other. Christ does not live and act outside the Church . . . . The same is true of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible of the Old and New Testament has no normative value

---

<sup>21</sup> Leonard Hodgson, "The Doctrine of the Church as Held and Taught in the Church of England," The Nature of the Church, edited by R. Newton Flew (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952), pp. 137 f.

outside the Church. It is the Church that created the Canon, not vice versa. The Scripture certainly is the eternal revelation of God, and has its unique value. Nevertheless, it is only part of the living tradition of the Church. The Scripture is the work of the Church as a mystical whole . . . . only in fellowship with the Church, in a direct and spontaneous communion of prayer and love can an individual Christian understand the truth and meaning of the prophetic and apostolic writings. The criterion of truth, the ultimate court of appeal is the Church itself. The truth of the redemptive message can be apprehended only through the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit is active through the mystical union of love and faith.<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, this authority resides in the whole Church. It is not restricted to or centralized in the hierarchy:

. . . . the theologians of the East . . . . insist upon the fact that the Church as a whole is an organic, mystical body of all believers, and has been the medium, instrument and embodiment of the infallible truth of Christ. True, some doctrines were defined and promulgated by the councils, however it was not until the whole Church accepted and incorporated them into the living tradition that they proved to be authoritative, infallible manifestations of the divine truth.<sup>23</sup>

In reality, the difference between Anglican and Orthodox of doctrinal authority is a difference of emphasis. Although Anglicans locate the authority in written documents, they also recognize these documents to be the work of the Holy Spirit through the Church. On the other hand, the Orthodox do not object to the authority of the

---

<sup>22</sup>Joseph L. Hromadka, "Eastern Orthodoxy," The Great Religions of the Modern World, edited by Edward J. Jurji (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946), pp. 291 f.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 292.



Scriptures. Only when that authority is placed above the authority of the Church is there grounds for controversy between the two views. In recent years ecumenical conferences have stimulated much study on the doctrines of the Church and the Holy Scriptures. Since both Orthodox and Anglican theologians are taking part in these studies, it is probable that a closer agreement between the two on the related question of doctrinal authority will be achieved in the future.

#### Veneration of the Saints

Orthodoxy, as was noted above, has a singularly dynamic and comprehensive doctrine of the Church. Unique expression of this doctrine is found in Eastern liturgy and piety. For the Orthodox believer the reality of the Church supersedes the incident of physical death. There is a living relationship between the saints in heaven and those on earth. Fellowship with the heavenly saints is both possible and valuable for earthly saints. It is this concept of the Communion of Saints which has given rise in Eastern liturgy and piety to veneration of the saints. Ikons are employed by the Orthodox in connection with saint veneration.

The Orthodox pray to the saints for their intercession with the Father. They see no reason why it is not just as proper to ask for the intercession of a fellow saint after his death as it was before, "But we believe

the Saints not only while they are upon earth are our orators and mediators with God, but chiefly after their death."<sup>24</sup> In their invocation of the saints the Eastern Christians insist that they are not being idolatrous:

For we do by no means worship the Saints of God by that most holy Worship of Latria, but modestly call upon them as our Brethren and the Friends of God, praying that they would obtain the Divine Help and assistance for us their Brethren and be as Mediators with God for us.<sup>25</sup>

In the strict sense, even the word "mediator" is not properly applied to the saints. This intercession and mediation for which the Orthodox beseech the saints in heaven is not something which the latter may offer of themselves:

For we do not say to any Saint, 'O Saint, save or redeem or devise some good or do something for me.' In no wise---for these things are possible only to God. Nor do we term the Saints mediators. For there is one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, Who alone is able to mediate directly between us and the Father. So we do not call the Saints departed mediators, but ambassadors and pleaders.<sup>26</sup>

The Mother of Jesus has been singled out by the Orthodox for special devotion and veneration. Among them, varying degrees of honor are given to her. A reverent but rather conservative estimation of her place among the saints is stated by Gavin:

---

<sup>24</sup>Douglas, op. cit., p. 156.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 153 f.

Of the Saints, the Church particularly asks the prayers of the Mother of God addressed 'to Him whom she bore, 'and honors her above others, 'since she was marked out by God for this great and distinguished function. 'Yet, as Kritopoulos says, she was not without original sin, though 'she received the special gift from God enabling her to live without commission of any actual sin.'<sup>27</sup>

Zernov promotes a view which is much more elaborate and assigns a much more exalted role in God's plan to the Virgin. According to Zernov, the Virgin Mary is the fruit of a long process of selection with which God was engaged throughout the whole Old Testament era:

. . . she is the human being nearest to God that has ever lived on earth, for she was able to become the Mother of the Incarnate Lord . . . the final link in the chain which connects fallen mankind with the Saviour of the World. She is the representative of us all, and through her all mankind meet their Friend and their Redeemer. She is therefore not only the Mother of Jesus Christ, but also the Mother of all creation; the second Eve who repaired the fault of the first woman.<sup>28</sup>

Ikons are employed by the Orthodox as an aid to their communion with the saints and with the Savior. These ikons are simply paintings which have been executed with special devotion and ceremony, usually by monks. The express purpose of ikons is to facilitate communion with the saint whose likeness appears on them. Much ceremony surrounds the use of ikons in the liturgy and in the private devotions of the Orthodox. Because of their sacred use ikons are regarded very highly by Eastern

---

<sup>27</sup>Gavin, op. cit., p. 402.

<sup>28</sup>Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians, p. 60.

Christians. Extreme reverence and affection -- often approaching superstition -- characterize the attitude of the people toward their ikons.

Underlying the use of ikons is the Orthodox conception of the unity of matter and spirit, and, consequently, the redemption also of the material world. Because of the unity of matter and spirit, a material object such as an ikon can bring to the scene the presence of the departed saint which it represents. The Incarnation reveals clearly how the physical can be the vehicle of divine action. Furthermore, the physical creation has also been redeemed. Ikons are particles of creation in which redemption has been realized through prayer and ritual. For these reasons ikons are able to "provide a special facility for fellowship between the Saints and members of the Church here on earth."<sup>29</sup>

This expansive, dynamic doctrine of the Church and the resulting practices are much less prominent in the Anglican Church than in the Orthodox Church. In fact, among the Anglicans veneration of and invocation with the departed saints are restricted almost exclusively to the Anglo-Catholics. Even among these High Churchmen this emphasis is much less central than it is among Eastern Christians. For the greater part of Anglicanism veneration of the saints is thought to be either superstitious or

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

idolatrous. This, then, represents another situation in which real differences of doctrine and practice must be overcome before unity can be realized. However, it has been observed by Zernov that here, too, there has been genuine progress. He says:

It has been a great satisfaction to Eastern Christians to witness during the last 100 years a growing understanding among Anglicans of the meaning of 'the Communion of Saints.' It is possible to say, therefore, that this doctrinal divergence is now less acute than at the time of the Non-Jurors.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

## CHAPTER V

### PROBLEMS RAISED BY ANGLICAN AND ORTHODOX REUNION

Reunion abroad at the expense of schism at home is not worthy of the name. Yet, such a reaction threatens both the Anglicans and the Orthodox as they engage in reunion negotiations. We look first to the Anglicans to see why this problem confronts them. On several occasions we have noted the fact that among the Anglican impetus for reunion with the East comes almost exclusively from the Anglo-Catholic party. This is quite natural and understandable, for it is a case of like being attracted by like. In fact, no other group within the Anglican Church could hope for much success in negotiating with the Catholic East. Nor, indeed, would any other Anglican party have the desire to do so. It is a blessing, then, to the cause of reunion that the High Church party has been active in this way. The blessing is not unmixed, however, and results in a twofold problem.

In the first place, the Anglo-Catholic reunion enthusiasts do not always fairly represent the majority of Anglicans in their dealings with the Eastern Orthodox. The manner in which these High Churchmen understress the Reformation and the significance of the Thirty-Nine Articles is a cause of exasperation to their Low and Broad

Church brethren, and it is an inaccurate portrayal of the mind of the whole Anglican body. Furthermore, as the Anglo-Catholics escort their Eastern visitors around the Church of England, they usually take care that the church life which these guests see is properly catholic. Henson, in his own acrimonious way, gives a lucid description of this phenomenon:

Eastern ecclesiastics, visiting England under the guidance of Anglicans who are more anxious to make a favourable impression on their visitors than to bring home to them the truth about English religion, are shown aspects of the Church of England which are little representative of its formal doctrine and actual procedure. Some great ceremonials at St. Paul's or Westminster, where archbishops and bishops make a brave show in copes and mitres, reception by the monastic communities of Cowley and Mirfield, a visit to an Anglo-Catholic Congress, or attendance at 'High Mass' in some 'advanced' church can hardly fail to create in the minds of the foreign visitors a notion of Anglicanism which is curiously remote from the actualities of law, history, and current procedure.<sup>1</sup>

Such inadequate representation of Anglicanism on the part of the High Churchmen does not provide a sound basis for eventual union between the two churches. For a short time it may produce a false show of progress. However, as soon as the Orthodox acquire a more complete understanding of Anglicanism a more realistic relationship is resumed.

Another side of the same problem, and perhaps the more serious, is the fact that the Anglo-Catholic desire for

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Hensley Henson, The Church of England (London: Cambridge University Press, 1939), pp. 244 f.

unity with the East is often coupled with a disinterest, perhaps even contempt, for the Low Churchmen and Non-Conformist churches at home. The strength and depth of this attitude stand out clearly when one recalls the fact that the Catholic Movement began in part as a reaction against a Broad Church attempt to unite the Anglicans and Non-Conformists.<sup>2</sup> As they reach out to unite with the Eastern Church, the Anglo-Catholics tend to pull away from ecumenical responsibilities toward their brethren at home. Resentment over against the Anglo-Catholics often runs rather high in England on this account. The tragedy and irony of the situation is that the Orthodox are not interested in partial reunion. They do not negotiate with schismatics and are completely out of sympathy with any group which would seek unity with them at the cost of division at home.

Although the Orthodox have such an attitude, a similar situation exists in their own case. The ecumenical impetus of Orthodoxy originates chiefly in the Russian Theological Institute of Paris and in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The extremely progressive nature of the Paris Institute often places it far in front of the rest of Orthodoxy and, therefore, somewhat under suspicion. Reason for the ecumenical interest at Constantinople is

---

<sup>2</sup>Lars P. Qualben, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1942), p. 405.



to be found in several of the Patriarchs of that church, who developed ecumenical interests from political as well as ecclesiastical insights.<sup>3</sup>

There is a unifying element between these two groups. Both are endeavoring to resist domination from the huge Russian Church. The people of the Paris Institute are, for the most part, exiles who fled Russia during the Bolshevik persecution. Although they are ready to recognize the spiritual authority of the Russian Church, they reject its organizational control. The reason for this is largely the fact that the Russian Church has so obviously become a puppet of the Soviet government. Because of its enormous size the Russian Church naturally assumes a leading role among the Orthodox Churches. On numerous occasions the Russian Church has sought to become the recognized head of Orthodoxy. This puts the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate on the defensive. For it has been the acknowledged head of Orthodoxy since the days of Constantine. However, during a thousand years of Muslim domination the political position of Constantinople and the size of the church have dwindled almost to nothingness. Rallying around these two groups of ecumenically minded Easterners are various individuals from other sections of Orthodoxy. This element in the Eastern Church is

---

<sup>3</sup>Outstanding among these patriarchs was Meletios, whom Father Florovsky once characterized to me in a private conversation as "a vague theologian, but a great politician."

no more representative of Orthodoxy than the Anglo-Catholics are representative of Anglicanism.

Some of the most significant advances toward Anglican and Orthodox reunion have taken place since the subjugation of the Russian Church to the Soviet government. As a result of its position the Russian Church has been unable to participate in these reunion activities or even to express itself on them. The immense size of the Russian Church renders its opinion very weighty in the eyes of a great part of Orthodoxy. Therefore, until the reaction of the Russian Church toward reunion was expressed, a large section of Orthodoxy, particularly the Churches of the Balkan countries, withheld endorsement of these reunion efforts. When in the summer of 1948, shortly before the first meeting of the World Council of Churches, the Moscow Synod convened and declared itself against reunion with Western Christendom, a severe blow was dealt to Anglican and Orthodox reunion. As was expected, nearly all of the Orthodox Churches followed the lead of the Russian Church and boycotted the World Council. Pressure from within the Orthodox Churches is toward strengthening relations with the Russian Church. In the present circumstances this automatically means the discontinuation of contacts with Western Churches.

As a result of this, the only groups of Orthodoxy which are maintaining their relations with the Anglicans are those such as the Paris Institute and the Russian

Church in America, which have declared themselves to be free from the organizational domination of the Russian Church. From now on any progress on the part of these ecumenical Easterners toward Anglicanism will be drawing them away from the rest of Orthodoxy. At present only three courses of action seem possible for them. These ecumenically minded groups could separate themselves from the rest of Orthodoxy and unite with the Anglicans. This, however, is extremely unlikely. The Orthodox are singularly opposed to all kinds of schism -- even schism in the interest of ecumenicity. A second possibility for them would be to discontinue negotiations with the Anglicans and be received back into the good graces of Orthodoxy. In the opinion of this writer such a move is also unlikely. These Orthodox Christians who take ecumenical action do so because they are convinced that ecumenicity is an essential part of Orthodoxy. They would violate their consciences to cease reunion efforts with the Anglicans. The final possibility for these ecumenical Orthodox Christians is to attempt the precarious task of preserving both contacts -- with their fellow Orthodox and with the Anglicans as well. By such a move they could gradually work toward a more ecumenical viewpoint in the whole Orthodox Church and thereby be able to lead the way toward future Anglican and Orthodox reunion. In the opinion of this writer this final possibility is the one which will be attempted.

Recent developments indicate that the United States may prove to be the most promising field for the continuation and culmination of Anglican and Orthodox reunion efforts. Here is a setting in which both churches are free from the political alliances which are so disturbing to reunion endeavors. During the last few years several additional American Orthodox groups have joined the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. It is conceivable that the contact between the Anglicans and the Orthodox in the Council will provide the stimulus for carrying on reunion negotiations in the United States where such favorable conditions obtain.

Another very fundamental problem raised by Anglican and Orthodox reunion is: What shall be the basis of unity? The unifying factors within Anglicanism are the acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles and a greater or lesser conformity to the worship outlined by the Book of Common Prayer. Similarly, the Orthodox are united in their use of the Orthodox liturgies, in their subscription to the Nicene Creed, and in their acknowledgment of the authority of the Seven Ecumenical Councils. In addition to these formally recognized points, the churches of each communion share an abundance of unofficial traditions and culture which also bind them together. Beyond these points, however, both the Anglicans and the Orthodox tolerate a rather wide range of customs and differences. It is obvious that union will never be achieved as long as either

church demands complete submission to her peculiar unifying factors. How then will unity ever be achieved? Zernov points to the direction of a solution when he says, "Their unity can be achieved only when the essential parts of Eastern and Western interpretations are harmonized without being either suppressed or disfigured."<sup>4</sup>

Yet, such an observation is merely pointing in the direction of a solution. For, it leaves to both churches the task of delineating the essence of their positions. It requires of them that they answer the questions: What are the essentials of Anglicanism? What are the essentials of Orthodoxy? Only after definitive answers have been given to these questions will it be possible to establish a solid basis of unity and to realize reunion.

In conclusion we must ask one more very fundamental question: Can Orthodoxy really be ecumenical with the Anglicans or with any other non-Orthodox Christian body? We have repeatedly pointed to those few but vigorous spirits within the Orthodox fold who believe not only that Orthodoxy may, but that it must be ecumenical, if it is to remain truly Orthodox. It must not be forgotten, however, that the vast majority of Orthodox people are either apathetic or even hostile toward ecumenicity. Are these few ecumenical Orthodox leaders heralds, bringing a weakened and misled church back to the very nature of

---

<sup>4</sup>Nicolas Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1942), p. 104.

Orthodoxy? Or, are they a left-wing movement of only temporary significance, emitting a flash of foreign and non-Orthodox light upon that life of that ancient church, but one which is destined to fade? At present, it is impossible to answer these questions conclusively. One thing is certain, however, the future of reunion, perhaps the future of Orthodox survival, will be determined at this crucial point.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Alvisatos, H. S. "Greece." Christianity Today: A Survey of the State of the Churches. Edited by Henry Smith Leiper. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1947.
- The Anglican and Eastern Churches: A Historical Record, 1914-1921. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921.
- Attwater, Donald. The Catholic Eastern Churches. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1935.
- . The Christian Churches of the East. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1948.
- Baillie, D. M. God Was In Christ. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.
- Bell, George Kennedy Allen. Documents on Christian Unity. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1924.
- . Documents on Christian Unity, Second Series. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1930.
- . Documents on Christian Unity, Third Series. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- , editor. Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. The Stockholm Conference, 1925, Official Report. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1926.
- Bolshakoff, Serge. The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946.
- The Book of Common Prayer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott and Co., 1843.
- Brandreth, Henry Renaud Turner. Unity and Reunion: A Bibliography. London: A. and C. Black, 1945.
- Brent, Charles Henry. Understanding, being an Interpretation of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held in Stockholm. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1925.
- Brown, William Adams. Toward a United Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

- Bulgakov, Sergei Nikolaevich. The Orthodox Church. Translated by Elizabeth S. Gram. Edited by Donald A. Lowrie. New York and Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., pref. 1935.
- Callinicos, Constantine. A Brief Sketch of Greek Church History. Translated by Katherine Natzio. London: Faith Press, Ltd., 1931.
- Church of England Council on Foreign Relations. Survey on the Affairs of the Orthodox Church. London: Issued for the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1934.
- . Second Survey on the Affairs of the Orthodox Church. London: Issued for the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1937.
- Dampier, Margaret C. The Organization of the Orthodox Eastern Churches. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1910.
- Documents Bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship 1916-1920. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- Douglas, John Albert. The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern-Orthodox Especially in Regard to Anglican Orders. London: Faith Press, 1921.
- Dun, Angus. The Meaning of Unity. Prepared by the Commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship (Commission IV) for the World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937.
- Emhardt, William Chauncey, and Others. The Eastern Church in the Western World. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1928.
- . The Eastern-Orthodox Church, a brief description of the Orthodox Church of the East together with some thoughts on reunion. New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension of the Episcopal Church, 1920.
- . Religion in Soviet Russia. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1929.
- Fedotov, George Petrovich. "The Eastern Orthodox Church," Religion in the Twentieth Century. Edited by Vergillius Ferm. New York: The Philosophical Library, c. 1948.



- Flew, R. Newton, editor. The Nature of the Church. Papers presented to the Theological Commission appointed by the Continuation Committee on Faith and Order. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1952.
- French, R. M. The Eastern Orthodox Church. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1951.
- Gavin, Frank. Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1923.
- Headlam, Arthur Cayley. The Teaching of the Russian Church, being points on which it differs from the English Church. London: Rivingtons, 1897.
- Henson, Herbert Hensley. The Church of England. London: Cambridge University Press, 1939.
- Hodgson, Leonard. "The Doctrine of the Church as Held and Taught in the Church of England." The Nature of the Church. Edited by R. Newton Flew. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1952.
- Horton, Walter M. Contemporary Continental Theology: an Interpretation for Anglo-Saxons. New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1938.
- Hromadka, Joseph L. "Eastern Orthodoxy." The Great Religions of the Modern World. Edited by Edward J. Jurji. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.
- Keller, Adolph. Karl Barth and Christian Unity. Translated by Manfred Manrodt in collaboration with Werner Petersmann. Revised by A. J. MacDonald. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.
- Kennedy, James W. Venture of Faith: the Birth of the World Council of Churches. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1948.
- Kidd, E. J. The Churches of Eastern Christendom. London: Faith Press, 1927.
- Khomiakov, Alexei Stephanovich. The Church is One. London: S. P. C. K., 1948.
- Lacey, Thomas Alexander. The Universal Church, a Study in the Lambeth call to union. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1921.

- Lloyd, Roger. The Church of England in the Twentieth Century. II. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
- Macfarland, Charles Stedman. Steps Toward the World Council, origins of the ecumenical movement as expressed in the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1938.
- Macy, Paul Griswold. An Ecumenical Bibliography. New York: Published by the Committee on Education and Promotion, for the American Committee for the World Council of Churches, 1945.
- "Man's Disorder and God's Design." The Amsterdam Assembly Series. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, n. d.
- McBee, Silas. An Eirenic Itinerary. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911.
- Nolde, O. Frederick, editor. "Toward World-Wide Christianity." The Interseminary Series. IV. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, c. 1946.
- Oldham, J. H. World Conference on Church, Community and State, Oxford, 1937, Official Report. Chicago, New York: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937.
- Orthodox Spirituality, an Outline of the Orthodox ascetical and mystical tradition, by a monk of the Eastern Church. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945.
- Ramsey, Michael. The Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church: why their unity is important. London: S. P. C. K., 1948.
- Reports of Journeys Undertaken on Behalf of the Alliance in the Countries of Europe. London: World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, n.d.
- Senaud, Auguste. Christian Unity, a Bibliography. Geneva: World's Committee of Y.M.C.A.'s, 1937.
- Shaw, Plato Ernest. The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1930.
- Slosser, Gaius Jackson. Christian Unity. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1929.
- Sperry, Willard Learoyd. The Non-Theological Factors in the Making and Unmaking of Church Union. Report Number Three, prepared by the Commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship (Commission IV) for the World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1937.

Van Dusen, Henry Pitney. World Christianity; Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow.

Williams, George. The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, being the correspondence between the Eastern patriarchs and the nonjuring bishops; with an introduction on various projects of reunion between the Eastern Church and the Anglican communion. London: Rivingtons, 1868.

Zernov, Nicolas, The Church of the Eastern Christians. London: S. P. C. K., 1942.

----- . The Reintegration of the Church. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1952.

#### Magazines

Florovsky, George. "The Eastern Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Movement," Theology Today, April, 1950.

----- . "The Legacy and the Task of Orthodox Theology," Anglican Theological Review, April, 1949, pp. 65-71.

"Greek Orthodox Not at Lund," Christian Century, August 20, 1952, p. 939.

Hodgson, Leonard. "Anglicanism and the Ecumenical Movement," Anglican Theological Review, July, 1949, pp. 125-132.

Horton, Walter M. "Amsterdam 1948: An Analysis," Religion in Life, Winter, 1948-49, pp. 48-57.

Morrison, S. A. "The Churches of the Near East and the World Council of Churches," Ecumenical Review, Spring, 1949, pp. 277-284.

Robinson, William. "The Eastern Church and the Unity of Christendom," Christendom, Summer, 1938, pp. 364-376.

Schmemmann, A. "Orthodox Youth and the Ecumenical Movement," Ecumenical Review, Spring, 1949, pp. 320-323.

Tinckom-Fernandez, W. G. "Eastern Orthodox Peoples and Churches in the United States," Christendom, Summer, 1939, pp. 423-436.

Zander, L. "The Ecumenical Movement and the Orthodox Church," The Ecumenical Review, Spring, 1949, pp. 267-27