

Orthodox Statements On Anglican Orders

Edited by
E. R. HARDY, JR.

for the
Advisory Council to the Presiding Bishop
on Ecclesiastical Relations

MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO.

New York

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., LTD.

London and Oxford

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	vii
I OFFICIAL SYNODICAL STATEMENTS OF ORTHODOX CHURCHES.	1
1. Constantinople, 1922	1
2. Jerusalem, 1923	6
3. Cyprus, 1923.	8
4. Alexandria, 1930.	10
5. Romania, 1936.	14
6. Greece, 1939.	18
II REPORTS OF OFFICIAL ORTHODOX-ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCES	20
1. Lambeth, 1930.	20
2. Joint Doctrinal Commission, London, 1931.	25
3. Bucarest, 1935.	32
III THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS	36
1. Anglican Ordinations, by Professor Panteleimon Komnenos, 1921.	36
2. The Meaning of the Apostolic Succession in Non-Orthodox Faiths, by Patriarch Sergius of Moscow (then Metropolitan) 1935.	52
IV BIBLIOGRAPHY	71

INTRODUCTION

1

The purpose of the following collection of documents is to make accessible the official synodical statements on Anglican Orders of those Eastern Orthodox Churches which have passed on the subject. To these statements have been added reports of official conferences between Orthodox and Anglican delegations held at London in 1930 and 1931, and at Bucarest in 1935, which are closely related to this subject, and two papers by Orthodox theologians which illustrate more extensively the theological background of the formal decisions. Most of these documents are not available except in publications which are either out of print or hard to obtain in this country. Grateful acknowledgment is here made to Canon J. A. Douglas for permission to reprint those which first appeared in English in the volumes of *The Christian East* or in his translation of *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations* by Mgr. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, Archbishop of Athens.

There is an impression among many Episcopalians that "recognition of orders" establishes a relation of practical or complete intercommunion between two Churches, and that owing to the extension of such recognition to Anglican Orders by part of the Orthodox Church we now enjoy virtually full intercommunion with that Church. It is necessary to correct this impres-

sion both on the matter of principle and on the matter of fact. That recognition of orders does not carry with it intercommunion is illustrated by the fact that the Roman Catholic Church has been divided by schism from the Orthodox East since the Middle Ages, although never expressing any doubt as to the validity of Orthodox ordinations. Closer to us is the establishment of intercommunion between the Anglican and Old Catholic Communions, in which the recognition of Anglican Orders by the Dutch Old Catholics in 1925 was followed by the Bonn Agreement of 1931, ratified by our General Convention in 1934 and 1940. Quite properly, this agreement not only reaffirmed the recognition of orders but covered other points as well. Each Church recognized the teaching of the other as orthodox and its practice as legitimate, although not insisting on uniformity in details.¹ Some such agreement is the basic essential for the establishment of intercommunion between two previously separated Churches. Recognition of orders is, however, one important step in that direction, and, as the following documents will illustrate, the movement for Orthodox recognition of Anglican Orders has been inseparable from the larger movement for better understanding between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions.

2

A slight historical sketch will serve to put these documents in their proper setting. The periodic friendly contacts between Anglicans and Orthodox in the seven-

¹ Cf. text in *Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission Appointed by the Œcumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury*, London, S.P.C.K., 1932, 20 pp., p. 18.

teenth and eighteenth centuries do not seem to have involved this particular question, although certain precedents were established by letters addressed by Eastern Patriarchs to Archbishops of Canterbury in which the usual forms of brotherly salutation were used.² Curious as it may seem, one of the early nineteenth-century contacts involved an Anglican recognition of Orthodox Orders. When, after the Greek War of Independence, the American Episcopal Church began its mission of help to the people and Church of Greece, the instructions given to the first missionaries carefully stated that we recognized the orders of the Greek Church, thus distinguishing our attitude toward it from that of those who assumed that the only hope for Christian progress in Greece was the introduction of Protestantism in place of Orthodoxy.³ The main work of the American Mission was the establishment of the institution which still survives as the Hill School at Athens. It was always conducted in full co-operation with the Greek Church and its clergy. The first effort at intercommunion was an individual one, the attempt of the Rev. William Palmer, an English deacon, to be acknowledged as a member of a sister Church in Russia in the 1840's. In Russia, he was told that he would have to leave the Anglican Church

² E.g. Cyril (Lucar) of Alexandria, afterward of Constantinople, to Archbishop Abbot in the 17th century, and Chrysanthos of Jerusalem to Archbishop Wake in the 18th (cited in Chrysostom Papadopoulos, *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, tr. J. A. Douglas, London and New York, Faith Press and Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1931, xxxiv-113 pp., pp. 25-26).

³ Instructions to J. J. Robertson and J. H. Hill in 1830, in S. D. Denison, *A History of the Foreign Missionary Work of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Part I, New York, 1871, 315 pp., pp. 142-144.

and join the Orthodox, and at Constantinople was warned that even his Baptism would not be recognized. Fruitless though his effort was, the contacts it established marked the beginning of intimate acquaintance between Orthodox and Anglicans.

The question of practical ecclesiastical relations was raised in the 1860's in two far-distant parts of the Anglican Communion. The American Church became aware of the spiritual needs of Russian Orthodox settlers in California, and the Church of England of the needs of some of its own children whom travel or trade had carried to places remote from the ministrations of their own Church but within reach of those of one or another of the Orthodox Churches. Both in America and in England, the hope was roused that under such circumstances each Church might be authorized to minister to the isolated members of the other. The result was the series of negotiations carried on for some years by the "Russo-Greek Committee" of the American General Convention, and by a similar committee of the Convocation of Canterbury. It soon became clear, however, that neither Church was prepared for any such generous arrangement. The Russians preferred to extend the work of their own Church to California, and shortly afterward to the Eastern United States, and, of course, received the welcome of the Episcopal Church in doing so, while the only formal response to the English approaches was a decree of the Synod of Constantinople providing that in case of necessity Orthodox clergy might conduct the funerals of Anglicans.⁴ As has been observed, the first

⁴ Report of the Russo-Greek Committee in *Journal of the General Convention, 1871*, Appendix VI, pp. 565-585.

result of the movement for intercommunion was inter-burial.⁵

Slight though these results were, they marked the opening of official contacts between the Anglican and Orthodox Communion looking toward mutual recognition, and involved such interesting incidents as the visit of representatives of the American Church to Moscow. In the early 1870's, the Old Catholic Congresses at Bonn brought together Orthodox and Anglican sympathizers with the German Old Catholic movement. Their sessions were the beginning of serious theological discussions between East and West in modern times, and showed the possibility of friendly explanation on some of the points of disagreement which had been the occasion of the mediaeval schism. In the forty years following, however, there was little further progress, and, in fact, there was some loss, owing to the popularity in certain Orthodox circles of the idea of a strictly Orthodox mission to Western Europe. The great figure in Anglo-Orthodox relations of that period was W. J. Birkbeck, who for many years was able to act as an interpreter of the Russian Church to the English and vice versa. His own contacts and those he promoted remained on the unofficial and personal level, although crowned by the visits to Russia of such personalities as Bishop Creighton of London and Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac.⁶

Although there were no formal discussions of Anglican Orders between Anglicans and Orthodox during this

⁵ Nicholas Zernov, *The Church of the Eastern Christians*, London, S.P.C.K., 1942, 114 pp., p. 86.

⁶ Cf. Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-40.

period, there was, nevertheless, considerable interest in the subject among Orthodox theologians, and several works on the topic were produced in both Russian and Greek. The treatises of that time furnished the theological basis on which the more recent and more formal statements on the subject have been built. They sufficed to clear away confusion among the Orthodox as to the historic continuity of Anglican ordinations. But what most of the writers felt to be lacking was a clear statement by the Anglican Church that she considered Holy Orders to be a sacrament in which divine grace is received. If this were provided, most of the writers felt that the Orthodox Church could recognize the clergy of the Anglican Communion as such.⁷ The papal condemnation of Anglican Orders in 1896 tended on the whole to increase sympathy for Anglicans in Orthodox circles. The reply issued by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, which was circulated in various languages, including Greek, in defending Anglican Orders touched on some of the points about which the Orthodox had been hesitant. It asserted an Anglican doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and an Anglican tradition of the grace of Holy Orders for the Ministry of Word and Sacraments, drawing parallels to the latter from Orthodox Service Books and Catechisms.⁸

⁷ Cf. summary of these works in Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-61; Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*, Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York, 1923, xxxix-430 pp., pp. 302-303.

⁸ *Responsio* of the English Archbishops (*Saepius officio*), published as a pamphlet, London, 1896, and in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, new edition, 1902-1904, 3 vols., vol. iii, pp. 269-312, (reprinted, S.P.C.K., 1943).

Out of the tragedies of the World War of 1914-1918, there came several occasions of closer contact between the Orthodox and Anglican Communion. One was the reception of Serbian theological students in England. Another was the visit to America in 1918 of Meletios Metaxakis, then Archbishop of Athens, with a Greek delegation for the organization of the Greek parishes in America. This visit led to conferences with Anglican theologians in New York and London, at which the Orthodox position in regard to Anglican Orders was expounded. In the years after the war, Anglican interest in the Orthodox Churches was further aroused by the crises faced by some (especially Russia and Constantinople) and the hopeful reconstruction of others (especially Serbia and Rumania). The Appeal to All Christian People of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 indicated a desire to enter into negotiations with all Christian bodies on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral (the Bible, the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Ministry). It was naturally taken up by those interested in Orthodox-Anglican relations, among others. Two books published in 1921 showed the kind of approach which was possible from the two sides. Canon J. A. Douglas, in *The Relation of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*, looked into the question from the Anglican point of view. His book included a draft of Terms of Intercommunion put forward for discussion by the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, and a Declaration of Faith on the points on which the Eastern Orthodox most desired reassurance. This latter, though remaining unofficial, was afterward signed by a considerable number of English

clergy, headed by Bishop Gore.⁹ Professor Komnenos of Halki produced the treatise of which the central part is reprinted in this collection (III, 1), in which he not only recommended that the Orthodox Church give as much recognition to Anglican Orders as to any others outside its own fold, but also proposed certain concrete steps that might be taken on the basis of this recognition.

Meanwhile, Meletios, having become Patriarch of Constantinople, discussed with his Synod the question of Anglican Orders. The result was the first official Orthodox action on this subject, the recognition of Anglican Ordinations as standing on the same basis "as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches." In July, 1922, this proposal was announced by letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and by encyclical to the various Orthodox Churches, asking for their opinions (I, 1). In 1923, affirmative replies were received from Jerusalem and Cyprus (I, 2, 3). As Meletios wrote in 1922 there was "as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church," although the proceedings might have amounted to such if all the Patriarchates and autocephalous Churches had agreed. However, this was impossible—if for no other reason, because the Russian Church was in no position to act on such a question. In 1923, political changes obliged Meletios to leave Constantinople. In 1926, he became Patriarch of Alexandria, and four years later headed a distinguished Orthodox delegation to the Lambeth Conference. The delegation met with a committee of the Conference presided over by the Bishop of Gloucester and discussed the problems involved

⁹ Text of the Declaration of Faith in Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-69.

in Orthodox-Anglican relations. The question of possible ministrations of the clergy of each Communion to members of the other in case of emergency was brought forward by Bishop Gray of Northern Indiana, with special reference to isolated Orthodox in America. The report of these discussions (II, 1) suggests that such ministrations are permissible if the relevant ecclesiastical authorities do not object. The two delegations recommended the appointment of a Joint Theological Commission for the more detailed discussion of matters of faith. Such a commission was accordingly organized and met in London in 1931 ((II, 2). Meanwhile, at Christmas, 1930, Meletios and his Synod had, on the basis of the statements made at Lambeth, joined the Church of Constantinople in its recognition of Anglican ordinations. (I, 4).

In 1925, the Romanian reply to Constantinople had taken the position of much Orthodox theology on this question—the matter is historically clear, but theologically requires elucidation from the Anglican Church as to its doctrine of Holy Orders. The desire was expressed for an Anglican theological delegation to Romania. This was appointed and met with a Romanian delegation at Bucarest in 1935, continuing the series of theological discussions which began at Lambeth in 1930 (II, 3). As a result of its statements, the Romanian Commission presented a favorable report to the Romanian synod, which was adopted in 1936, subject to acceptance in England of these statements. This was provided in due course by the English Convocations (I, 5). In 1939, the Synod of the Church of Greece was preparing to take up the subject, and secured an interesting series of memoranda on it from the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens. The Synod's resolution of September 21, however, said

nothing about Anglican Orders in particular, but merely reaffirmed the traditional attitude of the Orthodox Church toward all non-Orthodox sacraments. But it did express a desire for further contacts and theological discussions with the Church of England (I, 6). In partial and perhaps rather premature fulfilment of this desire, a delegation headed by the Bishop of Gloucester visited the Balkans in 1940. At Athens the members attempted to face the differences as well as the agreements between Anglican and Eastern Orthodox conceptions of the Church, suggesting that "comprehensiveness" and "exclusiveness" were the respective principles of the two Communion. There, as also in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, they were received cordially, but no formal statements were produced.¹⁰

This is the stage that official Orthodox action on Anglican Orders has so far reached. When the formal discussion can be resumed, we may hope that contact with the Russian Church will have been fully established with regard to this and other matters. The concluding document in this collection is an article by Patriarch Sergius, published in 1935, which illustrates the thought of an influential and representative leader of the Russian Church on the subject of non-Orthodox Orders.

¹⁰ The memoranda and synodical resolution of 1939 were published in *Ekklesia*, Athens, which has not been available in this country; they are cited and discussed in Bertold Spuler, "Orthodoxe Stimmen zur Frage der Gültigkeit der anglikanischen Weihen," in *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. 30, Bern, 1940, pp. 13-20; the memoranda are summarized, on the basis of a Romanian review of them, in W. G. Wood, "The Greeks and Anglican Orders," in *Sobornost*, No. 21, London, May, 1940, pp. 20-22; the delegation of 1940 is reported in *Irenikon*, vol. 18, 1941.

Before passing to the hopeful aspects of Orthodox recognition of Anglican Orders it may be well to note its limitations. What has happened so far is not an act of the whole Orthodox Church. Though the Church of Constantinople has an honorary precedence, it is only one of the Orthodox Churches, and its practical importance has been considerably reduced since the expulsion of non-Turks from most of Turkey in 1923. Consequently, the action inaugurated by Patriarch Meletios in 1922 affects only those Orthodox Churches which have joined in it. One should note, too, Professor Alivisatos' suggestion at the Congress of Orthodox Theology at Athens in 1936 that simultaneous action after previous discussion rather than separate action would have been the proper way for the Orthodox Churches to take up such a question. However, as the examples adduced by Professor Komnenos and Patriarch Sergius illustrate, Orthodox Churches have differed in the past as to the practical aspects of their relation to Western Christendom, and so there is nothing anomalous in the existence of similar variations today.¹¹

More important than this canonical question is the theological one: what does "recognition of Orders" mean? In Eastern Orthodox theology, it seems both to mean less in itself and to imply more with regard to other matters than it usually does in the West. The Latin theology

¹¹ Hence the action of Orthodox authorities in America in sometimes allowing and sometimes forbidding their people to receive the sacraments from the clergy of the Episcopal Church is quite in accordance with history as well as with the principles stated at Lambeth in 1930.

which we have inherited is accustomed to the principle that valid ordination (like valid Baptism) is present wherever the essentials of the external rite are found, along with a minimum intention of administering it. In the East, the principle behind all discussion of the sacraments is that they are acts of God through the corporate Church, and hence do not exist apart from the Church. Considering themselves as the undoubted true Church, coming down from the Apostles' time, the Orthodox might in strictness refuse to acknowledge the validity of Baptism or any Christian rite outside of their own Communion. In the West, St. Cyprian followed this principle in his refusal to recognize heretical Baptism. The Orthodox East has not adhered to this strict rule, but considers any variation from it a special concession which does not have the force of a precedent, except in the negative sense that what has been done is obviously not impossible. This is the practice of "economy," a term which it is almost impossible to translate or to define in the language of Western theology. Professor Alivisatos of Athens has defined it as follows:

Oikonomia is suspension of the strict enforcement of Canon Law in cases of urgent need and in a spirit of prudent stewardship, condescension and leniency, practiced by the Church's leaders, without overstepping the limits of dogma, in order to regularize abnormal conditions, for the salvation of those concerned.¹²

¹² Hamilcar S. Alivisatos, "'Economy' from the Orthodox Point of View," in *Dispensation in Practice and Theory*, the Report of a commission Appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1935, London, 1944, pp. 27-43, p. 30.

In other words, economy condones a violation of the usual rules of Orthodox Canon Law in order to secure the purpose of such rules, the salvation of mankind. Its limits are fixed by this purpose, and the dogmas involved, and in the nature of the case cannot be precisely defined in advance. In relation to ordinations, economy is usually restricted in theory (and always has been in practice) to the cases defined by Patriarch Sergius—non-Orthodox rites may be recognized by the Church (but do not have to be) if the external forms have been preserved, together with faith in their spiritual power. From the strict Orthodox point of view, recognition of non-Orthodox Orders is merely a statement that the Orders in question are among those with reference to which economy might be exercised. Thus the terms of Patriarch Meletios' letter of 1922 are that Anglican Orders have the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches, all of which the Orthodox Church considers herself free to accept or reject as seems best for practical reasons.

Some Orthodox theologians refuse to speculate as to the status of the sacraments administered among Christian bodies separated from their Church, since that is to them an abnormal condition. The status of the non-Orthodox comes up only when and if they enter the Orthodox fold and it must be decided whether they are to be treated as baptized, confirmed, or ordained. This principle seems to be implied in the form in which Meletios propounded the question of Anglican Orders and in the reply from Jerusalem; it clearly appears in the reply from Cyprus, which formally confines itself to the case of Anglican clerics acceding to Orthodoxy. Those who do speculate on the status of non-Orthodox sacra-

ments vary from a sharp denial of their reality to a generous recognition of it. Two forms of the latter attitude will be found in the articles of Professor Komnenos and Patriarch Sergius. Another statement of it occurs in the contribution of the (Russian) Orthodox member to the Report of the American Section of the Commission on Intercommunion of the World Conference on Faith and Order, which includes the following:

The repentant heretics and schismatics were and are received, however, into the Church in various ways, implying the recognition on the part of the Church of the validity of Sacraments and priesthood, therefore, of the genuine church life outside her canonical boundaries. This practice and certain cases known from ancient and modern church history point to the possibility of the recognition of an at present non-Orthodox Christian body as a genuine part with it [the Orthodox Church], with or without any sacramental action involved.

But, in any case, dogmatic unity would be a "pre-condition of reunion."¹³

The degree of harmony in faith and practice which is required for the recognition of orders from the Orthodox point of view goes considerably beyond the mere technicalities in which discussion of the subject in the West sometimes loses itself. Hence the questions raised at Lambeth and Bucarest laid the foundation for the more complete agreement which would be necessary for full

¹³ Statement of Paul T. Lutov in *Report of the American Section of the Commission on Intercommunion*, Washington, Conn., World Conference on Faith and Order, 1942, 80 pp., p. 71.

intercommunion. This was reflected in the terms of the Romanian resolutions, which expressed satisfaction that such definite steps toward full agreement had been taken, and used the phrase "recognition of the validity of the Anglican Orders" without the restrictions introduced by the Greek synods. The discussions of 1930-1935 have at least illuminated the relation of Orthodox and Anglican theology over a wide area.

4

It remains to ask what immediate practical results follow from such action as has been taken. In the strictest sense, the technical result of Orthodox recognition or Anglican Orders is the inclusion of Anglicans among those whose ordination would not have to be repeated on their entrance into union with the Orthodox Church—presumably this would apply to any corporate reunion as well as to the unusual cases of individuals.

However, the practical results are not limited to the technical point of theology. Recognition of orders has its place in the increasing atmosphere of friendship between the Orthodox and Anglican Communion. The granting, or even the discussion, of it depends on this more extensive friendly intercourse, and in turn helps to promote it. And in one particular point our friendly relations have sometimes gone beyond strict canonical limits. The anticipation of union by mutual ministrations in emergencies, proposed by the American and English Committees eighty years ago, again suggested by Professor Komnenos in 1921, and cautiously endorsed by the Orthodox and Anglican delegations at Lambeth in 1930, has been actualized in a

number of cases in the last twenty years.¹⁴ As Komnenos pointed out, this was an innovation, at least in the sense that the Orthodox might receive as well as give such ministrations. However, it falls under the head of economy, which within its limits neither demands nor creates precedents, and provides the method by which the Orthodox Church can take cognizance of unprecedented circumstances. What it amounts to in practice is that, where the Orthodox authorities are willing, they may allow their people in isolation or emergency to receive the sacraments of the Church from Anglican clergy, and the reverse situation may be similarly dealt with. It must be noted, however, that while this practice, sometimes called "economic intercommunion," has been proposed and recommended by leaders of both Churches, it is not based on any formal agreement or strictly official endorsement. It should be thought of as a means of meeting the needs of the individuals involved. Except as illustrating possibilities, it is not a step toward the union of the Churches, which must continue to be sought on a broad basis of mutual understanding and confidence.

Many other aspects of Orthodox-Anglican relations will be found discussed in the books listed in the Bibliography. The subject cannot be entirely separated from the question of Orthodox participation in the World

¹⁴ Particularly, though not systematically, by chaplains in the American Army and Navy. On January 28, 1945, Bishop Dionisie of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada, preaching at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, spoke of the Lambeth agreements as meaning (a) mutual recognition; (b) "mutual participation in the sacraments" when necessary; (c) co-operation of the two Churches. This is the most that any official Orthodox spokesman has made of them (*The Diocesan Bulletin*, New York, Lent, 1945, p. 5).

Conferences on Faith and Order and the other organs of the Ecumenical Movement, information on which can be found in the publications of the various conferences. There are also the various official, unofficial, and semi-official organs of Orthodox-Anglican friendship. We are here concerned with one technical but important question and the providing of information about it. In the words of the Romanian Synod we may be allowed to hope and pray,

May this approach be of great use in the path shown by Our Common Saviour Jesus Christ in his words, "That they all may be one."

E. R. HARDY, JR.

Berkeley Divinity School
October, 1946

I

OFFICIAL SYNODICAL STATEMENTS
OF ORTHODOX CHURCHES
ON ANGLICAN ORDERS

1

CONSTANTINOPLE, 1922

The official statements of Orthodox Churches on the subject of Anglican Orders began with the letters addressed by Patriarch Meletios of Constantinople in the name of his synod to Dr. Randolph Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury and to the Orthodox Churches in July, 1922. The letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury follows.

Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Chief Hierarch of all England, Brother, beloved and yearned for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings; your Reverence well beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

Our special committee dealing with the Union of the Churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view, for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity taking under our presidency the matter under consideration, and, having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the

ordination of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the "Charisma" of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession.

Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

But even so it is an event not without significance that the Synod of one, and that the Primatial Throne of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration, has come to this conclusion.

Therefore with great joy we communicate the matter to your beloved Grace as the Chief Hierarchy of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your Grace will be equally favourably disposed towards this conclusion, as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

May the Heavenly Father grant unto us to be of the same mind, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever and ever.

July 28, 1922.

Your well-beloved Grace's beloved Brother in Christ,
and altogether well disposed,

✠ MELETIOS OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

The Encyclical of the Œcumenical Patriarch, Meletios, to the heads of all Orthodox Autocephalous Churches follows.

The Most Holy Church of Constantinople, kindled from the beginning with zeal for universal union, and always keeping in mind the Lord's words prayed by Him to His heavenly Father just before His Saving Passion, has always followed with keen interest every movement in the separated Churches, and has examined with care and study every and any expression of faith which might point towards a *rapprochement* with Orthodoxy. Further, it has concluded with real joy that amongst them the Church, which has manifested the most lively desire to remove the obstacles towards a *rapprochement*, and indeed, to full union with the Orthodox Church, is the Episcopal Anglican Church, which herself, having first received the light of Christianity from the East, has never ceased to remember the East, and to account as an important end a sincere *rapprochement* towards a full union in Christ Jesus with the Orthodox in the East.

Therefore the great Church of Christ (now) under our presidency, necessarily honouring the readiness of this Church in former periods, and especially in the last twenty years, entered into many sincere brotherly relations with it, and recently established a special committee, with instructions to report upon the still existing points of difference on the basis of a scientific inquiry, and on the method of their removal, with a view to accomplishing a full union of the two Churches in the same Orthodox Christian spirit.

Perceiving in its labour that on an important question—namely, the validity of Anglican ordinations—the Holy Orthodox Church had not yet officially delivered any opinion either as a whole or through any of the particular Holy Synods, although there have been many discussions on the matter from time to time among her

theologians, and that an authoritative investigation and canonical solution of this important question would greatly facilitate the desired union by removing one of the more serious obstacles that oppose the goal of reunion which is sought on either side, and is dear to God, the Committee brought under the judgment of our Holy Synod a special report scientifically treating the above-named question. Our Holy Synod studied this report of the Committee in repeated sessions, and took note:

1. That the ordination of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury by four bishops is a fact established by history.

2. That in this ordination and those subsequent to it there are found in their fullness those orthodox and indispensable visible and sensible elements of valid episcopal ordination—namely, the laying on of hands and the *Epiklesis* of the All-Holy Spirit, and also the purpose to transmit the *charisma* of the Episcopal ministry.

3. That the Orthodox theologians who have scientifically examined the question have almost unanimously come to the same conclusions, and have declared themselves as accepting the validity of Anglican ordinations.

4. That the practice in the Church affords no indication that the Orthodox Church has ever officially treated the validity of Anglican Orders as in doubt in such a way as would point to the reordination of the Anglican clergy being regarded as required in the case of the union of the two Churches.

5. That, expressing this general mind of the Orthodox Church, the Most Holy Patriarchs at different periods and other Hierarchs of the East, when writing to the Archbishops of the Anglican Church, have been used to

address them as “Most Reverend Brother in Christ,” thus giving them a brotherly salutation.

Our Holy Synod, therefore, came to an opinion accepting the validity of the Anglican priesthood, and has determined that its conclusion should be announced to the other Holy Orthodox Churches, in order that opportunity might be given them also to express their opinion, so that through the decisions of the parts the mind of the whole Orthodox world on this important question might be known.

Accordingly, writing to your well-beloved (Beatitude) and informing you of the considerations which, in this question, prevail with us, we have no doubt that your (Beatitude) also investigating this question with your Holy Synod, will be pleased to communicate the result of your consideration to us, with a view to a further improvement of our relations in regard to union with the Anglican Church, in the good hope that the Heavenly Ruler of the Church will supply that which is lacking through his all-strengthening grace, and will guide all who believe in Him to a full knowledge of the truth and to full union, that there may be formed of them one flock under a Chief Shepherd—the true Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever. Amen.

Published as Appendices II and III of Mgr. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, translated and prefaced by J. A. Douglas, London and N. Y., Faith Press and Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1931, pp. 106-110.

JERUSALEM, 1923

The Patriarch of Jerusalem wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the name of his Synod on March 12, 1923, as follows:

To His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, First Hierarch of All England, our most beloved and dear brother in our Lord Jesus, Mgr. Randall. Greeting fraternally your beloved to us, Grace, we have the pleasure to address to you the following:

Yesterday we dispatched to Your Grace the following telegram: 'We have pleasure inform Your Grace that Holy Synod of our Patriarchate after studying in several meetings question Anglican Orders from Orthodox point view resolved their validity.' Today, explaining this telegram, we inform Your Grace that the Holy Synod, having as a motive the resolution passed some time ago by the Church of Constantinople, which is the Church having the First Throne between the Orthodox Churches, resolved that the consecrations of bishops and ordinations of priests and deacons of the Anglican Episcopal Church are considered by the Orthodox Church as having the same validity which the Orders of the Roman Church have, because there exist all the elements which are considered necessary from an Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the grace of the Holy Orders from Apostolic Succession.

We have great pleasure in communicating to Your Grace, as the First Hierarch of all the Anglican Churches,

this resolution of our Church, which constitutes a progress in the pleasing-to-God work of the union of all Churches, and we pray God to grant to Your Grace many years full of health and salvation.

(Signed) DAMIANOS

February 27/March 12, 1923.

Official translation published in *The Christian East*, vol. IV, 1923, pp. 121-122.

The Archbishop of the autonomous Church of Sinai expressed for his Church adherence to the decisions of Constantinople and Jerusalem.

CYPRUS, 1923

The Archbishop of Cyprus wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople in the name of his Synod on March 20, 1923, as follows:

To His All-Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch Mgr. Meletios we send brotherly greeting in Christ.

Your Holiness—

Responding readily to the suggestion made in your reverend Holiness' letter of August 8, 1922, that the autocephalous Church of Cyprus under our presidency should give its opinion as to the validity of Anglican Orders we have placed the matter before the Holy Synod in formal session.

After full consideration thereof it has reached the following conclusion:

It being understood that the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church by the Sacrament of Order was not broken at the Consecration of the first Archbishop of this Church, Matthew Parker, and the visible signs being present in Orders among the Anglicans by which the grace of the Holy Spirit is supplied, which enables the ordinand for the functions of his particular order, there is no obstacle to the recognition by the Orthodox Church of the validity of Anglican Ordinations in the same way that the validity of the ordinations of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Church are recognized by her. Since clerics coming from these Churches into the bosom of the Orthodox Church are received without reordina-

tion we express our judgment that this should also hold in the case of Anglicans—excluding *intercommunio* (sacramental union), by which one might receive the sacraments indiscriminately at the hands of an Anglican, even one holding the Orthodox dogma, until the dogmatic unity of the two Churches, Orthodox and Anglican, is attained.

Submitting this opinion of our Church to Your All-Holiness, we remain,

Affectionately, the least of your brethren in Christ,

CYRIL OF CYPRUS.

Archbishopric of Cyprus.

March 7/20, 1923

Published in *The Christian East*, vol. IV, 1923, pp. 122-123.

ALEXANDRIA, 1930

After the Lambeth Conference of 1930, the Synod of the Patriarchate of Alexandria found itself able to join in the recognition of Anglican Orders. The decision was announced in a letter from the Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury as follows:

To the Most Reverend Dr. Cosmo Lang, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of All England,

Greetings in the New Born Christ

The Feast of the Nativity, according to the Flesh, of the Redeemer of our Souls being a most suitable occasion for us, as it were, to visit your Beatitude, our friend, by means of a letter, we come to you hereby with a heart that is filled alike with joy, that "unto us is born a Savior, which is Christ the Lord," and with fervent prayers both for your health and for the peace and stability of the holy Churches of God over which you preside.

At the same time, together with our greetings for the Feast, we send you as our gift the news, which we are sure will be good news, to you, that having derived the greatest gratification from the accounts which it has received, both of the marks of honor which were rendered in London, alike by your Grace and by the general body of your Church, to the office which is ours, and also of the happy results which by the favouring breath of the Holy Spirit have emerged from the contact of the Orthodox Delegation with the Lambeth Conference, our Holy Synod of the Metropolitans of the Apostolic and Patri-

archal Throne of Alexandria has proceeded to adopt a resolution recognizing the validity, as from the Orthodox point of view, of the Anglican Ministry.

The text of that resolution is as follows: "The Holy Synod recognizes that the declarations of the Orthodox, quoted in the Summary, were made according to the spirit of Orthodox teaching. Inasmuch as the Lambeth Conference approved the declarations of the Anglican Bishops as a genuine account¹ of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and the Churches in communion with it, it welcomes them as a notable step towards the Union of the two Churches. And since in these declarations, which were endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, complete and satisfying assurance is found as to the Apostolic Succession, as to a real reception of the Lord's Body and Blood, as to the Eucharist being *thusia hilasterios*² (Sacrifice), and as to Ordination being

¹ The words in the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference are "sufficient account."

² We transliterate the term, *thusia hilasterios*, and do not translate it by propitiatory sacrifice, or expiatory sacrifice, because, as generally used, these terms present conceptions which are not attached by the Orthodox to *thusia hilasterios*. The words used by the Anglican Bishops in their discussions with the Orthodox Delegation, as recorded in the *Resumé*, and endorsed by the Lambeth Conference are:

"... that the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice as explained in the Answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII, on Anglican Ordinations: and also that in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Anglican Church prays that 'by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion,' as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed." *Lambeth Conference Report*, 1930, p. 139.

a Mystery, the Church of Alexandria withdraws its precautionary negative to the acceptance of the validity of Anglican Ordinations, and, adhering to the decision of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, of July 28, 1922, pronounces that if priests, ordained by Anglican Bishops, accede to Orthodoxy, they should not be re-ordained, as persons baptized by Anglicans are not rebaptized."

We rejoice to see the middle wall of partition being thrown down more and more, and we congratulate your Beatitude that under God you have had the felicity of taking the initiative in furthering that work. May the Lord Who was born in Bethlehem give to you and to us the happiness of its completion.

In Alexandria upon the Feast of Christ's Nativity, 1930
Your Beatitude's Beloved Brother in Christ

MELETIOS OF ALEXANDRIA

In reporting this decision to the Ecumenical Patriarch Meletios emphasized that his Synod was acting on the basis that the statements made at Lambeth had removed their former hesitation "as to the teaching of the Anglican Church upon the Mysteries and Apostolic succession," and could be held to have met the desire expressed by the Romanian Patriarch in replying to Constantinople in 1925, when he wrote,

But in order to make a definite pronouncement, we desire especially that the Anglican Church herself should precise her doctrine concerning the holy mysteries and particularly concerning orders: does she hold it to be a mystery or not?

Since that requirement had now been satisfied, wrote Meletios,

It is proper that the validity of Anglican Orders should now be recognized by all the Orthodox Churches. For that which, according to the same letter, was "one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the Union of the two Churches," has been "removed."

Letters published in *The Christian East*, vol. XII, 1931, pp. 1-6, with notes as above; the quotation in Note 2 is from No. 11 in the *Resumé* of the Lambeth Discussions, reprinted below, p. 22.

ROMANIA, 1936

On March 20, 1936, the Sacred Synod of the Orthodox Church of Rumania resolved as follows:

RESOLUTION

Of the Sacred Synod concerning the Validity of Anglican Orders

Session of March 20th, 1936

The Patriarch, His Beatitude

Miron Cristea, presiding Secretary: Bishop Veniamin

His All Holiness the Patriarch of Constantinople having notified the Sacred Synod that he had recognized the Validity of Anglican Orders, and having requested our Sacred Synod to examine that question and to inform him in reply of its opinion:

1. Accordingly, the Sacred Synod of the Orthodox Church of Rumania replied in 1925:

- a. That from the historical point of view no obstacle exists to the recognition of the Apostolic succession of Anglican orders
- b. That from the dogmatic point of view the validity of Anglican orders depends upon the Anglican Church itself and especially upon whether or not that Church recognizes Holy Orders to be a Mystery (Sacrament)

In order to explain the doctrine of the Anglican Church concerning Holy Orders, a Delegation of four

bishops and six theologians was sent to Bucarest by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Cosmo Lang) and from June 1-8, 1935, made such explanations to the Commission of Bishops and of expert professors of our faculties in theology appointed by our Sacred Synod.

The Rumanian Commission set before the Anglican Delegation a statement of Orthodox doctrine concerning the Mystery of Holy Orders.

In view of the fact that the Anglican Delegates accepted without reservation the doctrine of the Orthodox Church in regard to the Sacrament of Holy Orders after the Rumanian Commission had expressed it in all its points of importance and in its full sacramental character as one of the Seven Mysteries,

The Sacred Synod of the Orthodox Church of Rumania resolved the adoption of the recommendations of its Commission, viz:

“Having considered the conclusions of the papers on the Apostolic Succession, Holy Orders, Holy Eucharist, Holy Mysteries in general, and Tradition and Justification,

“And having considered the declarations of the Anglican Delegation on these questions, which declarations are in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church,

“The Rumanian Orthodox Commission unanimously recommends the Holy Synod (of the Rumanian Orthodox Church) to recognize the validity of the Anglican orders.”

It is to be understood that the above resolution will become definitive as soon as the final authority of the Anglican Church ratifies all the statements of its delega-

tion concerning the Mystery of Holy Orders in regard to the points of importance comprised in the doctrine of the Orthodox Church

2. This decision is to be communicated to His All Holiness the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of the Anglican Church;

3. At the same time the Sacred Synod of the Orthodox Rumanian Church expresses its great joy inasmuch as Divine Providence prepared the way that the representatives of the Anglican Church might be able to show us what effective and definitive steps have been taken towards establishing clearly their teaching to be in harmony with that of the Orthodox Eastern Church which is the faithful depository of the Christian Faith in all its Apostolic purity.

May this approach be of great use in the path shown by Our Common Saviour Jesus Christ in His words "That they all may be one."

4. In conclusion the Rumanian Church prays from its soul that such exploratory meetings may be continued in the future until the Holy Spirit pour out His Grace to make clear the doctrines of the Anglican Church to be in complete agreement with the doctrines of the Orthodox Œcumenical Church.

In confirmation the Seal of the Sacred Synod of the Orthodox Church of Rumania.

HIEROMONK CALLIST RADULESCU.

This translation was made by John A. Douglas and certified by Andrei Mager, London, July 7th, 1936. Published in *The Christian East*, vol. XVI, 1936, pp. 16-19.

The English Convocations provided the requested ratification as follows: The Convocation of York resolved nem. con. on the report of the delegation to Rumania, May 28, 1936

That this Synod thankfully accepts and approves the report, and trusts that it may lead to yet closer relations with the Rumanian Church and other branches of the Orthodox Communion. (*York Journal of Convocation*, May, 1936, p. 6)

The two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury resolved on January 22, 1937 (nem. con. in the Upper House and 104-6 in the Lower)

That inasmuch as the Report of the Conference at Bucarest between the Rumanian Commission on Relations with the Anglican Communion and the Church of England Delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury is consonant with Anglican formularies and a legitimate interpretation of the faith of the Church as held by the Anglican Communion, this House accepts and approves of the Report. (*Chronicle of Convocation of Canterbury*, May, 1937, p. 71)

GREECE, 1939

On September 21, 1939, the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece came to the following decision:

The Holy Synod has decided that it intends as before to follow in each individual case that may arise of the adherence of an Anglican cleric to Orthodoxy the practice of the Church and the unanimous conclusion of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens, that the "Orthodox Church recognizes as valid without qualifications only those Sacraments which she has herself administered, but that nevertheless the Church, in so far as she considers it proper and useful, in particular cases, after previous investigation of the current circumstances, recognizes by Economy the Ordination of those who come over to Orthodoxy."

The Holy Synod appreciates the desire expressed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to send a delegation of Anglican theologians under the chairmanship of the Right Reverend Bishop of Gloucester for common discussion of questions of interest. It remembers in this connection the bonds of affection which have long united the two Churches, and realizes that every opportunity of strengthening these contacts should be welcomed, and that every contact and interchange between the two Churches serves to strengthen their friendship and *rapprochement*. The Holy Synod will therefore look forward to welcoming the arrival of such a delegation after the difficulties caused by the present war are resolved,

and will appoint a corresponding delegation to represent our (the Greek Orthodox) Church.

Finally the Holy Synod expresses its warmest thanks to the theologians for their memoranda . . .

Published in *Ekklesia*, Athens, October 14, 1939, p. 315; translated into German in *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Berne, 1940, pp. 16-17, from which the above version has been made. By permission of the Rt. Rev. Adolf Küry, editor.

II

REPORTS OF OFFICIAL ORTHODOX-
ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL
CONFERENCES

1

LAMBETH, 1930

The report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 includes an account of the reception of the Orthodox delegation headed by the Patriarch Meletios and comprising representatives of the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Antioch, Jerusalem, Greece, Cyprus, and Poland, and of their discussions with a sub-committee of the Conference's Committee on the Unity of the Church, headed by the Bishop of Gloucester (A. C. Headlam). Regret was expressed at the unavoidable absence of representatives of the Russian Church. The discussions were summarized in the following statement, agreed on by both sides.

A Resumé OF THE DISCUSSIONS
July 15th-18th, 1930

Between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthodox Representatives and Bishops of the Anglican Communion at Lambeth Palace

1. It was agreed that a Joint Commission of Orthodox and Anglicans should be appointed for the consideration of questions of Doctrine.

2. It was agreed by the Anglican bishops that the

"Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church," published under the auspices of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Eastern Churches Committee in 1921, though not officially communicated to the different Provinces of the Anglican Communion, are not inconsistent with the mind and doctrine of the Anglican Church.

3. It was agreed by the Orthodox Delegation that the suggested "terms of Intercommunion," though they had not yet been officially considered, would form a useful basis of discussion with certain modifications.

4. It was stated by the Anglican bishops that in questions of faith the authentic decision would be given in the Anglican Communion by the whole body of Bishops without, however, excluding the co-operation of clergy and laity during the discussions.

5. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the final authority in matters of Doctrine in the Orthodox Church lies with the whole body of Bishops in Synod, without excluding the expression of opinion by clergy and laymen.

6. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Anglican Communion the Bishop has jurisdiction in questions of discipline through his own court in the first instance, with due provision for appeal to the Provincial Court or a similar body.

7. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that in the Orthodox Church spiritual causes are tried in spiritual courts, sentence being given in the case of a bishop by a court of Bishops, in the case of other clergymen by the Bishop through his own court.

8. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the

Anglican Communion Ordination is not merely the appointment of a man into a particular post, but that in Ordination a special *charisma* is given to the person ordained, proper to the Order, and that the nature of the special gift is indicated in the words of Ordination, and that in this sense Ordination is a *mysterion*.

9. It was stated by the Anglican bishops that the Preface to the Ordinal declares "that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," and that to preserve unbroken succession the rules regarding Ordination have been framed "to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England."

10. The Orthodox Delegation stated that they were satisfied with regard to the maintenance of the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church in so far as the Anglican Bishops have already accepted Ordination as a *mysterion*, and have declared that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer.

11. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," and that "the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and that after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ; further, that the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice as explained in the Answer of the Arch-

bishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Ordinations; and also that in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Anglican Church prays that "by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion," as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed.

12. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the explanation of Anglican Doctrine thus made with regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice was agreeable to the Orthodox doctrine, if an explanation were to be set out with all clearness.

13. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in different parts of the Anglican Communion, Anglican Clergy, at the request of Orthodox Clergy, provide sacramental ministrations to Orthodox laity, who are out of reach of their own Church's ministrations; that such clergy always desire to keep the Orthodox to whom they minister faithful to the Orthodox Church and are ready to teach them the Orthodox faith and to notify Orthodox Bishops or priests of persons thus receiving their ministration or instruction.

14. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the whole question of arrangements in such circumstances is to come up for discussion at the forthcoming Synod of the whole Orthodox Church.

15. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that it is the practice of the whole Orthodox Church not to re-baptize after Anglican Baptism.

16. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that in its forthcoming Pro-Synod the Orthodox Church would probably not object to recognising the Baptism of chil-

dren and their instruction from Orthodox books by Anglican clergy, or to marriage, or any other rites being performed by Anglican clergy (in case of need and where no Orthodox Priest is available), provided that all persons baptized or married are properly registered as Orthodox and their names notified as soon as possible to the competent Orthodox authority.

17. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation with regard to the Holy Eucharist that, pending a formal decision by the whole Orthodox Church and therefore without giving the practice official sanction, for which it has no authority, it is of opinion that the practice of the Orthodox receiving Holy Communion from Anglican Priests in case of need and where no Orthodox priest was available, might continue, provided that an Orthodox authority did not prohibit such a practice.

✠ ARCHBISHOP OF THYATEXIRA, G A. C. GLOUCESTR.

The *Resumé* of the discussions is published in *The Lambeth Conference, 1930*, London, S.P.C.K., (1930?), pp. 138-140; pp. 131-137 give a fuller report of the meeting.

2

JOINT DOCTRINAL COMMISSION, LONDON, 1931

The proposed Joint Commission met in 1931, headed by the Bishop of Gloucester and the Metropolitan Germanos of Thyateira. The Orthodox delegation included representatives of the same Churches that were represented in the delegation of the previous year; on the Anglican delegation, besides English bishops and clergy, were the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Northern Indiana. The report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission began by referring back to the Lambeth discussions, and then proceeded as follows:

SUGGESTIONS AS TO ECONOMIC INTERCOMMUNION

In the *Resumé* which was accepted by the Lambeth Conference reference was made to the admission under special circumstances of members of the Eastern Orthodox Church to the Sacraments and other ministrations of the Anglican Bishops and Clergy. The Commission has also received from the Bishop of Fulham as representing the work of the Anglican Church in Northern and Central Europe, and the Bishop of Northern Indiana on behalf of the Episcopal Church in America, statements showing the urgency of arrangements such as those proposed for the spiritual life of many who are separated from the ministrations of their own Communion in both Churches. The Commission desires to lay all these matters before the Synods of the Anglican Communion and of the Holy Eastern Orthodox

Church, and to ask them to make a decision as soon as possible on this urgent problem.

The main work of the Commission was to register points of agreement and disagreement between the two Churches on dogmatic matters considered of significance in connection with reunion. Six topics were discussed, and the results reported as follows:

(1) THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

We accept the Divine Revelation which was delivered once and for all in Our Lord Jesus Christ; and we receive it as it is revealed in the Holy Scriptures, and as it has been made known and handed down from the Apostles in the Tradition of the Church throughout the ages by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

(2) SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

We agree that we receive the Divine Revelation in Our Lord Jesus Christ through Scripture and Tradition. By *Scripture* we mean the Canon of Scripture as it is defined by St. Athanasius and as it has been received by the whole Catholic Church. As regards the other books which are sometimes called Deuterocanonical, sometimes ἀναγκινωσκομενα, we also accept the teaching of St. Athanasius: "For greater exactness I add this also . . . that there are other books besides these not included in the Canon but appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who newly join us and wish to be instructed in the word of Godliness . . . The former books . . . being included in the Canon, the latter being only read." And the teaching of St. Jerome: "That the Church may read them for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas."

Further, the representatives of the Anglican Church would say: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." As St. Athanasius says: "The sacred and inspired Scriptures are sufficient to declare the truth." And elsewhere: "These are the fountains of salvation that he who thirsts may be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these books alone is proclaimed the doctrine of Godliness. Let not man add to them nor take aught from them." And as St. Augustine says: "In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture all things are found which cover Faith and Morals—namely, Hope and Love."

The representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church would say: "We believe that the Holy Scripture is completed, explained, and interpreted by the Holy Tradition." As St. Basil says: "Of the dogmas and preachings which are kept in the Church, some are derived from the written doctrine, others we have received by way of Apostolic Tradition as they were secretly transmitted to us, and these two classes are of equal value to piety. No one will dispute this, at all events no one who has had the least experience of ecclesiastical institutions. For if we were to attempt to reject the unwritten customs on the ground that they are therefore of no great importance we should unwittingly inflict a deadly wound on the Gospel, or rather we should make the matter of our preaching a name and nothing more. For example (to mention first the earliest and most common), who taught us in writing to sign with the sign of the Cross those who hope on the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ? What saint

was it that bequeathed to us in writing the words of invocation at the showing of the Eucharistic bread and the cup of blessing? For we are not satisfied with what the Apostle or the Evangelist recorded, but we add a preface and an epilogue which we have received from unwritten tradition, and which we consider to be of great import in celebrating the mystery.”

Having made the above statements we agreed upon the following:

Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church.

We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which came down from Our Lord and the Apostles through the Fathers, which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church, and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

We agree that nothing contained in Tradition is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be logically defined and distinguished, yet they cannot be separated from each other nor from the Church.

(3) THE CREED OF THE CHURCH

We agree in accepting as the Creed of the Catholic Church that which is sometimes called the Nicene, sometimes the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan, which was put forth by the Council of Chalcedon and has been accepted by the whole Catholic Church. We accept the following statement of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the Creed: “These things having been defined by us with all possible accuracy and care, the Holy and Œcumenical

Synod has decreed that it is unlawful for any one to present, or compile, or compose, or believe, or teach to others, any other creed.” We recognize, therefore, that it is unlawful for a Church to put forward any other Creed as the teaching of the Catholic Church, or to add to or subtract from the Creed. Yet it is not unlawful for the several Churches to use as their Baptismal Creed some other Creed agreeable to the Tradition of the Church, as in the Western Church that which is called the Apostles’ Creed. Nor is it unlawful for a Church to use any other such document in the Services of the Church or for the instruction of the faithful, provided that it is agreeable to Scripture and Tradition.

(4) THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

On the difference which has prevailed between the East and the West concerning the doctrine of the Holy Spirit we record the propositions adopted by the Conference held at Bonn in the year 1875. While we reject every proposition or form of expression which implies the existence of two principles or *ἀρχαὶ* or *αἰτίαι* in the Holy Trinity, we consider as acceptable the teaching of St. John of Damascus and of earlier Greek Fathers that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son.

(5) VARIETY OF CUSTOMS AND USAGES IN THE CHURCH

With regard to ecclesiastical Customs or Usages (*ἔθη καὶ νομιμα*) we distinguish two classes—those which according to St. Photius are based on the authority of a general or catholic decree, and are thus obligatory for the whole Church; and those which have only a local character, which every local church is therefore free to accept or not. We agree with St. Augustine that every Christian

should accept the Customs and Usages of the Church to which he belongs.

(6) THE SACRAMENTS

The representatives of the Orthodox Church say: "We accept that the two of the seven Sacraments—namely Baptism and the Holy Eucharist—the first as introducing us into the Church, the second as uniting us with Christ, are pre-eminent among the others. But we do not think that the other five are of secondary importance as Sacraments, neither that they are unnecessary to the spiritual life of the Christian and consequently to his salvation. These also as the two first are Holy Services of Divine foundation in which through an outward visible sign the invisible grace of Christ is conveyed."

The representatives of the Anglican Church say: "The number of the Sacraments has never been authoritatively fixed either by tradition from the Apostles or any decision of an Œcumenical Council. We recognize that the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are pre-eminent above the rest. As regards other Sacraments, while the Eastern Orthodox Church uses the term *mysterion* also of Ordination, Penance, Confirmation of Chrism, Marriage and the anointing of the Sick; in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England the word Sacrament is only used of the two Sacraments Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, inasmuch as these only have an outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself and are held to be generally, that is universally, necessary for salvation. But it is recognized also in the Anglican Communion that in other Rites there is an outward and visible sign and an inward spiritual grace, and in that

sense they may be considered to have the character of Sacraments and are commonly called Sacraments."

We agree that with regard to the manner of celebration of Sacraments a variety of custom and rite is acceptable, provided that the things essential to the Sacrament are preserved.

Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission Appointed by the Œcumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Canterbury for Consultation on the Points of Agreement and Difference between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, London, S.P.C.K., 1932, 20 pp.; a fuller edition, 73 pp., gives a report of the proceedings as well as the conclusions.

BUCAREST, 1935

*The "Church of England Delegation" to Romania, headed by Bishop Hicks of Lincoln, consisted of three bishops and five priests, and, as assessors, the Archbishop of Dublin and "the Rev. Professor Dr. Frank Gavin of the American Episcopal Church, Member of the Council of Ecclesiastical Relations of the American Episcopal Church." It was cordially received at Bucarest and met with a similar Romanian Commission from June 1 to June 8, 1935. Its general program was the consideration of the statements made at Lambeth in 1930, as published in the report of the Lambeth Conference, and reported to the Romanian Synod by Metropolitan Nectarie of Bukovina (report published in *The Christian East*, vol. XII, 1931, pp. 6-26). Papers were read on a number of topics, on five of which formal statements were noted. In response to an enquiry about the Thirty-Nine Articles the Anglican Delegation stated that*

*"The Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer" (See *Lambeth Conference*, 1930, p. 139) and that therefore the XXXIX Articles are to be regarded as a document secondary to the Book of Common Prayer."*

The quotation is from the Resumé of the Lambeth discussions, No. 10. On the Holy Eucharist, the Romanian

Commission submitted a statement which the Anglican Delegation unanimously accepted, as follows:

1. At the Last Supper, our Lord Jesus Christ anticipated the sacrifice of His death by giving Himself to the Apostles in the form of bread blessed by Him as meat and in the form of wine blessed by Him as drink.

2. The sacrifice offered (*προσενεχθείσα*) by our Lord on Calvary was offered once for all, expiates the sins as well of the living as of the dead, and reconciles us with God. Our Lord Jesus Christ does not need to sacrifice Himself again.

3. The sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion (*ἀναιμάκτως*) under the form (Rumanian, *sub chipul*) of bread and wine through the consecrating priest and through the work of the Holy Ghost in order that the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross may be partaken of by those who offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by those for whom it is offered, and by those who receive worthily the Body and Blood of the Lord.

4. In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (*μεταβολή*) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery.

5. The Eucharistic bread and wine remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as these Eucharistic elements exist.

6. Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of Our Lord.

The statement on Tradition made by the Joint Doctrinal Commission of 1931 was considered, and the Romanians wished to amend the agreed summary (p. 26 above) by prefacing it with the sentence "The Revelation

of God is transmitted through the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Tradition," and by altering the actual definition to read:

We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which come down from Our Lord and the Apostles and *have been defined by the Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers*, which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. (Italics indicate the amended phrase.)

After discussing the 1931 statements on the sacraments the two delegations agreed to recommend for consideration the following agreed formula:

We agree that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, the first as introducing us into the Church, the second as uniting us with Christ and through Him with the Invisible Church, are pre-eminent among the Divine Mysteries. We agree that because Holy Scripture and Tradition witness to their origin, Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing, Holy Orders and the Unction of the Sick are also Mysteries in which, an outward visible sign being administered, an inward spiritual grace is received.

Finally, the two Delegations agreed unanimously on the following statement on Justification:

By the redeeming action of our Lord Jesus Christ, mankind has become reconciled to God. Man partakes of the redeeming grace through faith and good works, and reaches through the working of the Holy

Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, sanctification by means of the Church and the Holy Sacraments.

On the basis of these discussions, the Romanian Commission recommended to its synod the recognition of Anglican Orders (I, 5 above). The delegations stated in their Report that by these agreements "a solid basis has been prepared whereby full dogmatic agreement may be affirmed between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions," which they hoped might be developed in further conferences between Romanian and English representatives, with or without assessors from other parts of the two Communion, and the Anglicans spoke of the "deep spiritual and Christian goodwill" with which they had been received.

Report of the Conference at Bucarest, Westminster, Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1936, 16 pp.

III

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS

1

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS¹

by Professor Panteleimon Komnenos, 1921

(translated by J. A. Douglas)

This brief treatise by a professor of the Patriarchal Seminary at Halki is of considerable importance as illustrating the theological basis on which the Synod of Constantinople acted in 1922, and also as propounding the theoretical and practical questions which were taken up in the Conferences held in 1930 and following. But for his death in 1923 Professor Komnenos would doubtless have taken a prominent part in these discussions. The treatise is here reprinted from Appendix I of Mgr. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, The Validity of Anglican Ordinations, translated and prefaced by J. A. Douglas, London and New York, Faith Press and Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1931, pp. 91-105, except that the long quotation in Note 5 from the work of "F. Dalbus" (The Abbé Portal) has been translated from the French; the

¹ The original is numbered Vol. I of a series of *Contributions Toward the Attempted Reunion of the Churches*, under the title *Αι Αγγλικανικαί Χειροτονιαί* in 1921, and was published at the expense of the Metropolitan Chrysostom of Smyrna. Professor Komnenos did not publish a second volume of the series. This is a complete translation of the treatise itself, but does not include appendices.

references in Note 4 are of course to the English Prayer Book, in which the Prayer of Oblation corresponds to the last paragraph of the American Prayer of Consecration, and the alternative Prayer of Thanksgiving to the American Prayer of Thanksgiving. E.R.H., Jr.

If Professor Komnenos' conclusions are far-reaching, they are the result of long and protracted study.

It will be noted that he concludes that:

1. Our Orders are valid for economical acceptance.
2. Our Eucharist and other sacraments are valid.
3. The Eastern-Orthodox could unite with certain of the Churches in our Communion without uniting with others.
4. The administration and reception of the Eucharist, etc., could and ought to be mutually allowed between us and them in emergency.

5. The Great Church of Constantinople can and ought to proceed at once to allow them—if necessary without the concurrence of other autocephalous churches.

The notes in brackets are mine. J.A.D.

The present short study aims at convincing every impartial reader that the reserved attitude of our Church towards Anglican Orders is altogether unjust, and that any notion of the absolute or conditional reordination of those of the clergy of that Church who may accede to Orthodoxy is even more so.

We hold that [the conclusion] which on every reasonable consideration governs our present attitude towards Roman Catholic and Armenian clergy should on the same consideration govern our attitude towards the clergy of the Anglican Church. In regard to the Roman Catholic and Armenian clergy, inasmuch as they have

preserved the Apostolic Succession of Ordination, have the same view of it in its essentials as ourselves, and maintain the necessary forms, [our procedure is that] we recognize them as such, and if they accede to Orthodoxy, receive them individually in their particular grade, on the condition that, as is reasonable, they first subscribe the requisite *Libellum Fidei* or are chrismated.

We are of unhesitating opinion that the self-same rule ought to be adopted and applied to the Anglican clergy, inasmuch as they also are demonstrated by the relative *notabilia* to have received not the semblance of Ordination but an Ordination which is real and is based upon a most incontrovertible, humanly speaking, historic succession from the Apostles, upon its canonical transmission, and upon an essentially and fundamentally right conception of it and reverence for it. It is true that according to the broadly prevalent aspect [of the action] of the Ancient Church, teaching which declines from Catholic [fulness]—i.e., heresy, destroys even the priestly *character*—i.e., the power of transmitting Sacramental Grace so that in the Sacred Canons it is laid down that on the [individual's] return to the Catholic Church both Baptism and Ordination be received again. That Canon, however, was not general in application. A distinction was made among heresies, and in each case the attitude of the Church to them was regulated by canonical action. Ecclesiastical practice indeed was not everywhere of the same pattern, the Church acting on occasion the more severely or on occasion the more gently. This being so, and our Church having at other times accepted the ordination of heretics—e.g., of the Arians—as valid, I am of opinion that no one should hesitate in any way about the recognition as valid of Anglican Ordinations. And

further, in view of what has been said above about Roman Catholics and Armenians, the validity of whose ordinations our Church rightly and properly recognizes today, we think that a considered judgment given by Guetté bears on the matter. He writes (*Exposition of the Teaching of the Orthodox Church*, p. 26): "From what has been said it follows that the teaching of the Anglican Church is more akin to the teaching of the Orthodox Eastern Church than is the teaching of the Roman Church." As bearing on which judgment it must be noted that Guetté made his pronouncement before the Vatican Council (1870), which proclaimed the infallibility of the Pope and opened wider the chasm which separates the two Churches. This further observation may, I think, be added. The Œcumenical Patriarch, Jeremiah III, decided in regard to the manner of the accession of the followers of Luther and Calvin (M. Gedeon, *Canons*, Vol. I, p. 148) that "on one of them acceding to the Church he be received simply by Chrism," apparently with, at the same time, the proper *Libellum Fidei*.

In its treatment of Armenians and Roman Catholics the practice of our Church is as a general rule in conformity with this—with the exception of the well-known Oros delivered for well-known reasons under Cyril II in the matter of the rebaptism of Latins. Taking, therefore, into consideration the fact that apparently² the recognition of Baptism involves that of Ordination—in so far as the particular conditions necessary for it are observed,

² D. Petrakakos, in his study on the "Validity of Ordinations," p. 18, expresses himself much more categorically, writing: "Accordingly, after the acceptance of the validity of Baptism, the recognition also as valid of the other Sacrament of Priesthood follows as a logical consequence."

which conditions are not found among the followers of Luther and Calvin, but are found among the Anglicans in essentially equal measure as among Roman Catholics and Armenians—it follows that from this standpoint the recognition of the validity of the Anglican priesthood claims logical warranty.

It is not unknown to theologians, and especially to those of us who follow the life and relations of the Churches, that, through the Bull of Pope Leo XIII dealing directly with the subject, the Roman Church has characterised Anglican Orders as invalid. The arguments, relying on which the Papal Curia promulgated this severe declaration, at least those advanced officially and publicly, are of a character chiefly dogmatic though connected with the [Anglican] liturgy and rite [of Ordination]. The principal dogmatic argument is that inferred from private opinions contemporary with the initial compilation of the Anglican Ordinal, from that [Ordinal] itself, and from the Thirty-nine Articles [the twenty-fifth], and consists of allegations of an imperfect conception of the Priesthood and of its having been stripped and deprived of its most significant and therefore of its principal mark.

Now, first of all, as to private opinions given, especially during the first years of the English Reformation: Many quite plain and discordant opinions and declarations were put forward on that subject. But these opinions and declarations in effect contradict the totality. For they are found to be opposed to a most important extent to the official documents that express the official voice of the Anglican Church, which in the storm and tempest that seized her, was manifestly not forsaken by the Divine Pilot. In spite of all its possible deficiencies the Ordinal of Edward VI stands as a clear witness of that. In its most

noteworthy Preface the three grades of the Priesthood are referred back to the Apostles and it is defined that nobody be received into one of them except he be chosen and approved, except prayer be made publicly for him, and except there be the laying on of hands.

Indeed, as an analysis in detail and a collation of it demonstrate (see below), the theory of the Preface permeates all the contents of the Ordinal, and is applied to them and is realised in them. That theory is the transmission under the proper conditions of the special Grace of the Priesthood which has been inherited from the Lord through the Apostles and their successors by the Church of Christ, the objective of which Grace is to make suitable persons competent for the Ministry of the Divine Word, the Holy Sacraments, and the government of the faithful. As having such a character and being necessary and indefectible, this Grace must necessarily be of a sacramental nature, as, indeed, it is incidentally termed and characterised.³

It follows also logically, and according to the principle of *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, that the references to the Priesthood in the twenty-fifth Article should be interpreted in the same sense rather than independently of it by themselves. And here, also, it must not be forgotten that a very secondary authority is assigned to the Thirty-nine Articles, which, in their details, are not binding on

³ It must be noted that the term "Sacrament" as applied to the Priesthood is not entirely absent from the—in a sense—official books of the English Church. Thus in the Homilies we read: "Neither it [the Ordering of Ministers] nor any of the Sacraments else, be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are." [The reference is to the Homilies appointed to be read, 1563, "Of Common Prayer," and "The Sacraments." J.A.D.]

the clergy themselves, are designated as Articles of Religion and not of Faith, to-day have chiefly an historic value, are being abandoned entirely every day by this or the other of the Episcopal Churches, and, being formally retained almost only in England because of their former political importance, were drafted with a view to the religious, and consequently to the peaceful, settlement of the country.

Finally, as to the conclusion that by removing the words of the ancient Ordinal which were uttered to the presbyter by the Bishop, "Take authority to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Liturgies [Masses] for the living and the dead," the Anglicans appear as denying the Sacrifice in the Eucharist and so as having stripped the priest of his special character and mark, we are of opinion that that conclusion is not warranted by the evidence.

No one who, as have the Anglicans,⁴ has the Holy

⁴ Professor Komnenos appends a long note, in which after saying: "There is in fact a section of Anglicans that denies the character of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, but the great theologians of this Church always profess this doctrine—for example, the English Archbishops affirm it officially and solemnly in their answer to the Papal Bull in 1897. We judge, therefore, that it will be no less to the point to quote here, leaving them to the individual judgment of the reader, the following extracts from the Office of the Holy Communion, as publicly expressing through the official Book of Common Prayer the Faith of the Anglican Church concerning the Divine Eucharist, both as to the Body and Blood of Christ itself and as to the memorial [celebration] of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that memorial 'being connected with and in a sense being united with it,' and in consequence conferring upon those who partake of it [*sc.*, the Eucharist] the benefits which are its own [*sc.*, of the Sacrifice of the Cross]." He then translates from the *Long Exhortation*: "Dearly Beloved . . . consider," "For as the

Scriptures in his hands can deny the Divine Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, as much as it is connected with, and is a memorial of, and represents, the Sacrifice of the Cross;⁵

benefit . . . Christ with us," and "He hath instituted . . . comfort": the whole *Consecration Prayer*; the whole *Words of Administration*; the whole *Prayer of Oblation*; and from the alternative *Thanksgiving*, "Almighty . . . members of Thy dear Son."

⁵ In reference to the particular contents of the thirty-first of the Thirty-Nine Articles, we think it well in preference to any other to quote here verbatim the following extract from *Les ordinations anglicanes*, the work of the Roman Catholic, F. Dalbus, who gives the Anglican point of view impartially and does not represent it as untrue:

It is before all necessary, in order to understand what the Anglican Church is repudiating, and to judge its proceedings impartially, to acquaint oneself with the opinions held by theologians and doctors on the Sacrifice of the Mass at the time when this article (No. 31) was drafted, that is, in the XVIth century. At that time some extraordinary opinions, which could not be maintained today anywhere in the Catholic world, were defended by certain theologians by no means without authority. It was supposed, for instance, that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was an independent sacrifice, complete in itself, providing an expiation distinct from that accomplished by Our Lord on the Cross. The statement was made that Our Lord, by the Sacrifice of the Cross, had expiated original sin, together with the sins committed under the Old Law and those committed by individuals before Baptism, while the Mass expiated sins committed after Baptism. It was said that by the Sacrifice of the Mass mortal sins were wiped out, *ex opere operato*. The less said of this the better.

The reader will have recognised by now what it is that the Anglican Church renounces and condemns; it is this kind of teaching which today seems extraordinary to us, but which then was supported by some theologians and on occasion even preached to the laity. The XXXIst Article, consequently,

but they are quite right, we think, on the one hand, in regarding it [*sc.*, the Sacrifice] as involved in the Rite of their Eucharist, and, on the other hand, in not making the *character* and the power of the priest to depend almost alone upon it [*sc.*, the offering of the Sacrifice], for they are of wider scope, as is established plainly from our own Ordinal, and even more explicitly from such words, for example, as these of St. John Chrysostom:⁶

For if any one consider . . . he will see how great is the dignity with which the Grace of the Spirit endows priests. For through them are accomplished these things [the Sacrifice of the Eucharist] and other things no less than they, both in reference to their office and to our salvation. For dwellers on the earth . . . received an authority which God has not given even to the Arch-angels. For it was never said to them, "Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven. And whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed . . ." Then what has He given them other than an heavenly authority? For whose sins ye remit, He says, they are remitted, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained . . . For if none can enter the Kingdom of Heaven except he be born again by water and the Spirit, and he who does not eat the flesh of the Lord and drink His blood is placed outside everlasting life; all these things are accomplished through no one else but only by those holy hands—I mean by those of the priest.

instead of being aimed against the true Catholic doctrine, is intended to defend it.

⁶ It is inexplicable that, of the many who have written about the question under discussion, none, so far at least as we know, has availed himself of this passage of Chrysostom, which throws much light for us upon the subject.

They often save the soul that is sick or at the point of death, not only by teaching and advice, but by the help of prayer. For they not only have authority to forgive sins at the time of regeneration, but sins committed after it. For, is anyone sick, He says, among you? Let him call the elders, etc. For if simply to be called a shepherd and to handle the business of one as might be were sufficient and there were no danger, then he who chose might accuse us of vain glory. But if it be necessary that he who receives it should have much understanding, and before his understanding much Grace from God and a rightness of manners and purity of life that is more than that of man . . .⁷

As to the deletion of the words quoted above, to which deletion such great significance is attached, but which were added even to the Latin Ordinal only in the Middle Ages, we are of the opinion that it was sufficiently justified by certain undisputed contemporary and incorrect notions about the power and significance of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist (see Note 5) and by the attempt to return even in the Ordinal to the more ancient and simpler forms. For, after all, that, of the compilers of the Ordinal, Cranmer himself, at the time indeed of the compilation of the Ordinal, believed in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is attested on indisputable grounds. The only important point on which Cranmer (and in the same way many Anglicans also today) was reserved, was as to the use of the terms *Propitiatory*, *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, through fear of depriving the Sacrifice of the Cross of the unique propitiatory power which exclusively belongs to it. But there exist no reasons for us to believe that Cranmer

⁷ *On the Priesthood*, Book III, chaps. v, vi, vii.

would have rejected in its true significance such a characterisation of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

Thus, then, from the above condensed observations, and from those that follow below, we are persuaded that any impartial person would be convinced that the Anglican Church justly claims, and with full warranty, that she also is possessed of a true priesthood, and that accordingly it is only right that the other Churches, and first of all our own, towards which she manifests great affection and consideration, should recognise this fact. If our Church has not already taken this step, the fact is plainly due to an imperfect knowledge of the Anglican position and in particular to an imperfect study of the question which we are discussing. But the affairs of this Church are continually becoming better known and more correctly estimated among us, and the matters bearing upon the validity and canonicity of its ordinations may be regarded from an impartial point of view as having been exhaustively dealt with, so that there appears to be no longer any reason justifying further reserve on the part of our Church—a reserve which, in addition to its other effects, affords a fresh weapon of attack upon the validity of its ordinations to those who are of a hostile mind to it.

Someone may ask, however, "Apart from what is due to a Church that is unjustly used, how would the recognition of Anglican Orders and of the Anglican Priesthood help forward the union of the Churches and, as is reasonable, in particular our union with the Anglican Church?"

1. In itself this justly conceived action of our Church would produce an increasingly favourable disposition towards us and ours among the adherents of this Church. The extent is recognised to which the most sympathetic

and friendly disposition possible is of importance for obtaining mutual understanding, and agreement even on questions that are most difficult of solution. It is plain, therefore, that under those more favourable conditions a mutual understanding on the points of difference (between the two Churches) would be effected more smoothly and that each would receive the explanations of the other gladly until a complete canonical settlement of the question of union was reached.

2. Very many of the lay and clerical members of the Anglican Church are inclined to be Orthodox in mind and would gladly enter into union with our Church, or otherwise fully communicate with her, if the non-recognition of their Priesthood did not stand before them as an insurmountable obstacle. The idea that on account of the non-recognition of their Priesthood they would be regarded as strangers and outside the defining limit of our Church life, as well as that, on attempting to officiate in our Church or to enter into full communion with it, their clergy would be called to submit to reordination, a very serious matter for anyone possessing a deep sense of his rank and office, keeps them at a distance from us. For this reason, then, we are of opinion that before everything it is necessary that our Church should proceed explicitly to the recognition of Anglican ordinations and should thus open wide the door to a quicker and more complete understanding and union.

But before we proceed farther in our present discussion, we must specify the necessary consequences which would ensue from the recognition of Anglican ordinations.

The recognition of the Anglican Priesthood as valid and canonical would involve as a consequence the recog-

dition of all their Sacramental actions—i.e., not only of their Baptism, but also of their Chrism or Laying on of Hands by the Bishop, of their Eucharist, of their Sacrament of Marriage, etc. It does not follow, of course, that the Orthodox would be justified in resorting to the Anglican clergy in order to be baptised, to be chrismated, to receive Divine Communion, etc., in the same way that they do not do so in regard to Roman Catholics and Armenians, whose Priesthood and by consequence whose other sacramental administrations the Orthodox Church recognizes, but to whom the Orthodox do not resort for any sacramental ministrations, from whom they do not receive the Holy Communion, and to whom they do not give it according to Canonical Rule.

Each side understands that until union, which postulates agreement on whatever points may be judged indispensable for it, is effected the members of either Church are not justified legally and canonically in leaving the defining limit of their own Church life.

None the less union can be effected with the particular [Anglican] Churches—as, for example, with the Episcopal Churches of America and Africa, etc.—in as far as dogmatic mutual agreement comes about with them. In that case, indeed, the hindrance would to a great extent be removed and a problem would be solved which weighs heavily upon the conscience of those whose feelings are Christian—that is to say, provision would be made for the religious needs of our people where our clergy are altogether absent and for those of Anglicans where our clergy are to be found.

Despite what has been said above, and considering the validity of the sacramental ministrations rendered by Anglican priests as in no degree less than that of those

rendered, for example, by Roman Catholic priests, I am of opinion that, since full dogmatic agreement and union will of necessity require time, our Church might well, on account of the altogether exceptional and absolutely necessary circumstances,⁸ decide at the present time to take into consideration and to conform in the matter of Baptism, the Divine Eucharist, and Marriage, to the relevant suggestion of Demetrius Chomatenos, Archbishop of Bulgaria (twelfth to thirteenth centuries), who answered to a relevant question:

We remember that there were some questions asked a good many years ago by Mark, Patriarch of Alexandria, of blessed memory, and answers written by Theodore Balsamon, late Patriarch of Alexandria . . . One answer altogether forbade that the aforesaid (captive) Latins should be admitted to receive the Divine Communion at the hands of our priests. This answer, however, was disapproved by many of the most eminent men living at that time as showing too great harshness and bitterness. They appealed also to the judgment on this same subject of Theophylact the most wise Archbishop of Bulgaria, which we have given in an abridged form above in another of our answers and which discourses of condescension and economy in a manner worthy both of admiration and of praise. And so they who argued against the opinion of Balsamon, as has been related, were judged to have insisted piously and reasonably for giving the preference over inflexible harshness to economy that so, instead of casting down,

⁸ As when children are in danger of dying or of reaching maturity without Baptism, when a man and woman live together irregularly and have children through the lack of a minister to perform their marriage.

we may gently and gradually win our brethren for whom our common Saviour and Lord shed his own most precious blood.⁹

It is plain from the words used that the question dealt with by the Archbishop referred to deals only with the administration by us of Sacramental Grace and Blessing to the heterodox, and not even, though in exceptional circumstances, of their reception by us from them. But taking into consideration, as above, the validity of their ordinations and of their sacramental ministrations, it is plain that the second of the two states of affairs may be sanctioned in exceptional circumstances. But someone will ask: "Can or ought our Church to proceed to the above without the agreement and knowledge of the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches?"

In regard to the formulation of reception of the least definition of the truths fundamental to belief, which are indispensable for the unity and communion of the Churches, I am of opinion that agreement among the doctrinally consentient Churches is indispensable. In regard, however, to the question of the recognition of ordinations, although I hold it to be well that agreement should first be reached, I think that motion and action of our own initiative and responsibility is not precluded—in the same way that different practice has obtained formerly in the case of the reception of the Baptism of the heterodox between ourselves and the doctrinally consentient Russian Church, we not receiving but repeating it (from 1756) and she receiving it as valid and not repeat-

⁹[Demetrius Chomatenos wrote in 1203 to Constantine Cabasilas, Archbishop of Dyrrachium. A lengthy extract from his answers—including the above—is given by Palmer, *Dissertations*, London, 1853, pp. 25-31, J.A.D.]

ing it (from 1667).¹⁰ In similar fashion, unless I am mistaken, the particular Orthodox Churches have been used to regulate their procedure in reference to the Ordination of the heterodox.

¹⁰[Before 1629 all the Eastern Orthodox Churches accepted Western Baptism. In 1629 the Russian Church decided to reject it *in toto*. In 1667 this decision was revised for Roman Catholic Baptism. In 1718 the whole Communion accepted Lutheran and Calvinist Baptism. But in 1756 the four Greek Patriarchates concurred in an Oros requiring all Westerns to be rebaptised. This was not received by the Russians, but has never formally been superseded. The matter, however, is now held to be of economy, and in practice the Greeks appear now to accept all Western Baptism. J. A. D.]

*THE MEANING OF THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION
IN NON-ORTHODOX FAITHS*

by Patriarch Sergius of Moscow, 1935

This article by the then Metropolitan and Acting Patriarch Sergius appeared in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, Nos. 23-24, Moscow, 1935, and is here in part reproduced and in part summarized from a translation secured through the courtesy of Mr. Paul Anderson. The careful and conservative theology of the late Patriarch may be held to represent what is likely to be the official attitude of the Russian Church. It should be noted that while holding fast to the point of view which holds the Orthodox Church to be the only true Church of Christ, he equally criticises the view which ascribes no significance to sacraments and other rites administered outside her communion, and its opposite, which ascribes full validity to the rites of individuals or groups in schism. A few explanatory notes have been added.

I

The authority of our present-day ecclesiastical hierarchy as a hierarchy established by God, and its rights and powers, are based on the historical fact of the succession from the Apostles. Such is the teaching of the Orthodox Church at present, and such was her teaching in antiquity, in the period known in Church History as "undivided," a term customarily used in the theological

literature of the West. Thus it is not surprising that non-Orthodox bodies which have separated from the Church but do not want to break the connection with their Church past (as do the Protestants) maintain this teaching and greatly value the apostolic succession of their hierarchy, if they can prove it. The question of apostolic succession inevitably arises also with every effort of non-Orthodox bodies to unite with the Orthodox Church, or, as they like to put the matter in the West, in connection with discussions on the right of one or another of such self-born "churches" (the Old Catholics and others) to be recognized as an integral part of the Universal Church. There is, for instance, a whole theological literature about the Anglican hierarchy. The opponents as well as the defenders of this hierarchy start from the question of the apostolic succession; the former deny the fact of this succession in the said hierarchy, the latter affirm it.

The question is: how does the Orthodox Church consider the question of the possession by non-Orthodox bodies of the apostolic succession in the hierarchy? Has this circumstance, in the belief of the Orthodox Church, any other interest than a historical one? In other words, does the presence of this succession have a significant influence on the opinion of our Church about a given non-Orthodox body, and about its priesthood in particular?

There is one opinion which answers this question with a decided "No." The Church of Christ, say the defenders of this opinion, considers Herself the only body on earth which is the depository of saving Grace ("I believe in the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church"). It is the only one which possesses a genuine apostolic hierarchy administering saving sacraments. The non-Orthodox

bodies which have separated from the Church—those which possess (as they say) the apostolic succession, as well as those which do not possess it—those which want to have priests, as well as those which do not recognize the authority of priests—all of them are considered by the Church as a single, uniform mass of Christians deprived of grace, who are indeed called Christians only because of an inaccurate definition of the word.

It is true that the Church has three different receptions for those who come to it from non-Orthodox bodies. Some the Church accepts as pagans by baptising them; some are accepted by chrismation, and others by penitence. And in this last case clerics are admitted in their present orders. But these three different kinds of reception do not in any measure imply the existence of three different categories in non-Orthodoxy—as that in the case of some the Church does not recognize any Sacraments, in others it recognizes the Sacrament of Baptism, and in the third case it recognizes not only the Sacrament of Baptism but also the Sacrament of Chrismation and even the Sacrament of Holy Orders, and in each case the Church by its corresponding reception completes whatever is lacking. In applying to one non-Orthodox body stricter rules of reception than to another, or even in applying more or less indulgent rules to the same body at different times, the Church is led only by practical considerations—considerations of Church economy, considerations of its desire and obligation to save as many people as possible. In substance, each newcomer should be baptised and anointed with holy oil (chrism), and afterwards if he is worthy of being accepted into the clergy he must be honored by Orthodox ordination. But, sparing the natural feelings of men who consider them-

selves to be already baptised and even ministers of the Church, the Church does not repeat the Sacrament of Baptism, or Ordination, but confines itself to the third reception in which by the Sacrament of Confession the Church gives by implication, *implicite*, baptism, chrismation, and ordination to those who are accepted. The indulgence occasionally shown, however, certainly does not bind the Church to act in the same manner in the future. Changing circumstances change also the type of reception.

It has been said that the accuracy of the above position is proved not only by its conformity with dogma, but also by the endless diversity and especially the extreme variability of Church practice in relation to the non-Orthodox. For instance, in the past, Catholics¹ were admitted by the Russian Church by the third type of reception and in their existing Orders; later on the Church started to re-baptise them, and still later the Church returned to the older practice, which is still followed at present. The Greek Church, on the contrary, in the past admitted Catholics as we do, but beginning in the eighteenth century it started to re-baptise them. But at the same time the Greek Church not only does not reproach our Church for such indulgence, but, in certain cases and taking differing circumstances into consideration, is ready itself to make exceptions from its own strict

¹ As commonly in Russian usage, "Catholic" throughout this article is used for "Roman Catholic"—which does not, of course, imply any abandonment of the theological use of the term (cf. quotation from the Creed on p. 53 above), but is comparable to the Roman Catholic usage of "Orthodox" for the Eastern Orthodox Church. In the Creed, the word *Catholic* is translated into Slavonic by *soborny*, which means approximately "corporate" or "conciliar."

rules. Having recognized Anglican ordination,² the Greek Church logically ought to modify and perhaps already has modified its practice with reference to Catholics as well. The same lack of consistency characterizes the practice of the ancient Church in respect to different bodies (Donatists and others, for instance). It would be useless to look for any system in this variety of practice or to search for dogmatic foundations in the action of the Church; there is no system here, and no dogmatic foundations oblige the Church to use the second or third type of reception instead of the first. Hence the Church can act quite freely, choosing, in its own judgment, what is more useful from its point of view in the given conditions and at the given time.

The above opinion is satisfying in its dogmatic straightforwardness, and because it immediately removes all perplexity and obscurity with reference to the non-Orthodox. It is sufficient for the non-Orthodox to enter into the Church's vineyard, and no matter what he comes with the Church will reward him on the same level as its own children. So the late Archbishop Illarion answered an Anglican professor:

Don't be tormented by the question as to whether you have the priesthood or not. Turn directly to the Church. She will admit you without any humiliation, without re-baptising, without reordination, and from its plenitude the Church will give you at once an existence within the Universal Christian Church, as well as the saving priesthood and everything.

² Strictly speaking, of course, the *Greek Church* which has recognized Anglican ordination means those of the Greek-speaking Orthodox Churches which have done so.

Nevertheless, we do not have the Catholic principle by which dogma rules history. We of the Orthodox Church cannot shut our eyes to the testimony of the latter. Seeing discrepancies between history and dogma, we must first of all ask the question: do we understand the Church's dogma correctly? In the present case the testimony of history is not in favor of the conception in question. The practice of the Church in regard to the non-Orthodox is in truth very diverse and variable. The importance of Church economy in the matter of the admission of the non-Orthodox is always very great. But at the same time there is always a strict line that the Church never crosses in its practice. This line is the absence in a given non-Orthodox body of true episcopal consecration, a succession descended from the Apostles (together, of course, with the apostolic teaching about Holy Orders). However strong may be the arguments of Church economy, the Church will never admit the members of such a body by the third type of reception (without chrismation); still, more, the Church will never receive such members into its clergy without Orthodox ordination. For instance, a Lutheran pastor, a Scotch minister, a teacher of Pomorje³ and others may be men quite worthy of admission among the Orthodox clergy, but nevertheless they will never be recognized as priests without Orthodox ordination, as they will not receive in the Sacrament of Penance (third type of reception) the implicit grace of Holy Orders.

Thus the existence of the apostolic succession separates a certain group from the great mass of non-Orthodox bodies. The Church can accept into its clergy without

³ That is, a minister of the "priestless" Old Believers, who were especially strong in the northern coastal district of Russia [Pomorje].

ordination only those who have kept the apostolic succession. Does the Church consider these ordinations as having the fullness of Grace?

The defenders of the opinion under discussion give another explanation. The Church, they say, holding dearly to the apostolic succession in general, does not want in the case in question to violate even the external forms preserved from the Apostles, although these forms outside the Church have become empty, for they have lost the content of apostolic Grace.

But the facts of Church practice show Church teaching in quite a different light. For instance, the present rule of our Church for the admission of Catholic priests in their present status goes so far that if such a priest, perhaps out of the desire to marry, does not wish to be admitted in his present Orders, then after admission he will not be considered simply as a layman, but as one who has abandoned his Orders, who as such has no hope of receiving Orthodox ordination. One can hardly admit that out of respect for a meaningless form the Church would irrevocably deprive a worthy man of the hope of ever becoming an Orthodox cleric, especially since the married priesthood is permitted by its rules.

If it is said that in this case the Church punishes a moral instability undesired in the clergy—the refusal to carry the cross already taken upon oneself—why then does the Church leave unpunished the Lutheran pastor, the teacher of Pomorje, and others of similar status when they, on transferring to Orthodoxy, likewise do not desire immediately to enter the Orthodox priesthood, but later may seek this?

The Church does not think of the apostolic succession as merely a simple, external transmission of the act of

ordination, for there is connected with this act a corresponding faith, namely the retention in the given body of the apostolic teaching regarding Grace in the priesthood. This again is incompatible with the opinion under discussion . . . [since if non-Orthodox ordination were merely an empty form, faith in Grace received in it would be a delusion, and not something to be insisted on] . . . Therefore it is nearer to the truth and to Church teaching to suppose that in non-Orthodox bodies where the apostolic succession has been kept (i.e., the apostolic form of ordination, as well as the apostolic teaching about the Grace of Holy Orders), these ordinations do not, in the thought of the Church, appear to be only a form without Grace, and therefore are not repeated when their clerics are received into the Orthodox clergy.

It is more correct to understand the Church's teaching thus than to invent some kind of unprecedented administration of Sacraments *implicite*, which can be traced neither in the Canons of the Church nor in the teaching of the Holy Fathers, where on the contrary one finds facts which make against any such teaching . . . [this is illustrated by ancient Canons dealing with cases of uncertain baptism, and with a catechumen communicated by mistake; it was directed that baptism should be administered, not that baptism had been administered implicitly by other Sacraments—Canon 1 of Timothy of Alexandria, 83 of Carthage, 84 of the Council *in Trullo*—even though there was danger of repeating a Sacrament which ought not to be repeated, forbidden by Canon 47 of the Apostles⁴] . . .

⁴ The Canons which Sergius cites are from the main body of Orthodox Canon Law, which consists of the Canons of the General Councils, together with certain local canons and

It seems to me (as I suggested in my article in Nos. 2-4 of our *Journal* for the year 1931) that many things in the relations between the Church and the non-Orthodox faiths will become more intelligible to us if we keep in mind that the non-Orthodox are not considered by the Church as an independent entity, completely foreign to it, like those of other religions; that the non-Orthodox are in fact a category of lapsed, or penitents. Now the lapsed are excluded from participation of the Sacraments, sometimes even from participation in the prayers; nevertheless they are still within the Church and are under its influence. The non-Orthodox are certainly separated from the Church more than the lapsed (Orthodox); they not only sin, but even do not recognize the Church and struggle against it. Nevertheless, the attitude of the Church towards them remains the same as to the lapsed in general. It is undoubtedly condemnatory, "hating even the garment spotted by the flesh" (Jude 23), but in no way antagonistic and hostile, "redeeming by fear." The Church indeed "delivers unto Satan" the non-Orthodox also, but with the single purpose "that the spirit may be saved" (I Corinthians 5:5). In other words, the attitude of the Church towards non-Orthodoxy is only one side of the activity of ecclesiastical judgment, understood in the broad sense as a reformatory influence on the lapsed. It is natural that this attitude reflects in itself the general characteristics of the activity of judgment.

For us in the present case it is important to point out

decisions of individual bishops which were adopted by the Council in *Trullo*, held at Constantinople in 692 to supplement the fifth and sixth General Councils. These canons can mostly be found in vol. XIV of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series II.

a general negative feature characterizing ecclesiastical jurisdiction—namely, that the court, while having full authority, when it sees grounds for it, to deprive one (permanently or temporarily) of that which is received in the Sacraments, cannot bestow by its verdict that which can be received only by the Sacraments; the court cannot recognize as baptised one who has not been baptised, cannot recognize a layman as a priest, and so on. This is exactly what is done in relation to the non-Orthodox. Those of them whom the Church does not recognize as having been properly baptised are not accepted without baptism, and those who do not have proper ordination the Church does not accept into the clergy without its own ordination.

II

If the Orthodox Church accepts non-Orthodox clerics in their present status because the Church recognizes the validity of their priesthood, how can this recognition be reconciled with the historical fact of the changes which have taken place in the relations of the Church to bodies having such priesthood, as for instance the Catholics?

It must not be forgotten that the attitude of the Church is at times critical towards its own ordinations, performed within its own bosom. Many Orthodox ordinations have been declared invalid. For instance, Maximus the Cynic was an Orthodox himself, and even an outstanding one, and received his ordination from Orthodox Bishops, rightly appointed; nevertheless "all done for him and all done by him is invalid" (Canon 4 of the First Council of Constantinople).⁵ Related to this are all the

⁵ Maximus the Cynic was an irregularly consecrated claimant to the see of Constantinople whose claims, as here noted, were

Canons which declare that Orthodox ordinations performed with essential deviations from the Canons are invalid—for instance, without the consent of the Metropolitan of the province (Canon 6 of Nicaea), or by a Bishop in an alien diocese (Canon 14 of the Apostles), or for an alien cleric (Canons 16 of Nicaea, 15 of Sardica, 91 of Carthage, etc.).

At the same time the practice laid down by such Canons appears to be, in its turn, not unalterable. Cases of exceptions from the rules are repeatedly found in history. The reason for this is that Ecclesiastical Canons are not dogmatic decisions on matters of faith, once and for all solving the problem, and they do not operate automatically.

They were issued first of all for the guidance of ecclesiastical courts, and consequently each case of their application presupposes a special decision of the court. In particular when speaking of the invalidity of ordination in this or that case, the Canons speak only of the right of the church court to recognize the invalidity of these ordinations. This means that in case of need, taking into account the circumstances of the case, or simply out of considerations of church economy, the court can stay its vindictive sword and leave the ordination in question in force . . . [an example is the occasional interference of Bishops outside of their own provinces in case of emergency, as in certain acts of St. John Chrysostom.]

Nevertheless, by making such exceptions from the Canons, the Church never creates thereby a precedent for the future, nor does it give anyone the right to justify the

rejected by the first Council of Constantinople (Second General Council) in 381.

breaking of Canons by referring to this precedent. Church economy does not abolish and does not even weaken the force of the Canon. The Church has in mind only the single particular case with its individual, unrepeatable nature, and confines its action to it. The Canon remains binding on all, and the strictness of the Canon can be used by the Church court to punish the guilty if there is no reason for applying the principle of economy.

The relations of the Church towards non-Orthodox bodies are built, approximately, on such a scheme. The essential difference consists only in that in matters subject to the Church court the Church has to do with individual violators of Church Canons, and here the Church has to do with more or less organized groups of violators, each group united by some special departure from the Canons. Judgment regarding any individual member of such a group necessarily depends upon a preliminary judgment about the group.

As the only bearer on earth of the power to bind and loose, and the only depository of saving Grace, the Church of Christ has the power and the right to declare invalid all ordinations effected outside the Church. However, guided by reasons of Church economy and the wish to facilitate the salvation of as many people as possible, the Church does not always or everywhere exercise this power. The Church thus leaves in force ordinations of non-Orthodox bodies which have kept the apostolic teaching about ordination and the apostolic form. In a certain way the Church recognizes them as valid, because the Church draws consistent conclusions from such recognition; for instance, the Church does not repeat either Baptism or Chrismation performed by such clergy. But with all this, the failure of the Church to exercise its

basic right with regard to a given group of non-Orthodox bodies does not at all mean the abdication of this right for ever. When circumstances of Church life alter and the lenience, referred to above, to a given non-Orthodox body ceases to favor the salvation of the largest number of persons, or, more than that, begins directly to hinder it, the Church returns to its basic right, revokes the dispensation, and binds again what has been loosed. This explains the apparent lack of system and the variability in the relations of the Church to non-Orthodox bodies.

[. . . So the hierarchy of the Belokrinitzy⁶ and that of the Old Catholics both derive from single Bishops, contrary to the ancient Canons. The former is rejected unconditionally and its adherents are received by chrismation. The Old Catholics have been regarded with sympathy, and if they were otherwise in sufficient harmony with Orthodoxy the single-bishop consecration would probably not be an insuperable obstacle to the acceptance of their hierarchy . . .]

There is much in common between the origin of Anglicanism and our "Renovation" (Living Church). Here, as there, the movement began by a rupture with its patriarch and with the canonical hierarchy united under him—as far as one can so speak of the Catholic hierarchy. Here, as there, authorized diocesan Bishops declined to perform the first episcopal consecration. Here, as there,

⁶ The reference is to the conservative group of "Old Believers" who, after being separated from the Russian Church since the time of Peter the Great, and dependent on priests who came over to them from it, in 1846 acquired a hierarchy through consecrations performed by a deposed Greek bishop. Since 1917 their bishops have been able to return to Russia, but, as indicated, are not recognized by the Russian Orthodox Church.

the first consecration was performed by casual Bishops, some being mere Vicar-Bishops, some already retired, whose entire authority seemed to be limited to this, that the Church authorities had not yet had time to place them under an interdiction.

The Anglican hierarchy has not received the recognition of all Orthodox Churches. Nevertheless, if the much spoken of "rapprochement between the Anglican Church and the Orthodox Church" were to follow its normal, ecclesiastical path—if the Anglicans as a body were really anxious to find a true Church and a priesthood possessed of Grace—if they had not at times gone astray in this search by looking first of all for recognition of their hierarchy (which at one time was condemned in such a rude fashion by the Pope) in order, in that case, to remain quietly as they were—then the reunion of the Anglicans with the Orthodox Church might very well take place and the question of hierarchy would probably be resolved in an affirmative sense.

[. . . On the other hand, the Russian Church has always condemned the "Renovation," although with increasing strictness. From the beginning those ordinations which, as well as being schismatic, had other canonical defects, were not recognized; since the interdiction of April 2, 1924, all their ordinations are rejected, and other Sacraments] . . . including in this number also chrismation, even though administered with previously consecrated oil (chrism) taken from the Church. This is because the consecrated oil is not considered as a self-active substance which if used by any person will constitute a Sacrament. According to Church teaching, the Sacrament of Chrismation is administered strictly by a Bishop, and only by delegation of his power by a priest, hence not by

an interdicted one. Anointing administered, for example, by a deacon or a layman would not be a Sacrament.

Such a varying attitude towards facts which seem to be identical is to be explained by pastoral and practical considerations of the benefit to the Church. The Old Catholics and the Anglicans separated from Rome when Rome itself was schismatic. Their separation was in reality a separation from a schism, although not yet crowned by reunion with the Church. They must not be reproached for the separation, but rather for the fact that they did not separate earlier. They incidentally by their separation weakened the Roman schism, and thus to some extent strengthened the position of the Orthodox Church. It is natural then for them to look upon our Church as an ally and to have an interest in and sympathy for it, and for our Church to hope that lenience towards them will lead to the salvation of a greater number of men. On the contrary, the hierarchies of the Belokrinitzy and the Renovates arose with the direct purpose of strengthening the schism in its irreconcilability to the Church and suppressing the aspirations of faithful souls towards a real priesthood by counterfeiting it and finding a substitute for it, aiming to push aside the Orthodox hierarchy and put themselves in its place. The purpose of such bodies is not the building but the destruction of the body of the Church. For this reason the Church, while applying the order of church economy to the first two bodies, in relation to the others does not see any reason for deviating from the strictness of the Canons, at least as long as the position of these two and schisms similar to them does not change for the better. . . .

So, contrary to the above discussed completely negative opinion about non-Orthodox ordinations, it is more

correct to think that the Church does not repeat non-Orthodox ordinations (when the Church sees the apostolic succession in a given body) because it considers these ordinations valid, and not only because it values the apostolic forms. Nevertheless this does not at all mean that there can be Sacraments giving Grace outside the Church. The Church recognizes that Grace is present among the non-Orthodox only because it considers them not yet "alien" to the Church, "*ek tes ekklesias*" (Canon 1 of Basil the Great), and only while they remain in that state. Keeping with them "some kind of intercourse" (although the official ties of fellowship in Eucharist and prayer have been broken), the Church gives them the opportunity, somehow, to benefit from the crumbs of Grace of that rich table served by the Church to its faithful children. There is no Grace except that of the Church. Therefore the Church, having the power "to bind and loose," may continue this "same kind of intercourse" with the non-Orthodox when it is in conformity with its own objectives (the salvation of men), and it may on the other hand stop the intercourse, i.e., cut the stream of Grace and in this way reduce the body in question to a condition without Grace, such as must essentially be that of all those outside the Church. On the other hand, the several (national) Orthodox Churches, since they are widely separated and each one acts in view of its own circumstances, may perform such acts of rejecting a non-Orthodox body (for instance Catholics) at different times, or one Church may do it and others maintain relationships. But this is only a temporary, passing state, pending the time when a uniform, universal practice will prevail.

III

In Section III Patriarch Sergius stresses the principle that Grace is God acting through his appointed means, and not, which he criticizes as the (Roman) Catholic view, an energy proceeding from God but under human control. Hence the minister of a Sacrament "is not an authoritative giver of Grace, but the intercessor for the action of God, and the guarantor that God will truly act. Furthermore both the prayer and the guarantee of the priest derive their force from the prayer and the sponsorship of the Church, "the accomplishment of Christ" on the earth. This means that the Sacraments are valid so long as the priest is within the Church and ministers in accordance with its commission."

On this basis he denies altogether the orders of isolated episcopi vagantes, such as the late Villatte. He also criticizes the view which he finds among Anglicans, Old Catholics, and others, that "a non-Orthodox body, although separated from the Church, if it has kept the apostolic succession in the priesthood, continues to be a territorial Church in the body of the Church, as a part of it . . . [so that] . . . Eucharistic Communion with the Orthodox . . . is for it only a moral obligation (according to the will of Christ, 'That they may all be one'); or rather an attractive, distant ideal than a practical necessity of life; having lost communion, the non-Orthodox body, even without it, does not cease to be a territorial Church, a part of the Universal Church."

This idea Sergius of course repudiates; he adds in conclusion, "Besides knowing by their own experience only union with Rome, accompanied as it was by absorption

of all local character and independence, the Westerners are afraid that in the invitation to join the Eastern Orthodox Church they will find the same attempt to subjugate them to the East with a loss of their autonomy. Of course, this fear cools to a great extent already lukewarm thoughts about a union of Churches. As a matter of fact, if Communion in the Eucharist with the Orthodox Church is only a very desirable embellishment of Church life, but not life itself, is it reasonable to risk very valuable realities for an abstract idea, perhaps fascinating and edifying, but of little practical use? Hence in the negotiations there are many sweet words, and much erudition, but also a great deal of arguing about matters of secondary importance, a great deal of stubbornness in defending one's ideas—but there is no thirst that obliges one 'to come to the waters of salvation' (Isaiah 55:1, 12:3), there is no spiritual heroism by which one 'can do great things' " (the Great Canon).

IV

The closing section denies the idea, which has been at least rhetorically advanced by some Orthodox prelates, that the Universal Church consists of many territorial Churches, some Orthodox and others not. Sergius points out that the petition in the Liturgy "for the unity of all" cannot mean "all Churches," as the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow is said to have taken it, since "all" is in the masculine whereas the word "Church" is feminine. The true Church shares one common Eucharist. The most that can be said of the non-Orthodox is that they are like the penitents of old who stood in the porch, not yet entirely alien to the Church, but awaiting readmission to it.

This was the view of the ancient Church about itself; it is still the view of the Monophysites and other separated bodies which survive from ancient times and consider that they are the true and orthodox Church (and hence, incidentally, the occasional consecrations by such bodies of wandering Westerners who do not intend to adopt their faith or join their communion are disingenuous on both sides). To summarize the whole matter:

Those who deny any meaning to the apostolic succession of the non-Orthodox, as the immoderately zealous defenders of Orthodox dogma do, are wrong, and those who represent this succession as something valuable in itself which can be obtained even outside the Orthodox Universal Church are still more mistaken. A tremendous advantage for the non-Orthodox bodies which have preserved the apostolic succession among themselves lies in the fact that the Church still considers them as "part of the Church" (*ek tes ekklesias*), "not yet alien to the Church." The Church still maintains "certain types of intercourse with them," as it has with the lapsed and those who are under penance. Nevertheless, if this incomplete and unreliable intercourse is not crowned by a complete union with the Church in the one Eucharist, all the advantages of such non-Orthodox bodies will be lost without any benefit (Romans 9:4-5; 10-4).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Anglican Orders: the Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, September 13, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 29, 1897, S.P.C.K. (for Church Historical Society), 1943, 67 pp.*
(A reissue of the official English translations of these important documents; the Latin originals have also been reprinted.)
- W. J. Birkbeck, (Athelstan Riley, ed.) *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, containing essays and articles by the late W. J. Birkbeck, M.A., F.S.A., written in the years 1888-1915. S.P.C.K. and The Macmillan Co., 1917, xii-372 pp.
(includes several articles on Anglican Orders and related topics)
- A. I. Bulgakoff, *The Question of Anglican Orders*, in respect to a "vindication" of the Papal decision which was drawn up by the English Roman Catholic Bishops at the end of 1897, translated by W. J. Birkbeck. S.P.C.K. (for Church Historical Society), 1899. 46 pp.
- Sergius Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, translated by Elizabeth S. Cram. Morehouse-Gorham Co. and The Centenary Press (1935), 222 pp.
(Chapter XVII, Orthodoxy and Other Christian Confessions, pp. 213-218)
- The Christian East*, published for the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association by the S.P.C.K., vols. 1-15, 1920-1935.
(contains many official documents and reports)
- Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1923, xxxvi-430 pp.
(especially pp. 249-267 on the Orthodox Church and others, 287-305 on the validity of Sacraments, Economy, and Anglican Orders)
- E. R. Hardy, Jr., "The Greek Mission of the Episcopal Church," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. X, 1941, pp. 183-201.

- *The Lambeth Conference, 1930, S.P.C.K., 1931, 200 pp.*
(Resolutions 33-34, and pp. 131-140 of the Report on the
Unity of the Church relate to the Eastern Orthodox.)
- William Palmer, *Dissertations on Subjects Relating to the
"Orthodox" or "Eastern Catholic" Communion*, Masters,
1853, viii-336 pp.
- William Palmer, (J. H. Newman, ed.) *Notes of a Visit to the
Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841*. Kegan Paul, 1882,
xxiv-572 pp.
- William Palmer, (W. J. Birkbeck, ed.) *Russia and the English
Church*, vol. I, containing a correspondence between Mr.
William Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and
M. Khomiakoff in the years 1845-1854. Rivington, 1895,
lx-227 pp.
(views of a famous Russian lay theologian on the Orthodox
Church and its relation to others).
- "Reports of the Russo-Greek Committee" in *Journal
of the General Convention*:
1865, Appendix D, pp. 325-342.
1868, Appendix XI, pp. 480-487.
1871, Appendix VI, pp. 565-586.
1874, Appendix X, pp. 540-556.
(these Reports contain many interesting documents; the
Committee was created in 1862 and asked to be discharged
in 1874, assuming that further relations would be the
responsibility of the bishops).
- George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the
18th Century*, being a correspondence between the Eastern
Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops, Rivington, 1868,
lxxi-180 pp.
- Stefan Zankov, *The Eastern Orthodox Church*, translated by
Donald A. Lowrie, Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1930, 168 pp.
(Chapter VI, pp. 153-163, discusses the relation of the
Orthodox Church to other Christian bodies).
- Nicolas Zernov, *The Church of the Eastern Christians*. S.P.C.K.,
1942, 114 pp.
(the latest general sketch of Eastern Orthodoxy; Part II,
"The Prospect of Unity," pp. 73-109).