

Canterbury and Constantinople

chattel which caused, or might eventually cause, the death of a man was forfeit to the Crown. Hence it was a necessary part of the indictment in this case to state the nature and value of the weapon employed in the assault.

F. R. BRACEY.



CANTERBURY AND CONSTANTINOPLE

TWO recent efforts towards Reunion between the Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church are worthy of notice.

The first is entitled *Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church* (S.P.C.K.). "These terms were drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and are now published at their request."

The second is entitled *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox, especially in regard to Anglican Orders*, by the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. (The Faith Press, pp. 198 ; 12s.).

As an organism is essentially defined in terms, not of what it is, but of what it will become, and as movement is essentially defined in terms, not of its term whence but of its term whereto, we are loath to criticize the present state of a movement which may one day re-unite the scattered flocks of Christendom. We are not sure that the present interchange of terms between semi-official groups on either side is a display of sincere faith. But if it is a display of sincere charity we may hope that divisions and schisms begotten and fostered by a lack of love may be undone when charity—which is the love of truth—has come unto its own. For this reason we would ask the writer of the second work to drink deeply of the spirit of the first. The recurrent anti-papalism of his work is but a dubious compliment to the Orthodox Christians with whom he wishes to intercommunicate.

Blackfriars

Yet, so great is truth and so unexpected are its victories, that even the strong anti-papalism of the Rev. J. A. Douglas may be nearer a final reunion with the Holy See than is the dignified tolerance of the *Terms*. The difference between the two declarations of what doctrinal level the Church of England has reached is strikingly illustrated in the matter of the Blessed Sacrament. The Rev. J. A. Douglas has given us, at page 90, a "Draft of Suggested Doctrinal Declaration to be addressed to His Grace the Locum-Tenens of the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Holy Synod of the Great Church of Constantinople."

EASTERN CHURCH COMMITTEE

"The Church has at all times desired to fulfil the Lord's command by the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and we desire in all things to obey the teaching of Scripture and the regulations of the Universal Church. But whereas there has been much controversy and many divisions have arisen as to the more exact definition of the nature of the presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist ; and whereas there is no decree of any Œcumenical Council touching the manner of the presence of Christ ; and whereas some of the terms that have been used have been used with different significations in different parts of the Church ; we agree that this is a Divine

REV. J. A. DOUGLAS

"We hold that, at the moment of Consecration in the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine, being blessed by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, are changed and become the true Body and the true Blood of Christ, and as such are to be given to and received by the faithful. Also, we hold that Christ there present is to be adored. As to the actual manner of the change and method of the Divine Presence, no doctrine on this point is laid down in any Œcumenical Council ; and therefore while believing the fact we do not venture to define the method. There is here a Divine Mystery which passes human understanding ; and our Church, while asserting that one particular explanation of the manner of the

Canterbury and Constantinople

Mystery which transcends human understanding and that the Church has expressed sufficiently its belief in its Liturgies; and we agree further that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as it is taught in the Liturgies of the Orthodox Church and in the Liturgies of the Church of England and those of the Churches in communion with the Church of England is adequate and sufficient."

Divine Presence is not tenable, has attempted no definition on her own authority."

It is to be noted that the Semi-official Statement of the Committee follows the lead of Archbishop Benson and his fellow Bishops. When asked by the Roman Catholic Bishops whether the Church of England held only a *subjective* or also an *objective* presence of our Lord's Body and Blood, the Bishops of the Church of England met the question by silence. Of course, much water has flowed under London Bridge since then. The whole spirit of the Lambeth Conference witnesses to a change of outlook which, in days to come, we may justly attribute to the "right hand of the Most High." Nevertheless, on this plain fact of a real objective and adorable Presence the semi-official *Terms* are silent. Yet the doctrine of this Presence is of vital importance, not only for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist but for the Sacrament of Holy Order which is so essentially bound to the idea of a Consecrating and Sacrificing priesthood.

It is then evident from the *Terms* and *The Relations* how vital is the division between the various schools, even of Catholic thought, within the Church of England. It is no joy to us to point out these divisions. It is only a painful duty which we fulfil with a hope and prayer that from the sight of these scattered flocks of Christendom men may rise to the thought of the One Fold and the One Shepherd.

V. McN.