



Methuen, C. (2018) Coming into Communion: Anglican involvement in agreements of (Full) Communion and Reunion. *Sri Lanka Journal of Theological Reflection*, 9, pp. 103-137.

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/171447/>

Deposited on: 29 October 2018

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Coming into Communion: Anglican involvement in agreements of (Full) Communion and Reunion

Charlotte Methuen

Nearly a century ago, the 1920 Lambeth Conference issued its Appeal to All Christian People, a clarion call to church unity. In it, the Anglican bishops affirmed that “God wills fellowship”, recognised that “this united fellowship is not visible in the world today” and confessed the part of Anglicans in “crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of his Spirit.”¹ The Bishops expressed their belief that they and the whole church were being called into “an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith” which required “nothing less ... than a new discovery of the creative resources of God.” Drawing on the Lambeth-Chicago quadrilateral, they affirmed that the unity of the church would be found to involve “the wholehearted acceptance” of Scripture, the Apostles’ and Nicene creeds, the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion and of “a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.” Of this ministry, they asked: “May we not reasonably claim that the episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?” This was not, they asserted, a denial of “the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the episcopate.” Quite the contrary: “we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.” Rather, the bishops, wished to “urge” that the episcopate, “exercised in a representative and constitutional manner”, “is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church.”

A century later, the Anglican emphasis on the episcopate – and specifically “the historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church”, as the fourth article of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral puts it – continues to present a challenge in many Anglican ecumenical relationships. At the same time, beginning with agreements with the Church of Sweden and the Old Catholic Churches of the Utrecht Union, the past century has seen Anglicans enter into a number of agreements of Union and of (Full) Communion, all of which bring about full interchangeability of ministries. The United Churches of North and South India, of Bangladesh and Pakistan are all members of the Anglican Communion. Agreements between churches which do not seek to unite but which achieve full interchangeability of ministries – and thus Communion – as a step towards full visible unity have been reached between the British and Irish Anglican Churches and Lutheran churches in the Nordic and Baltic countries, between Anglicans and Lutherans in Canada and in the USA, between Anglicans and Moravians in the USA, and between Anglicans and Methodists in Ireland. This article explores the basis on which these agreements have been made, the way in which such agreements have been marked and how they are lived out.

The Old Catholic Churches of the Utrecht Union and the Bonn Agreement (1931)

¹ “Appeal to All Christian People,” Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 9. Lambeth Conference resolutions can be found online at: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/structures/instruments-of-communion/lambeth-conference.aspx>; click on the year of the conference and the resolution number.

From the first movements towards the establishment of an Old Catholic Movement in the wake of the First Vatican Council, Old Catholics and Anglicans sought contact to one another. Particularly after the Roman Catholic rejection of Anglican orders as “absolutely null and utterly void” in Leo XIII’s 1896 encyclical, *Apostolicae curae*,² catholicly inclined Anglicans saw the Old Catholics as a possible route to the recognition of Anglican orders.³ The Bonn Agreement proposed a relationship of “intercommunion” which recognised the continuing independence of the Anglican and Old Catholic churches, admitted each other’s members to the sacraments, and mutually recognised that each communion held “all the essentials of the faith”:

1. Each communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
2. Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith.

As Klaus-Heinrich Neuhoff has observed, the Bonn Agreement was predicated on the acceptance of Anglican Orders by the Churches of the Union of Utrecht, and particularly the Dutch Old Catholic, which after several decades of hesitaiton was finally communicated by the Archbishop of Utrecht, Franciscus Kenninck to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson in June 1925.⁴ That decision in turn was predicated on the declaration by three Orthodox Churches, the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Cyprus, in 1923 and 1923 that in their view the orders of the Anglican Church “possess the same validity as the orders of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian churches.”⁵ In the case hesitation about the question of orders came not from the Anglican but from the Old Catholic side, although as Atherton has shown, not all evangelical Anglicans supported the deepening of this relationship.⁶ The Bonn Agreement quickly led to the participation of Old Catholic bishops in Anglican episcopal consecrations, and *vice versa*, establishing a relationship that has had a continuously lived-out existence ever since.⁷ Old Catholic and Anglican bishops not only attend each other’s consecrations, but act as assistants in each other’s dioceses; the German

² “*Apostolicae curae*,” § 36; online at <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/leo13/l13curae.htm>.

³ See Charlotte Methuen, “The Bonn Agreement and the Catholicization of Anglicanism: Anglicans and Old Catholics in the Lang Papers and the Douglas Papers 1920-1939,” *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* [hereafter IKZ] 97 (2007), 1-22; for the earlier period, Angela Berlis, “Ignaz von Döllinger and the Anglicans,” in: Stewart J. Brown and Peter Nockles (eds), *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World, c. 1830-c. 1930* (Cambridge 2012), 236-248.

⁴ Klaus Heinrich Neuhoff, *Building on the Bonn agreement: an historical study of Anglican-Old Catholic relations before and after the 1931 Bonn Agreement with special reference to the Anglican-Old Catholic theologians’ conferences 1957-2005* (Amersfoort 2010), 34-35.

⁵ See IKZ 12 (1922), 176-177.

⁶ Andrew Atherton, “Anglican Evangelicals, Old Catholics and the Bonn Agreement,” IKZ 97 (2007), 23-47.

⁷ Neuhoff, *Building on the Bonn agreement*; Methuen, “A view from without – Reflections on the Old Catholic Church from an Anglican Perspective,” IKZ 98 (2018), forthcoming.

Old Catholic bishops regularly confirm Anglican candidates in Anglican congregations, and I myself serve as an assistant priest in my local Old Catholic parish in Germany.⁸

The interwar agreements with Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches

Leading up to the Bonn Agreement, between 1888 and 1930, the Lambeth conferences passed a series of resolutions affirming the Anglican bishops' wish to deepen relationships with the churches emerging from the Old Catholic movement. However, the Anglican bishops were also affirming their intention to deepen relationships with other churches including the Church of Sweden. Thus the third Lambeth Conference, in 1888, passed resolutions recommending closer relationships with the Church of Sweden, the Old Catholic Churches, the *Unitas Fratrum* or Moravians, and the Orthodox churches.⁹ Both the 1897 and the 1908 Lambeth Conferences passed resolutions that steps should be taken to deepen relationships, or establish "an alliance of some sort" with the Swedish Church, including achieving clarity on the question of orders.¹⁰ In 1909, an Anglican the Commission travelled to Uppsala for a conference with its Swedish counterpart.¹¹ The conference considered a range of theological questions, including episcopal succession in Sweden and England, the validity of the ministries of each church, the diaconate, confirmation, the authority of the *Confessio Augustana invariata* and its Eucharistic doctrine, the relationship between the Church of Sweden and other Lutheran churches, including the Swedish Churches in the U.S.A., and the implications of that relationship, the Swedish understanding of "the holy ministry and the constitution of the Church" and forms and rites of ordination. The Anglican delegation was primarily concerned with the understanding of order of the Swedish Church. Their report concluded:

- (1) That the succession of bishops has been maintained unbroken by the Church of Sweden, and that it has a true conception of the episcopal office, though it does not as a whole consider the office to be so important as most English Churchmen do;
- (2) That the office of priest is also rightly conceived as a divinely instituted instrument for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and that it has been in intention handed on throughout the whole history of the Church of Sweden.¹²

They recognised what they saw as "the paramount duty of holding communion with all other Christians wherever it is possible and not clearly wrong to do so" and concluded:

⁸ See for my own reflections, Methuen, "A view from without"; compare also the reports of the Anglican-Old Catholic International Co-ordinating Council, *Belonging together in Europe: A joint statement on aspects of ecclesiology and mission* (2011), and *Anglicans and Old Catholics together in Europe* (2017), both online at: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/relationships/churches-in-communion.aspx>.

⁹ Lambeth Conference 1888, Resolutions 14 (Church of Sweden), 15 (Old Catholic Churches in Austria, Germany and Switzerland), 16 (*Unitas Fratrum*), and 17 (Orthodox).

¹⁰ Lambeth Conference 1897, Resolution 39; Lambeth Conference 1908, Resolution 74.

¹¹ The Anglican Report of the Anglican Delegation to the Conference was published as *The Church of England and the Church of Sweden: Report of the Commission Appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in Pursuance of Resolution 74 of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 on the Relation of the Anglican Communion to the Church of Sweden* (London 1911); online at: <http://anglicanhistory.org/lutherania/conference1909.html>.

¹² *Ibid.*, Conclusion.

“Here we have an opportunity for such communion with a Church which is the most like our own in history and organization of any in Europe.”¹³

At the 1920 Lambeth Conference that opportunity became reality. Resolutions 24 and 25 related to the Church of Sweden. They reiterated the conclusions of the 1909 Report, recommending, “that members of [the Church of Sweden], qualified to receive the sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours” and that “on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches.”¹⁴ In addition, a further resolution was approved, which affirmed that Anglican bishops might accept invitations to take part in the consecration of a Swedish bishop.¹⁵ The Lambeth Conference had recognised of the orders of the Church of Sweden and effectively introduced what is now referred to as full interchangeability of ministries. It was not until 1922 that the Swedish bishops responded with a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury expressing their “deep and sincere satisfaction” that the Lambeth Conference “after long and thoroughgoing negotiations” had found “the time come for a closer connexion between the two Churches, of such a kind as from its most important feature might be characterised as intercommunion.”¹⁶ The Swedish bishops hinted that there had been some hesitations on the Swedish side: the Church of Sweden had generally required assent to the *Confessio Augustana* as a precondition for eucharistic hospitality or intercommunion. However, they recognised that “direct acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* has not been considered in all cases as the necessary condition for the concession of intercommunion” as attested also by North-American Swedish-Anglican relations since the seventeenth century, according to which “intercommunion of this kind has existed in North America between our Church and yours.”¹⁷

Together, the 1920 Appeal and the Resolutions relating to the Church of Sweden formed the basis for discussions between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, which led to an agreement in 1934,¹⁸ and with the Churches of Estonia and Latvia, leading to an

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 24.

¹⁵ Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 25.

¹⁶ “The Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden,” in: George Bell (ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity 1920-4* (OUP: Oxford 1924), 185-195, here 185.

¹⁷ Ibid., 186. This affirmation drew on a long history of relationships both between Sweden and England, but also, importantly, between English and Swedish emigrants in the USA. The first graduate of the Episcopal Seminary at Nashotah House was Gustaf Elias Unonius (1810-1902), a Swedish Lutheran who was ordained deacon and priest by Jackson Kemper, Episcopal missionary bishop in Minnesota and Kansas. See Gustav Unonius, *A Pioneer in Northwest America*, and other documents online at <http://anglicanhistory.org/nashotah/unonius/index.html> [last visited 12 May 2007], and compare also Henry Renaud Turner Brandreth, “Approaches of the Churches towards each other in the nineteenth century,” in: Ruth Rouse & Stephen Charles Neill (eds), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948* (London, 2nd edition 1967), 259-306, at 295-296.

¹⁸ An agreement was reached between the Church of England and the Church of Finland in 1934. See *Report of the Committee Appointed to Confer with Representatives of the Church of Finland In Accordance with Resolution 38 of the Lambeth Conference, 1930* (London 1934); online at <http://anglicanhistory.org/lutherania/finland1934.html>.

agreement in 1938.¹⁹ Both these agreements affirmed mutual eucharistic hospitality and included a commitment to invite the bishops of the other church to take part in consecrations. The negotiations which led to the agreement with Latvia and Estonia were instigated on the basis of a request by the Archbishop of Latvia and the Bishop of Estonia, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Gordon Lang. On this basis, a delegation was appointed, and meetings took place in Lambeth in March 1936, and in Riga and Tallinn in 1938.²⁰ These considered Scripture,²¹ the authority of the church (including councils),²² and tradition;²³ the creeds;²⁴ the Sacraments²⁵ (noting “substantial agreement about the doctrine of the Eucharist”);²⁶ and the ministry, particularly with regard to episcopacy. All agreed on the necessity of a properly ordered ministry, but there was disagreement about the nature and importance of succession and differences in practice about who might ordain presbyters/priests.²⁷ The Archbishop of Latvia explained that “so far [he] had been installed, but the question of his consecration could not be decided before the next meeting of the Synod. The German minority in Latvia, like the Germans of the Reich, was suspicious of episcopacy.”²⁸ He noted that in practice he always ordained pastors, although this was not actually required of him.²⁹ The Bishop of Estonia had been consecrated according to the rites of the Church of Sweden by Archbishop Eidem of Upsala, Bishop Lehtonen of Tampere and Archbishop Grünbergs of Latvia, a development that had been noted with interest in England.³⁰ All were agreed that the intention in all three Churches was “to ordain bishops, priests and deacons to an office in the universal church of Christ and not merely in a particular Church.”³¹ The aim of their conversations, as the Anglican chair, Arthur Cayley Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, articulated it, “should be to reach a state of affairs in which a priest of the Church of England would be recognised as a priest in the Churches of Latvia and Estonia and that a priest of those Churches should would be recognised as such in the

¹⁹ As reported in *Conferences between Representatives appointed by the Archbishop the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Church of England and Representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Latvia and Estonia* (London 1938) [hereafter *Anglican, Latvian and Estonian Conferences*]; online at: http://anglicanhistory.org/lutherania/latvia_estonia1938.html.

²⁰ Extensive minutes in the form of transcripts of these conversations were produced and are held at Lambeth Palace Library (hereafter LPL). The minutes of the 1936 London conversations can be found in LPL, Douglas Papers, vol. 74, fol. 238-265. A transcript of the 1938 Riga/Tallinn conversations is included in LPL, papers of the Church of England’s Council for Foreign Relations (hereafter CFR), Lutheran and Reformed Churches, file 21 (Estonia).

²¹ *Anglican, Latvian and Estonian Conferences*, 13-14.

²² *Ibid.*, 14-15.

²³ *Ibid.*, 15.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, quotations 16-17, discussion 16-21.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 20.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 21-24.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 22.

³⁰ G. K. A. Bell (ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity: Third Series 1930-1948* (Oxford University Press 1948), 154.

³¹ *Anglican, Latvian and Estonian Conferences*, 23. However, the delegates recognised that in the Latvian and Estonian Churches the diaconate existed as an office rather than as an order of ministry: *Ibid.*, 24.

Church of England.”³² That is, the discussions sought to achieve mutual interchangeability of ministries.

The second conference met in Riga on 18 and 20 June 1938 and then at Tallinn from 22 to 24 June 1938. In Riga, the discussions focused once again on order and ministry. Headlam stressed that “the Church of England ... says quite clearly that all bishops are to be properly consecrated by other bishops, and all clergy are to be ordained by bishops. That is the point on which all must agree in the Conference.”³³ While “there was no opposition on the Lutheran side to the office of bishop as such,” in the Latvian Church pastors could be ordained by the Dean, and although in practice they were ordained by the bishop except in exceptional cases, the Latvian Church wanted to retain the possibility which was based on their understanding of the universal priesthood of all believers.³⁴ Dr Grüner of the Latvian Church distinguished between the spiritual value of the bishop’s office and the canonical and legal aspects: “Could not the function of oversight be exercised as well in the Lutheran tradition as in the Anglican?” The Bishop of Gloucester thought that “it was not necessary to express an opinion on the theoretical question, but from a practical point of view episcopacy was necessary for Church unity. ... The breaking of the traditional ministry has resulted in the present lack of unity in Christendom.”³⁵ In Tallinn, discussions centred on seven questions put by the Estonian participants relating to the faith of the Church of England. The question of confirmation was raised, and specifically whether it must be “performed only by the Bishop”; it was agreed that the Church of England “was prepared to accept confirmation as conducted in Sweden and Finland,” although some in the Church of England would be unhappy with confirmation done by anyone other than the bishop.³⁶ It was agreed also that members of each other’s churches should be admitted to communion when appropriate.³⁷

These discussions resulted in a report and recommendations which agreed and signed on 24 June:

We have considered with great care that agreements and differences in the doctrine and customs of the three Churches, and have to report that on most fundamental points of doctrine there is agreement. Such relations between the three Churches as we recommend do not require from any of the three Communion that acceptance of all doctrinal opinion or of all sacramental or liturgical practice characteristic of either of the others, but imply that each believes the others to hold the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. We are of the opinion that all three Churches hold the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

We recommend therefore:

1. That if the Archbishop of Latvia or the Bishop of Estonia shall invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a bishop to take part in the consecration of a

³² Ibid., 23.

³³ Ibid., 30. Discussions made particular reference to a statement by the Swedish Lutheran Bishops about ministry and the section in the Doctrine Report of the Church of England (1938) dealing with episcopacy (Ibid., 121-123).

³⁴ Ibid., 30, 31.

³⁵ Ibid., 33.

³⁶ Ibid., 36-37.

³⁷ “Transcript of the Riga/Tallinn conversations,” CFR, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, file 21 (Estonia).

bishop in either of the Churches of Latvia or Estonia, he shall commission a bishop for such a purpose; and, in the same way, if the Archbishop of Canterbury shall ask the Archbishop of Latvia and the Bishop of Estonia to appoint a bishop to take part in the consecration of a bishop in the Church of England, they shall commission a bishop for such a purpose.

2. The Anglican delegation recommends that admission of communicants of the Churches of Latvia and Estonia to communion in the Church of England, and takes note of the fact that, as it is stated, the Churches of Latvia and Estonia would be ready to admit to communion at their altars communicant members of the Church of England.

The Conference further recommends:

3. That if at the time of the Lambeth Conference or at any other time there shall be a Conference between bishops of the Anglican Communion and bishops of other Churches in communion with it, bishops of the Churches of Latvia and Estonia shall be asked to attend it, and that the Churches of Latvia and Estonia shall invite Anglican bishops to similar conferences if they are held in the future.

4. That the Anglican clergy should be ready to baptize and marry members of the Latvian and Estonian Evangelical Churches in England or in any British colony, and that the clergy of Latvia and Estonia should perform like functions for members of the Anglican Church who have not access to an Anglican clergyman. It is to be desired also that they provide certificates of Baptism and Marriage.³⁸

These resolutions were virtually identical to those agreed with the Church in Finland in 1934. They went further than the Lambeth Resolution of 1920 relating to the Church of Sweden, including not only the extension of mutual Eucharistic hospitality, but also an explicit affirmation that mutual invitations to episcopal consecrations should be issued. The agreement with Latvia and Estonia was particularly interesting since neither church claimed that it had an unbroken episcopate. This point was emphasised by the 1948 Lambeth Conference, which received the 1938 report, noting that the Churches of Latvia and Estonia “had formerly been under general superintendents; but after the first world war, the first Bishop of Estonia was consecrated by the Archbishop of Uppsala, and the first Bishop of Latvia by the Archbishop of Uppsala and the Estonian Bishop.”³⁹ However, the bishops observed that the situation of Latvia and Estonia in 1948 was difficult to judge:

The whole situation of the Latvian and Estonian nations has been gravely affected by the war, which broke out soon after the Report had been considered by the Convocations. It is exceedingly difficult to obtain any information about Church conditions inside the two countries: and the Archbishop of Latvia and the Bishop of Estonia are, the one a “displaced person” and the other, it is believed, an exile in Siberia. The Archbishop of Latvia (Dr Grünbergs) was himself never consecrated a bishop, and the position of both Churches is beset with difficulties. We are happy to know that spiritual and material help are being given by the Church of England and other Churches in Great Britain to the increasing number of

³⁸ *Anglican, Latvian and Estonian Conferences.*

³⁹ *The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops; together with Resolutions and Reports* (London 1948), 75.

Latvians and Estonians coming to Great Britain. We do not think, however, that the time is propitious for any special action in the field of ecumenical relationship.⁴⁰

Nonetheless, it was recognised that Anglicans had a “special relationship” to the Latvian and Estonian Churches and this was reiterated in 1955, when the Church of England insisted that Latvian and Estonian Church Leaders be included in an official visit England by leaders of the Russian Churches.⁴¹ Efforts were made to ensure that the Latvian and Estonian representatives were invited independently and not through the Russian Metropolitan,⁴² and in Latvia, Archbishop Tūrs wrote to his KGB “minder” asking permission to participate, including a translation of the 1938 agreement into Russian.⁴³ The visit concluded with a Eucharist at Westminster Abbey on 17 July 1955, at which, Tūrs recorded, “from the eminent Anglican clergyman, the Archbishop, we – the Baltic (Latvian and Estonian) Lutheran Bishops – received the Holy Communion meal, which blessed event was an approval of our church, and an affirmation of the pre-existent intercommunion (sharing of Holy Communion between two faiths [*sic*]).”⁴⁴ Of the whole delegation, which included Roman Catholic and Orthodox Church leaders, only the Latvian and Estonian Archbishops were invited to communicate.

Both the Bonn Agreement and the agreements between Anglicans and the Churches of Sweden, Finland, Latvia and Estonia brought about closer relationships between churches which largely operated in separate geographical areas. Particularly for the Anglican-Lutheran agreements, a strong motive was to secure the provision of spiritual and pastoral care of church members living in the other country. This situation was very different in the case of the protracted negotiations which led to the establishment of the Churches of South and North India, Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The United Churches of South and North India, Bangladesh and Pakistan

The first discussions which would lead nearly thirty years later to the founding of the Church of South India took place in 1919. By 1923, the discussions had already reached the point of considering how a commissioning service might be formulated so as not to create “virtually a dual ministry in the united Church”.⁴⁵ The 1930 Lambeth Conference recognised that, in what it described as “a novel feature” of the scheme, “a complete agreement between the uniting Churches on certain points of doctrine and practice is not expected to be reached before the inauguration of the union; but the promoters of the scheme believe that unity will

⁴⁰ Ibid., 76.

⁴¹ CFR correspondence, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, file 21 (Estonia), 10 January 1955.

⁴² As evidenced by the subsequent correspondence: CFR correspondence, Lutheran and Reformed Churches, file 21 (Estonia).

⁴³ I am grateful here and in what follows to the Revd Jana Jeruma-Grinberga for sharing her research in the Consistory Archive of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church (LELC), Riga. Tūrs subsequently wrote an extensive report on his trip for the KGB, which was later published in *Baznīcas Kalendārs 1956* (Church Calendar).

⁴⁴ LELC, Consistory Archive, “Report of the Visit to England”.

⁴⁵ G. K. A. Bell (ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity 1920-4* (London 1924), “Resolutions of the Fourth Meeting of the Joint Committee on Union of the Anglican and S.I.I.C. Churches” (April 1923), 311-328; and Resolutions adopted by the Ninth General Assembly of the South India United Church (August 1923), 328-329.

be reached gradually and more securely by the interaction of the different elements of the united Church upon one another."⁴⁶ However, in many ways the approach taken by the South India Scheme incorporated that envisaged in the 1920 Appeal, which called for:

a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communion now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.⁴⁷

When the Church of South India (CSI) was inaugurated on 27 September 1947, it was rightly hailed as a major achievement, becoming the first united church bring together churches with episcopal and non-episcopal ministries – Anglican (Episcopal), Congregational, Presbyterian and Methodist – into a united Episcopal church. The bishops assembled at 1948 Lambeth Conference, however, took issue with the means by which the ministries had been reconciled, and particularly the form of the commissioning service. Looking back in 1968, J. I. Packer reflected that in 1948,

Lambeth's attitude to the young church was one of freezing nonwelcome. The bishops expressed disapproval of the way that its ministry had been unified (i.e., by unqualified mutual recognition of episcopal and non-episcopal orders alike, under the historic episcopate), and said that though this 'heroic experiment in reunion' was 'under the guidance, as we believe, of the Holy Spirit', no such unification should ever happen again if Anglicans could help it.⁴⁸

The bishops' objections centred on the way in which ministries were recognised. Mark Laing has summarised the approach taken in establishing the CSI:

The S[outh] I[ndia] S[cheme] recognized all ministers of the uniting churches, whether or not they had been episcopally ordained. Since the SIS accepted that there was but one ordination to the universal church, in the actual service of unification there was authorization, induction, and installation, granting ordained ministers full authority to exercise ministry in their respective spheres. The unification service categorically avoided any form of supplemental ordination. The CSI, however, accepted the historical episcopate as the legitimate center for the organization of the church. In its constitution it acknowledged that it would grow toward that goal: all new CSI ministers would be episcopally ordained, and they would thus gradually replace non-episcopal ministers when such ministers retired from service.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Lambeth Conference 1930, resolution 40.c.

⁴⁷ Lambeth 1920, Resolution 9.iv.

⁴⁸ James I. Packer, "The Church of South India and Reunion in England," *The Churchman* 82 (1968), 249-261, at 250.

⁴⁹ Mark Laing, "The International Impact of the Formation of the Church of South India: Bishop Newbigin Versus the Anglican Fathers," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 33 (2009), 18-24, at 19.

The missionary and deaconess Carol Graham described the inauguration of the new church, which was presided over by Right Reverend C. K. Jacob, the Anglican Bishop in Travancore and Cochin and at that time the only Indian Diocesan in South India:

One by one the representatives of the uniting churches stood forth to read aloud the resolutions of their respective governing bodies accepting the scheme of union and then laid upon the altar a book containing the signatures of the Ministers in each Communion assenting to the Basis of Union and accepting the Constitution of the united Church. Then came the solemn declaration by the Bishop presiding that the Church of South India had come into being. The *Te Deum* followed immediately as a fitting climax, after which the six existing Bishops, kneeling at the Communion rail, were commissioned by a Presbyter of each of the nonepiscopal Churches to exercise their authority throughout the Church of South India. Presbyters who were present were then commissioned by the Bishop presiding, all standing to declare their loyal acceptance of the Basis of Union, which includes the Creed of the Church, and then kneeling to receive an added authority for the exercise of their ministry wherever they may be appointed.⁵⁰

The first service of the newly constituted church followed after a short break, a eucharist in which nine new bishops were consecrated, “each being presented by two Presbyters of his former Communion as ‘a godly and well-learned person to be ordained and consecrated Bishop’”, with “the laying-on of hands by the Bishop presiding, assisted by two other Bishops (Madras and Tinnevely) and three Presbyters from each of the other uniting churches.”⁵¹ Graham stressed “this is only the *inauguration* of union, not the *consummation*. As we learn bit by bit, perhaps even by painful degrees, how good and joyful a thing it is to dwell together in unity, we shall need to face frankly and fearlessly the difficulties which will almost inevitably arise.”⁵² Similarly, in 1952, A. M. Hollis, Bishop of Madras and Moderator of the CSI reflected that the establishment of the new church had been

an act of faith; a step into what was, in very many respects, an unknown future. No amount of negotiating or drafting of constitutions can tell you what union is going to be like, before you are united. We were risking the abandonment of what God has given us in our amazingly rich denominational inheritances.⁵³

Since its inauguration, the CSI had, he affirmed, come to be “not unthankful for Anglicanism or Congregationalism or Presbyterianism or Methodism, but we know now that no one of them is enough by itself.” The CSI had grown out of “the conviction that a divided Church is a denial of the Gospel which the Church exists to proclaim. ... It is alive and it is going on living.” Indeed, David Challapa reflected in 1956, by stimulating discussion over its recognition of orders, the CSI might well have done wider ecumenical theology a significant service:

The emergence of the C.S.I. ... and the controversy that has ensued on its Orders is a challenge to all of us to set our doctrinal houses in order. Unfortunately, emphasis in the past tended to be too exclusively on the preservation of the Succession, without

⁵⁰ Carol Graham, “The Inauguration of the Church of South India,” *International review of Mission* 37 (1948), 49-53, at 50.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 52.

⁵³ A. M. Hollis, “The Church of South India,” in: *The Spectator*, no. 6583 (26 September 1952), 388.

reference to the Church as a whole. The notion was too long encouraged that the only thing that mattered was the link with the historic episcopate. One cannot help thinking that some harm has been done in separating Faith from Order. The C.S.I. will, therefore, have aided the cause of ecumenical unity, if it drives Christians all over the world to re-think the whole doctrine of the Church, and of the Ministry as a part thereof.⁵⁴

Chellappa's sense that the doctrine of the Church "can only be *evolved*, not *invented* afresh" expressed his clear sense that the CSI was on a journey of discovery.⁵⁵ Similarly, J. R. Chandran affirmed that "Church Union has enlarged my understanding of the purpose of God," and that the CSI

has meant to many a deepening of the experience of church membership and a deepening of the knowledge of the fullness of the Church. For many, the Church has ceased to be an organization with the limited bearings of a denomination and has become the growing realization of the salvation of God.⁵⁶

The lived experience of unity was an incarnational, salvific reality.

By the time of the 1958 Lambeth Conference, as the bishops "noted without disapproval", the four British and Irish Churches and the Church of India, Burma, Pakistan and Ceylon had recognised the orders of the CSI.⁵⁷ The 1968 conference recommended that "a bishop or episcopally ordained minister of the Church of South India" should experience "no restriction on the exercise of his ministry in other [Anglican] Churches with which the Church of South India is in communion", and called on all Churches and provinces of the Anglican Communion to "re-examine their relation to the Church of South India with a view to entering into full communion with that Church."⁵⁸ Packer commented that this resolution was passed by the Anglican bishops "despite the known fact that the CSI ministry is not entirely episcopal nor is it likely to become fully so in the immediate future."⁵⁹

However, the 1958 Lambeth Conference, was not unequivocally positive. The bishops returned to questions of church union, and, as the American Methodist theologian, J. Robert Nelson noted in his comment on the ecumenical report:

Three ways of unifying ministries were before the conference: that of the Church of South India with its well-known intentional tolerance of both episcopally and nonepiscopally ordained ministries for a period of thirty years; the Ceylon scheme with its initial act of unification; and the North India plan with

⁵⁴ David Chellappa, "I Believe in the C.S.I.": Reflections of an Ex-Anglican," *Theology* 57 (1954), 250-257, at 254-255.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 254.

⁵⁶ J. R. Chandran, "The Church of South India: A Church on the Move," *Theology* 57 (1954), 242-250, at 243.

⁵⁷ Cited according to Packer, "The Church of South India and Reunion in England," 250, who is presumably referring to the "Report of the Committee on Church Unity and the Church Universal concerning the Church of South India" which was welcomed and endorsed by Resolution 18.

⁵⁸ Lambeth Conference 1968, resolution 48.

⁵⁹ Packer, "The Church of South India and Reunion in England," 250.

its two-stage unification of, first, the Anglican and Methodist episcopates and, second, of the presbyterates.⁶⁰

The bishops expressed their strong preference for either the Ceylon or the North India scheme (the latter would eventually lead to the establishment of the Churches of North India, Bangladesh and Pakistan, whilst the former was stymied by a series of lawsuits) and in particular for the rites proposed by those schemes for the constituting of the united church, which involved the mutual reception of presbyters with prayer and laying on of hands. Lesslie Newbigin criticised these rites of “mutual acceptance” or “supplemental ordination” for their ambiguity: he saw them as “the attempt to combine a recognition of an existing ordination with the addition to it of something which also has the character of ordination.”⁶¹ His concern, as Laing points out, was that the proposed rites “allowed an equivocal interpretation: while non-Anglicans might view it as a harmless ceremony, Anglicans could see it as ordination itself.”⁶² Some of Newbigin’s contemporaries felt that the Lambeth Conference was trying to push the North India Scheme down a route it was seeking to avoid.⁶³ The Scottish theologian J. K. S. Reid noted that “the principle of immediate unification of ministries, together with the rite proposed for effecting it, commends itself [to the Bishops], as gradual unification and the relevant plan used in the case of the CSI do not,” although he complained that the report was not clear as to why this was the case.⁶⁴ Reflecting on the Anglican position, the Ceylonese Methodist minister Daniel Thambyrajah Niles, at that time principal of Jaffna College, observed that for two churches entering into a communion relationship with mutual recognition of ministries, but not into a church union, “the crux of the matter is that any action to be performed by uniting churches must have reality in terms of the life and convictions of those churches.”⁶⁵ However, in establishing a church union, these distinctions have to vanish:

Churches in their division will adopt certain practices to regulate their relationship to each other. But these very practices become intolerable as defining the relations of churches in their Union. Thus, when a Methodist minister joins the Anglican Church, the Anglican Church ordains him without taking into account the fact that he has already been ordained. But a Methodist minister, coming as a member of his whole Church into a United Church, cannot accept that the United Church could be silent about the fact that he is already ordained.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ J. Robert Nelson, “Commentary on the ‘Report on Church Unity’ of the Lambeth Conference of 1958,” *Ecumenical Review* 11 (1958-59), 177-181, at 179.

⁶¹ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church: A Defence of the South India Scheme* (London, second edition 1960), xxiv; cited according to Laing, “International Impact,” 19.

⁶² Laing, “International Impact,” 19.

⁶³ See, for instance, J. K. S. Reid, “Lambeth on Church Unity,” and V. E. Devaduit, “The Lambeth Conference of 1958 and the plan of Church Union, North India and Pakistan,” both in *Ecumenical Review* 11 (1958-59), 172-16 and 182-187 respectively.

⁶⁴ Reid, “Lambeth on Church Unity,” 173.

⁶⁵ D. T. Niles, “Church Union in North India, Pakistan and Ceylon,” *Ecumenical Review* 14 (1961-62), 305-322, at 306.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 307.

The intention in the Ceylon scheme was not to seek to bring together “two mutually exclusive types of ordination – one episcopal and the other non-episcopal,” as some of the Anglican critics seemed to have suggested. Rather, whilst “there are certainly two traditions of ordination ... they inhere in one indivisible Church,” and the rite of constituting the church leaves des not seek to judge “how and in what measure these two traditions overlap or fall outside one another in the ordaining act of God.”⁶⁷

A decade later, the 1968 Lambeth conference resolved that on the implementation of the North India and Ceylon/Lanka schemes for reunion, the churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion should “enter into full communion with” the churches thus inaugurated and “foster the relations of fellowship which this involves.”⁶⁸ Nonetheless, like the CSI, the three United Churches – the Church of North India, Church of Bangladesh and Church of Pakistan – which evolved out of the North India Scheme, although they were from their establishment in communion with the member churches of the Anglican Communion, did not acquire full membership of the Anglican Communion until 1990.⁶⁹ The different schemes had taken different approaches to achieving the interchangeability of ministries, but both led to a presbyteral ministry which was episcopally ordained (in the CSI after a generation) and gave rise to relationships of Communion with the other churches and provinces of the Anglican communion.

Anglican-Lutheran relationships of (Full) Communion

These differences in approach continued in the agreements which to date have established relationships of (full) communion between Anglicans and Lutherans: the Porvoo Common Statement between British and Irish Anglican churches and most of the Lutheran Churches of the Nordic and Baltic (with the exception of Latvia);⁷⁰ the Waterloo Declaration of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada and the Anglican Church of Canada;⁷¹ and “Called to Common Mission,” between The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.⁷² All three agreements achieve reconciliation of ministries, and the mutual involvement of bishops from the respective partner churches in episcopal ordinations or institutions going forward. The two North American agreements also offer considerable scope for growing into closer and deeper missional relationships since the partner churches are ministering in the same geographical areas; however, these were not conceived as schemes leading directly to the uniting of the churches concerned.

A key step in these agreements was the articulation of the deep relationship between episcopacy, episcopé and apostolicity. Thus the Porvoo Common Statement affirmed:

We believe that a ministry of pastoral oversight (episcopé), exercised in personal, collegial and communal ways, is necessary as witness to and safeguard of the unity

⁶⁷ Ibid., 317.

⁶⁸ Lambeth Conference 1968, resolutions 49 and 50.

⁶⁹ See Ian Douglas, “Church of South India Contributes to Anglican Communion,” Anglican News Service, 14 September 1999; online at: <http://www.anglicannews.org/news/1999/09/church-of-south-india-contributes-to-anglican-communion.aspx>.

⁷⁰ Online at: http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/102178/porvoo_common_statement.pdf.

⁷¹ Online at: <https://www.anglican.ca/faith/eir/full-communion-partnership/waterloo/>.

⁷² Online at: <https://www.episcopalchurch.org/page/agreement-full-communion-called-common-mission>.

and apostolicity of the Church. Further, we retain and employ the episcopal office as a sign of our intention, under God, to ensure the continuity of the Church in apostolic life and witness.⁷³

On the basis of their shared faith, the Porvoo churches were able to affirm:

that each church as a whole has maintained an authentic apostolic succession of witness and service; that each church has had transmitted to it an apostolic ministry of word and sacrament by prayer and the laying on of hands; that each church has maintained an orderly succession of episcopal ministry within the continuity of its pastoral life, focused in the consecrations of bishops and in the experience and witness of the historic sees.⁷⁴

In consequence of this, the Statement concluded that “the time has come when all our churches can affirm together the value and use of the sign of the historic episcopal succession.”⁷⁵ Building on the interwar agreements, the Porvoo Common Statement affirmed that “those churches in which the sign has at some time not been used are free to recognise the value of the sign and should embrace it without denying their own apostolic continuity.”⁷⁶ The statement thus recognised different ways in which the apostolic continuity of the church could be sustained. Consequently, the Porvoo Common Statement also asserted that “those churches in which the sign has been used ... should affirm the apostolic continuity of those churches in which the sign of episcopal succession has at some time not been used.”⁷⁷ The Porvoo Common Statement did not define any particular rite, but instructed that “this agreement and our new relationship be inaugurated and affirmed by three central celebrations of the eucharist at which all our churches would be represented.” These celebrations were to be “a sign of our joyful acceptance of one another; our joint commitment in the faith and sacramental life of the Church; our welcome of the ministers and members of the other churches as our own; our commitment to engage in mission together.”⁷⁸ They should include “the reading and signing of the Porvoo Declaration; a central prayer of thanksgiving for the past and petition for the future, offered by Lutherans for Anglicans and Anglicans for Lutherans; the exchange of the Peace; a jointly celebrated eucharist; other verbal and ceremonial signs of our common life.”⁷⁹ The mutual recognition of ministries in the Porvoo Statement explicitly applied only to “persons episcopally ordained in any of our churches to the office of bishop, priest or deacon”, who might be invited “to serve, by invitation and in accordance with any regulations which may from time to time be in force, in that ministry in the receiving church without re-ordination.”⁸⁰ Initially, in the period before the Church of England had admitted women to the priesthood, the “regulations which may from time to time be in force” excluded female priests from the Lutheran signatory churches from serving in the Church of England; later, before the Church

⁷³ Porvoo Common Statement, § 32.k.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, § 56.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, § 57.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, § 59.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, § 58.b.v.

of England had admitted women to the episcopate, this caveat excluded all those priests ordained by a female bishop from service in the Church of England.

In Canada, the Waterloo Declaration took a more inclusive approach. The Anglican and Lutheran churches acknowledged

that one another's ordained ministries are given by God as instruments of divine grace and as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also Christ's commission through his body, the Church (An Appeal to all Christian People, Lambeth Conference, 1920); and that these ministries are the gifts of God's Spirit to equip the people of God for the work of ministry (Ephesians 4:11-12).⁸¹

The two churches acknowledged further

that the episcopal office is valued and maintained in both our churches as a visible sign expressing and serving the Church's unity and continuity in apostolic life, mission and ministry. (The Porvoo Common Statement, 1993)⁸²

On this basis, the Declaration affirmed, with a similar affirmation from the Lutheran side:

The Anglican Church of Canada hereby recognizes the full authenticity of the ordained ministries of bishops and pastors presently existing within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, acknowledging its pastors as priests in the Church of God and its bishops as bishops and chief pastors exercising a ministry of episcopate over the jurisdictional areas of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada in which they preside.⁸³

Like Porvoo (but omitting the qualifier "episcopally"), Canadian Anglican and Lutheran churches therefore committed themselves "to welcome persons ordained in either of our churches to the office of bishop, priest/pastor or deacon to serve, by invitation and in accordance with any regulations which may from time to time be in force, in that ministry in the receiving church without re-ordination."⁸⁴ The Declaration does not define a form of service to mark this agreement, although one certainly took place.

Called to Common Mission took an approach which defined a growing into the future, more akin to the model of the CSI:

Within the future common pattern, the ministry of pastors/priests will be shared from the outset Some functions of ordained deacons in The Episcopal Church and consecrated diaconal ministers and deaconesses in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America can be shared insofar as they are called to be agents of the church in meeting needs, hopes, and concerns within church and society. The churches will over time come to share in the ministry of bishops in an evangelical, historic succession This succession also is manifest in the churches' use of the apostolic scriptures, the confession of the ancient creeds, and the celebration of the sacraments instituted by our Lord.⁸⁵

This required "an immediate recognition by The Episcopal Church of presently existing ordained ministers within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and a commitment

⁸¹ Waterloo Declaration, § A.4.

⁸² Ibid., § A.5.

⁸³ Ibid., § B.1.

⁸⁴ Ibid., § D.1.

⁸⁵ Called to Common Mission, § 8.

by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to receive and adapt an episcopate that will be shared.”⁸⁶ In order to make this recognition possible, TEC committed to

enacting a temporary suspension ... of the seventeenth-century restriction that “no persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are [episcopally] ordained, or have already received such ordination with the laying-on-of-hands by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders.”⁸⁷

This was the canonical step necessary in order to “permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all [the ELCA’s] pastors as priests or presbyters within The Episcopal Church, without any further ordination or re-ordination or supplemental ordination whatsoever, subject always to canonically or constitutionally approved invitation.”⁸⁸ Similarly, the ELCA pledged itself to take specific steps “in order to receive the historic episcopate”: “at least three bishops already sharing in the sign of the episcopal succession will be invited to participate in the installation of its next Presiding Bishop through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and with the laying-on-of-hands.”⁸⁹

These Anglican-Lutheran relationships take shape through the different ways in which churches work together. In Canada shared seminaries mean that Anglicans and Lutherans train together. The bishops of both churches meet regularly, and some joint synods take place. In one parish, one of the church buildings was physically relocated to provide a shared worship space made up of both original church buildings.

(Full) Communion with Moravian and Methodists

TEC has also reached an agreement of Full Communion with the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church. The agreement, “Finding Our Delight in the Lord” offers a detailed description of the rite by which the churches’ episcopal ministries would be reconciled, and subsequent involvement in episcopal consecrations.⁹⁰ This formed the basis for the recognition of the ministry of Moravian presbyters by TEC:

Following the inaugural liturgy of full communion, The Episcopal Church will consider bishops in the Moravian Church as bishops duly qualified to confer Holy Orders. ... All current ordained Moravian ministers in good standing as of the date of the full communion celebration will thus be considered clergy ordained by bishops in full communion with The Episcopal Church and thus eligible to minister in The Episcopal Church.⁹¹

Here too, TEC has made the decision to recognise the ministries of those ordained before the reconciliation of episcopal ministries.

The Church of Ireland’s 2014 agreement of communion with the Methodist Church of Ireland builds on the covenant signed by the two churches in 2002. It proceeds by way of

⁸⁶ Ibid., § 9.

⁸⁷ Ibid., § 16.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., § 19.

⁹⁰ Finding Our Delight in the Lord, §§ 30-33; online at https://www.episcopalchurch.org/files/finding_our_delight_official_text.pdf.

⁹¹ Ibid., § 34.

recognising the Methodist President of Conference as an episcopal minister, and by making provision for the Church of Ireland bishops and Presidents (and former Presidents) of Conference to take part in each other's consecrations or installations:

1. The Church of Ireland recognizes that the office of President of the Methodist Church in Ireland gives specific and personal expression to the historic episcopate as gifted to the whole Church of God.
2. The title 'episcopal minister', embraced by the Methodist Church in Ireland, expresses the role of serving and former Presidents in a manner consonant with, and parallel to, that in which the Church of Ireland describes the role of personal oversight exercised by a bishop.
3. The President of the Methodist Church in Ireland and at least two former presidents in the first instance (and at least two episcopal ministers thereafter) participate fully in the ordination/consecration of Church of Ireland bishops to symbolise and effect the consonance between the two traditions' understanding of personal and collegial episcopate.
4. At least three Church of Ireland bishops in the first instance (and at least two thereafter) participate fully in the installation and consecration of the President of the Methodist Church in Ireland to symbolise and effect the consonance between the two traditions' understanding of personal and collegial episcopate.
5. After both 3 and 4 above have taken place, presidents of the Methodist Church in Ireland and Church of Ireland bishops should participate fully – as often as is practicable – in the ordination of priests or presbyters of the other tradition.⁹²

This text is silent on the status of those ordained before the new arrangements take effect, although the original 2002 covenant affirmed:

We acknowledge each other's ordained ministries as given by God and as instruments of his grace by which our churches are served and built up. As pilgrims together, we look forward to the time when our ministries can be fully interchangeable and our churches visibly united.⁹³

The covenant commits the Anglican and Methodist Churches of Ireland to work together to achieve full interchangeability of ministries and a relationship of communion. The mutual recognition of episcopal ministry clearly achieves that aim for all those ordained in the future, even if the status of those ordained earlier is not quite clear.

Conclusion

The churches and the relationships between churches discussed in this article are all living and changing, developing and evolving. It is clear that there are many different ways by which full interchangeability of ministries can be achieved. For Anglicans, this is dependent on the mutual recognition of episcopal ministry, but Anglicans and Lutherans, Anglicans and Moravians, and Anglicans and Methodists have all found ways, appropriate to their specific relationship, to move forward together. The Anglican Bishops in 1920 decried the

⁹² Text online at: <https://www.irishmethodist.org/covenant-between-methodist-church-ireland-and-church-ireland>.

⁹³ Anglican Methodist Covenant (Ireland); online at: <http://www.covenantcouncil.com/resources/full-text-of-the-covenant/>.

disunity of the church: “we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.” They called churches to share with each other the riches of God’s grace, giving and receiving. It is apparent from the account of the establishment of the CSI than the bishops did not always find it easy to follow this road themselves. Nonetheless the relationship described here are all evidence that the Spirit of the 1920 Appeal – the Holy Spirit – continues to inspire Christians to seek the unity to which Christ called his church. As the bishops put it in 1920:

We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed into another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which he prayed.⁹⁴

⁹⁴ “Appeal to All Christian People,” Lambeth Conference 1920, Resolution 9.ix.