

## **The Lambeth Conference 2008**

### **Self Select Session on ‘Roman Catholic Perspectives on Anglicans’**

During this session chaired by the Most Revd Dr Drexel Gomez, Primate of the West Indies, Cardinal Walter Kasper of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity reflected on the contribution of *The Windsor Report*, the unity of the church and the episcopate, and the place of hermeneutics and related issues. Responses were made by the Revd Canon Dr John Gibaut, Director of Faith and Order, World Council of Churches, the Rt Revd Christopher Hill, Bishop of Guildford, and the Rt Revd David Beetge, Bishop of the Highveld.

#### ***1. From Cardinal Walter Kasper:***

It is my privilege to bring to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, to each of you here present, and to all the participants of this highly significant Lambeth Conference, the greetings of Pope Benedict XVI and of the whole staff of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. All of us are with you in these days; we are with you in our thoughts and in our prayers, and we want to express our deep solidarity with your joys, and with your concerns and sorrows as well.

Permit me to begin by extending my thanks to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the staff co-ordinating ecumenical relations at Lambeth Palace and at the Anglican Communion Office, for the invitation to take part in this important gathering and for the opportunity to offer some reflections on our common concerns. It is a strength of Anglicanism that even in the midst of difficult circumstances, you have sought the views and perspectives of your ecumenical partners, even when you have not always particularly rejoiced in what we have said. But rest assured, what I am about to say, I say as a friend.

When I saw what you proposed as subject, "Roman Catholic Reflections on the Anglican Communion", I thought that you could have chosen an easier one. This is a wide open title encompassing many aspects of history and doctrine, and I can only touch upon some of them. But it seems to me that there is a hidden question in the title, asking not so much what Catholics think about the Anglican Communion, but about the Anglican Communion in its present circumstances. I could imagine a less uncomfortable question.

My paper will be divided into three sections: an overview of our relations in recent years; ecclesiological considerations in light of the current situation within Anglicanism; and a brief reflection on underlying questions beneath current controversies and points of dispute within Anglicanism, especially those which have also had an effect on your relations with the Catholic Church. In the conclusion, I will offer a response to a quite unexpected question posed to me a few months ago by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which puzzled me a great deal, namely, what kind of Anglicanism do you want? – what a question! I hope that you yourself know the right answer – and what are the hopes of the

Catholic Church for the Anglican Communion in the months and years ahead? Here the answer is easier: We hope that we will not be drawn apart, and that we will be able to remain in serious dialogue in search of full unity, so that the world may believe.

## I. Overview of Relations in Recent Years

Let me in this first section refresh our memories, lest we forget what and how much we have already achieved in the last 40 years. When the Second Vatican Council, in its Decree on Ecumenism, turned its attention to the “many Communions (which) were separated from the Roman See” in the 16th century, it acknowledged that “among those in which Catholic traditions and institutions in part continue to exist, the Anglican Communion occupies a special place” (*Unitatis redintegratio* §13). This statement is grounded in an ecclesiological understanding that from the Catholic perspective, the Anglican Communion contains significant elements of the Church of Jesus Christ. In their 1977 Common Declaration, Archbishop of Canterbury Donald Coggan and Pope Paul VI identified some of those ecclesial elements when they wrote:

"As the Roman Catholic Church and the constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion have sought to grow in mutual understanding and Christian love, they have come to recognize, to value and to give thanks for a common faith in God our Father, in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit; our common baptism into Christ; our sharing of the Holy Scriptures, of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and the teaching of the Fathers; our common Christian inheritance for many centuries with its living traditions of liturgy, theology, spirituality and mission."

In this text, we can hear Archbishop Coggan and Paul VI pointing to what is the common ground, the common source and centre of our already existing but still incomplete unity: Jesus Christ, and the mission to bring Him to a world that is so desperately in need of Him. What we are talking about is not an ideology, not a private opinion which one may or may not share; it is our faithfulness to Jesus Christ, witnessed by the apostles, and to His Gospel, with which we are entrusted. From the very beginning we should, therefore, keep in mind what is at stake as we proceed to speak about faithfulness to the apostolic tradition and apostolic succession, when we speak about the threefold ministry, women's ordination, and moral commandments. What we are talking about is nothing other than our faithfulness to Christ Himself, who is our unique and common master. And what else can our dialogue be but an expression of our intent and desire to be fully one in Him in order to be fully joint witnesses to His Gospel.

It has often been said, and is worth restating, that the dialogue was dynamized by the desire to be faithful to Christ's expressed will that His disciples be one, just as He is one with the Father; and that this unity was directly linked to Christ's mission, the Church's mission, to the world: may they be one so that the world may believe. Our witness and mission have been seriously hampered by our divisions, and it was out of faithfulness to Christ that we committed ourselves to a dialogue, based on the Gospel and the ancient common traditions, which had full visible unity as its goal. Yet full unity was not and is

not an end in itself, but a sign of and instrument for seeking unity with God and peace in the world.

With this in mind, when we can look back at what the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) has accomplished over the past nearly four decades, we can say with confidence that it has indeed borne good fruit. The first phase of ARCIC (1970-1981) addressed "Eucharistic Doctrine" (1971) and "Ministry and Ordination" (1973), and in each instance, claimed to have reached substantial agreement.

The official Catholic response (1991), while requesting further work on both subjects, spoke of these texts as "a significant milestone" which witnessed "to the achievement of points of convergence and even of agreement which many would not have thought possible before the Commission began its work". The "Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry" (1993) produced by members of the Commission were seen to "have greatly strengthened agreement in these areas" according to Catholic authorities. The first phase of ARCIC also produced two statements on the subject of "Authority in the Church" (1976, 1981), the theme at the heart of the divisions of the 16th century.

While the texts of the second phase of ARCIC (1983-2005) have not been put forward for a formal response in either the Catholic Church or the Anglican Communion, and have not led to a conclusive resolution or to a full consensus on the issues addressed, they have each suggested a growing rapprochement. "Salvation in the Church" (1986) resonates, in many ways, with the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine on Justification signed by the Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation in 1999. Building on the understanding of the Church as *koinonia* which was first set forward in the introduction of ARCIC I's Final Report, ARCIC II offered the Commission's most mature work on ecclesiology in The "Church as Communion" (1991).

"Life in Christ" (1994) was able to identify a shared vision and a common heritage for ethical teaching, despite differing pastoral applications of moral principles. "The Gift of Authority" (1999) returned to the theme of authority, and made important progress on the need for a universal ministry of primacy in the Church. "Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ" (2005) took important and unexpected strides towards a common understanding of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

As you well know, the ordination of women to the priesthood in several Anglican provinces, beginning in 1974, and to the episcopate, beginning in 1989, have greatly complicated relations between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church. I will return to this subject in due course. With this obstacle in mind, and seeking to determine what was nonetheless possible in furthering our relations, an important initiative was carried out not long after the last Lambeth Conference. In May of 2000, my predecessor, Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, and Archbishop George Carey, invited 13 Anglican Primates and the corresponding Presidents of Catholic Episcopal Conferences, or their representatives, to Mississauga, Canada, in order to assess what had been achieved in the ARCIC dialogue, and in light of both those achievements and the difficulties which marked our relations, to offer recommendations for possible steps forward.

I have been to many ecumenical meetings in my life, and I am happy to say that this was one of the best meetings I have ever attended. The spirit of prayerfulness and friendship, the serious reflection not only on the work of ARCIC but also on ecumenical relations in each particular region represented, and the profound desire for reconciliation which pervaded the Mississauga gathering, renewed hope for significant progress in relations between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church. One of the fruits of the Mississauga meeting was the establishment of the International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission (IARCCUM), a commission principally composed of bishops. During the past week of this Lambeth Conference, you have studied IARCCUM's statement, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*. Synthesizing the work of ARCIC, this document offers the Commission's assessment of how far we have come in our dialogue, and identifies remaining questions needing to be addressed.

Over the past 40 years, we have not only engaged jointly in theological dialogue. A close working relationship between Anglicans and Catholics has grown, not only on an international level, but also in many regional and local contexts. As Pope Benedict XVI and Archbishop Rowan Williams noted in their Common Declaration of November, 2006, "As our dialogue has developed, many Catholics and Anglicans have found in each other a love for Christ which invites us into practical co-operation and service. This fellowship in the service of Christ, experienced by many of our communities around the world, adds a further impetus to our relationship."

Indeed, it is not at all a small thing that we have achieved and that was given to us through the years of dialogue in ARCIC and IARCCUM. We are grateful for the work of these commissions, and we Catholics do not want those achievements to be lost. Indeed we want to continue on this path and bring what we started 40 years ago to its final goal.

This leaves me all the more saddened as I have now, in fidelity to what I believe Christ requires – and I want add, in the frankness which friendship allows – to look to the problems within the Anglican Communion which have emerged and grown since the last Lambeth Conference, and to the ecumenical repercussions of these internal tensions. In the second section of this paper, I would like to address a series of ecclesiological issues arising from the current situation in the Anglican Communion, and to raise some difficult and probing questions. But before doing so I want to reiterate what I said when in November 2006 the Archbishop of Canterbury came to Rome to visit Pope Benedict: "The questions and problems of our friends are also our questions and problems." So I raise these questions not in judgement, but as an ecumenical partner who has been deeply discouraged by recent developments, and who wishes to offer you an honest reflection, from a Catholic perspective, on how and where we can move forward in the present context.

## II. Ecclesiological considerations

What I want to say in this second section is – of course – not a magisterial treatise on ecclesiology. Again I only want to remind you of some common insights of the last

decades which can be or should be helpful in finding a way – hopefully a common way – forward.

Ecclesiological questions have long been a major point of controversy between our two communities. Already as a young student I studied all of the ecclesiological arguments raised by John Henry Newman, which moved him to become a Catholic. His main concerns revolved around apostolicity in communion with the See of Rome as the guardian of apostolic tradition and of the unity of the Church. I think his questions remain and that we have not yet exhausted this discussion.

Whereas Newman dealt with the Church of England of his time, today we are confronted with additional problems on the level of the Anglican Communion of 44 regional and national member churches, each self-governing. Independence without sufficient interdependence has now become a critical issue.

Two years ago, the IARCCUM statement "Growing Together in Unity and Mission" addressed the situation within the Anglican Communion, and its ecumenical implications, as follows: "Since this (Mississauga) meeting, however, the Churches of the Anglican Communion have entered into a period of dispute occasioned by the episcopal ordination of a person living in an openly-acknowledged committed same-sex relationship and the authorisation of public Rites of Blessing for same-sex unions. These matters have intensified reflection on the nature of the relationship between the churches of the Communion... In addition, ecumenical relationships have become more complicated as proposals within the Church of England have focussed attention on the issue of the ordination of women to the episcopate which is an established part of ministry in some Anglican provinces" (§ 6). In addition to developments in relation to this latter point, we now need to take account of the decision of a significant number of Anglican bishops not to attend this Lambeth Conference, and of proposals from within Anglicanism which are challenging existing instruments of authority within the Anglican Communion.

In the next section, I will address some of these issues more directly, but here I intend to focus specifically on the ecclesiological dimension of these current problems, making reference to what we have said together about the nature of the Church, and to initiatives of the Anglican Communion to address these internal disputes.

In March, 2006, the Archbishop of Canterbury invited me to speak at a meeting of the Church of England's House of Bishops, addressing the mission of bishops in the Church. While the backdrop of that address was the possible ordination of women to the episcopate, the central argument about the nature of the episcopal office as an office of unity is relevant to all of the points of tension in the Anglican Communion identified above.

In brief, I argued that unity, unanimity and *koinonia* (communion) are fundamental concepts in the New Testament and in the early Church. I argued: "From the beginning the episcopal office was "koinonially" or collegially embedded in the communion of all bishops; it was never perceived as an office to be understood or practised individually."

Then I turned to the theology of the episcopal office of a Church Father of great importance for Anglicans and Catholics alike, the martyr bishop Cyprian of Carthage of the third century.

His sentence “*episcopatus unus et indivisus*” is well known. This sentence stands in the context of an urgent admonition by Cyprian to his fellow bishops: “*Quam unitatem tenere firmiter et vindicare debemus maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesia praesidimus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus.*” [“And this unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the church, that we may also prove the episcopate one and undivided.”] This urgent exhortation is followed by a precise interpretation of the statement “*episcopatus unus et indivisus*”. “*Episcopatus unus est cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*” [“The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole.”] (*De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* I, 5).

But Cyprian goes even one step further: he not only emphasises the unity of the people of God with its own individual bishop, but also adds that no one should imagine that he can be in communion with just a few, for “the Catholic Church is not split or divided” but “united and held together by the glue of the mutual cohesion of the bishops” (Ep. 66,8)... This collegiality is of course not limited to the horizontal and synchronic relationship with contemporary episcopal colleagues; since the Church is one and the same in all centuries, the present-day church must also maintain diachronic consensus with the episcopate of the centuries before us, and above all with the testimony of the apostles. This is the more profound significance of the apostolic succession in episcopal office.

The episcopal office is thus an office of unity in a two-fold sense. Bishops are the sign and the instrument of unity within the individual local church, just as they are between both the contemporary local Churches and those of all times within the universal Church.

This understanding of episcopal office has been set forward in the agreed statements of ARCIC, most especially in *Church as Communion* and in ARCIC’s statements on authority in the Church. *Church as Communion* (§45) states that:

"For the nurture and growth of this communion, Christ the Lord has provided a ministry of oversight, the fullness of which is entrusted to the episcopate, which has the responsibility of maintaining and expressing the unity of the churches (cf. §§ 33 & 39; Final Report, Ministry and Ordination). By shepherding, teaching and the celebration of the sacraments, especially the eucharist, this ministry holds believers together in the communion of the local church and in the wider communion of all the churches (cf. § 39). This ministry of oversight has both collegial and primatial dimensions. It is grounded in the life of the community and is open to the community's participation in the discovery of God's will. It is exercised so that unity and communion are expressed, preserved and fostered at every level — locally, regionally and universally."

The same agreed statement communicates the understanding of both Anglican and Roman Catholic Communion that bishops carry out their ministry in succession to the

Apostles, which is “intended to assure each community that its faith is indeed the apostolic faith, received and transmitted from apostolic times” (Church as Communion, 33).

ARCIC’s “The Gift of Authority” developed this further in stating: “There are two dimensions to communion in the apostolic Tradition: diachronic and synchronic. The process of tradition clearly entails the transmission of the Gospel from one generation to another (diachronic). If the Church is to remain united in the truth, it must also entail the communion of the churches in all places in that one Gospel (synchronic). Both are necessary for the catholicity of the Church (§26).”

The text adds that each bishop, in communion with all other bishops, is responsible to preserve and express the larger koinonia of the church, and “participates in the care of all the churches” (§39). The bishop is therefore “both a voice for the local church and one through whom the local church learns from other churches” (§38). “The Gift of Authority” (§37) also underlines the role played by the college of bishops in maintaining the unity of the Church: “The mutual interdependence of all the churches is integral to the reality of the Church as God wills it to be. No local church that participates in the living Tradition can regard itself as self-sufficient... The ministry of the bishop is crucial, for his ministry serves communion within and among local churches. Their communion with each other is expressed through the incorporation of each bishop into a college of bishops. Bishops are, both personally and collegially, at the service of the communion.”

While there is not time here to draw out more of the ecclesiology of ARCIC, suffice it to say that in our dialogue, we have been able to set forward a strong vision of episcopal ministry, within the context of a shared understanding of the Church as koinonia.

It is significant that the Windsor Report of 2004, in seeking to provide the Anglican Communion with ecclesiological foundations for addressing the current crisis, also adopted an ecclesiology of koinonia. I found this to be helpful and encouraging, and in response to a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury inviting an ecumenical reaction to the Windsor Report, I noted that “(n)otwithstanding the substantial ecclesiological issues still dividing us which will continue to need our attention, this approach is fundamentally in line with the communion ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council. The consequences which the Report draws from this ecclesiological base are also constructive, especially the interpretation of provincial autonomy in terms of interdependence, thus ‘subject to limits generated by the commitments of communion’ (Windsor n.79). Related to this is the Report’s thrust towards strengthening the supra-provincial authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury (nn.109-110) and the proposal of an Anglican Covenant which would ‘make explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between the churches of the Communion’ (n.118).”

The one weakness pertaining to ecclesiology that I noted was that “(w)hile the Report stresses that Anglican provinces have a responsibility towards each other and towards the maintenance of communion, a communion rooted in the Scriptures, considerably little

attention is given to the importance of being in communion with the faith of the Church through the ages.” In our dialogue, we have jointly affirmed that the decisions of a local or regional church must not only foster communion in the present context, but must also be in agreement with the Church of the past, and in a particular way, with the apostolic Church as witnessed in the Scriptures, the early councils and the patristic tradition. This diachronic dimension of apostolicity “has important ecumenical ramifications, since we share a common tradition of one and a half millennia. This common patrimony – what Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey called our ‘ancient common traditions’ – is worth being appealed to and preserved.”

In light of this analysis of episcopal ministry as set forward in ARCIC and the *koinonia* ecclesiology found in The Windsor Report, it has been particularly disheartening to have witnessed the increasing tensions within the Anglican Communion. In several contexts, bishops are not in communion with other bishops; in some instances, Anglican provinces are no longer in full communion with each other. While the Windsor process continues, and the ecclesiology set forth in the Windsor Report has been welcomed in principle by the majority of Anglican provinces, it is difficult from our perspective to see how that has translated into the desired internal strengthening of the Anglican Communion and its instruments of unity. It also seems to us that the Anglican commitment to being ‘episcopally led and synodically governed’ has not always functioned in such a way as to maintain the apostolicity of the faith, and that synodical government misunderstood as a kind of parliamentary process has at times blocked the sort of episcopal leadership envisaged by Cyprian and articulated in ARCIC.

I know that many of you are troubled, some deeply so, by the threat of fragmentation within the Anglican Communion. We feel profound solidarity with you, for we too are troubled and saddened when we ask: In such a scenario, what shape might the Anglican Communion of tomorrow take, and who will our dialogue partner be? Should we, and how can we, appropriately and honestly engage in conversations also with those who share Catholic perspectives on the points currently in dispute, and who disagree with some developments within the Anglican Communion or particular Anglican provinces? What do you expect in this situation from the Church of Rome, which in the words of Ignatius of Antioch is to preside over the Church in love? How might ARCIC’s work on the episcopate, the unity of the Church, and the need for an exercise of primacy at the universal level be able to serve the Anglican Communion at the present time?

Rather than answer these questions, let me remind you of what we stated at the Informal Talks in 2003, and have reiterated on several occasions since then: “It is our overwhelming desire that the Anglican Communion stays together, rooted in the historic faith which our dialogue and relations over four decades have led us to believe that we share to a large degree.” Therefore we are following the discussions of this Lambeth Conference with great interest and heartfelt concern, accompanying them with our fervent prayers.

### III. Reflections on particular questions facing the Anglican Communion

In this final section, I would like to briefly address two of the issues at the heart of tensions within the Anglican Communion and in its relations with the Catholic Church, questions pertaining to ordination of women and to human sexuality. It is not my intent to take up these points of dispute in detail. This is not necessary because the Catholic position, which understands itself to be consistent with the New Testament and the apostolic tradition, is well known. I want only offer a few thoughts from a Catholic perspective and with an eye to our relations – past, present and future.

The Catholic Church's teaching regarding human sexuality, especially homosexuality, is clear, as set forth in the Catechism of the Catholic Church, nn. 2357-59. We are convinced that this teaching is well founded in the Old and in the New Testament, and therefore that faithfulness to the Scriptures and to apostolic tradition is at stake. I can only highlight what IARCCUM's "Growing Together in Unity and Mission" said: "In the discussions on human sexuality within the Anglican Communion, and between it and the Catholic Church, stand anthropological and biblical hermeneutical questions which need to be addressed" (§86e). Not without reason is today's principal theme at the Lambeth Conference concerned with biblical hermeneutics.

I would like briefly to draw your attention to the ARCIC statement "Life in Christ", where it was noted (nn. 87-88) that Anglicans could agree with Catholics that homosexual activity is disordered, but that we might differ in the moral and pastoral advice we would offer to those seeking our counsel. We realise and appreciate that the recent statements of the Primates are consistent with that teaching, which was given clear expression in Resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference. In light of tensions over the past years in this regard, a clear statement from the Anglican Communion would greatly strengthen the possibility of us giving common witness regarding human sexuality and marriage, a witness which is sorely needed in the world of today.

Regarding the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, the Catholic Church's teaching has been clearly set forward from the very beginning of our dialogue, not only internally, but also in correspondence between Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II with successive Archbishops of Canterbury. In his Apostolic Letter "Ordinatio sacerdotalis" from May 22, 1994, Pope John Paul II referred to the letter of Paul VI to Archbishop Coggan from November 30, 1975, and stated the Catholic position as follows: "Priestly ordination... in the Catholic Church from the beginning has always been reserved to men alone", and that "this tradition has also been faithfully maintained by the Oriental Churches." He concluded: "I declare that the Church has no authority whatsoever to confer priestly ordination on women and that this judgment is to be definitively held by all the Church's faithful." This formulation clearly shows that this is not only a disciplinary position but an expression of our faithfulness to Jesus Christ. The Catholic Church finds herself bound by the will of Jesus Christ and does not feel free to establish a new tradition alien to the tradition of the Church of all ages.

As I stated when addressing the Church of England's House of Bishops in 2006, for us this decision to ordain women implies a turning away from the common position of all

churches of the first millennium, that is, not only the Catholic Church but also the Oriental Orthodox and the Orthodox churches. We would see the Anglican Communion as moving a considerable distance closer to the side of the Protestant churches of the 16th century, and to a position they adopted only during the second half of the 20th century.

Since it is currently the situation that 28 Anglican provinces ordain women to the priesthood, and while only 4 provinces have ordained women to the episcopate, an additional 13 provinces have passed legislation authorising women bishops, the Catholic Church must now take account of the reality that the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate is not only a matter of isolated provinces, but that this is increasingly the stance of the Communion. It will continue to have bishops, as set forth in the Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888); but as with bishops within some Protestant churches, the older churches of East and West will recognise therein much less of what they understand to be the character and ministry of the bishop in the sense understood by the early church and continuing through the ages.

I have already addressed the ecclesiological problem when bishops do not recognize other's episcopal ordination within the one and same church, now I must be clear about the new situation which has been created in our ecumenical relations. While our dialogue has led to significant agreement on the understanding of ministry, the ordination of women to the episcopate effectively and definitively blocks a possible recognition of Anglican Orders by the Catholic Church.

It is our hope that a theological dialogue between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church will continue, but this development effects directly the goal and alters the level of what we pursue in dialogue. The 1966 Common Declaration signed by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey called for a dialogue that would "lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed", and spoke of "a restoration of complete communion of faith and sacramental life". It now seems that full visible communion as the aim of our dialogue has receded further, and that our dialogue will have less ultimate goals and therefore will be altered in its character. While such a dialogue could still lead to good results, it would not be sustained by the dynamism which arises from the realistic possibility of the unity Christ asks of us, or the shared partaking of the one Lord's table, for which we so earnestly long.

## Conclusion

Anyone who has ever seen the great and wonderful Anglican cathedrals and churches the world over, who has visited the old and famous Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, who has attended marvellous Evensongs and heard the beauty and eloquence of Anglican prayers, who has read the fine scholarship of Anglican historians and theologians, who is attentive to the significant and long-standing contributions of Anglicans to the ecumenical movement, knows well that the Anglican tradition holds many treasures. These are, in the words of *Lumen Gentium*, among those gifts which, "belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity" (§ 8).

Our keen awareness of the greatness and remarkable depth of Christian culture of your tradition heightens our concern for you amidst current problems and crises, but also gives us confidence that with God's help, you will find a way out of these difficulties, and that in a new and fresh manner we will be strengthened in our common pilgrimage toward the unity Jesus Christ wills for us and prayed for. I would reiterate what I wrote in my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in December, 2004: In a spirit of ecumenical partnership and friendship, we are ready to support you in whatever ways are appropriate and requested.

In that vein, I would like to return to the Archbishop's puzzling question what kind of Anglicanism I want. It occurs to me that at critical moments in the history of the Church of England and subsequently of the Anglican Communion, you have been able to retrieve the strength of the Church of the Fathers when that tradition was in jeopardy. The Caroline divines are an instance of that, and above all, I think of the Oxford Movement. Perhaps in our own day it would be possible too, to think of a new Oxford Movement, a retrieval of riches which lay within your own household. This would be a re-reception, a fresh recourse to the Apostolic Tradition in a new situation. It would not mean a renouncing of your deep attentiveness to human challenges and struggles, your desire for human dignity and justice, your concern with the active role of all women and men in the Church. Rather, it would bring these concerns and the questions that arise from them more directly within the framework shaped by the Gospel and ancient common tradition in which our dialogue is grounded.

We hope and pray that as you seek to walk as faithful disciples of Jesus Christ, the Father of all mercies may bestow upon you the abundant riches of His grace, and guide you with the Holy Spirit's abiding presence.

**2. *From the Revd Canon Dr John Gibaut, Director of Faith and Order, WCC:***

Your eminence, you presented yourself first and foremost as a friend, and as such you have spoken to us in frankness and love. Your presence among us at this Lambeth Conference is a visible sign of the friendship of the Catholic Church towards to Anglican Communion.

My response to your paper comes from one who is an Anglican, a Canadian Anglican long involved in Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue in my own country. I respond also as the Director of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches, an ecumenical space where Anglicans and Roman Catholics meet as equal partners around the table of multilateral dialogue.

The ecclesiological statement of the 2006 Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Porto Alegre, "Called to be the One Church," calls the churches to mutual accountability: "Each church is called to mutual giving and receiving gifts and to mutual accountability (II.7)." The Archbishop of Canterbury's invitation to all the ecumenical guests to this Lambeth Conference, and his particular invitation to Cardinal Kasper this afternoon with

his question – *what kind of Anglicanism do you want?* – fulfils in a remarkable way the World Council of Churches’ call to mutual accountability. Cardinal Kasper, your response in honesty, frankness and love expresses that mutual accountability in equally wondrous ways, and is a gift to be received.

In my response, your eminence, I would like to pick up on some of the questions you have raised in your paper.

The first question is around “intent.” You have said “What we are talking about in nothing other than our faithfulness to Christ Himself, who is our unique and common master (p.3).” And later you refer to the fidelity to what Christ requires (p.5). I think this question of intent and fidelity is the crucial question in what you have raised, and indeed, in the conversations at this Lambeth Conference. It is worth noting that in the sixteenth-century Reformation every tradition, including the Tridentine reformers shared a common intent: fidelity to Christ as witnessed in the Scriptures and in the life of early Christianity, although there were different limits on the understanding of “early.” I see the same dynamic in the Anglican Communion at this between in the two issues you have highlighted: human sexuality and the episcopal ordination of women, and divergent views on these two questions with the Catholic Church. The expectations may be quite different, but the intent is the same: fidelity to what Christ requires. In that we were not able to see this intent in one another in the sixteenth century and in the present day raises important questions about hermeneutics and methodology. If, however, we can honour the intent to be faithful, then we accord respect and integrity to the other, and the conversation can continue. I note as a significant instance of such respect the response of the Roman Catholic episcopal conference in England and Wales to the Rochester Report of the Church of England on the ordination of women to the episcopate. While the Roman Catholic bishops were not surprisingly unable to agree with the conclusion of the report, surprisingly – or perhaps not so surprisingly – they were able to commend the breadth of scholarship and the depth of theological reflection that was contained in the report.

My second question is around the ordination of women to the episcopate, and the reactions of Catholic Church, the Orthodox Churches, and spectacularly, the secular press. The common reaction is to see this important step in the life of the Church of England as *the* definitive juncture when the Anglican Communion has made a judgement on women bishops. Your eminence indicated that “the that Catholic Church must now take account of the reality that the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate is not only a matter of isolated provinces, but that this is increasingly the stance of the Communion (p.13).” I am wondering if there is, perhaps, a misreading of Anglican ecclesiology. The others churches of the Anglican Communion which have ordained women to the episcopate are not “isolated provinces” but equal members of the Anglican Communion, after consultation with the Lambeth Conference and the consequent Eames Commission. While the See of Canterbury with its bishop may be mother church to the Anglican Communion, the Church of England is merely sister Church. By comparison, there are Anglicans who would be prepared to regard the See of Rome with its bishop as mother church and the Roman Catholic Church as sister church. This, however, might be an Anglican misreading of Roman Catholic ecclesiology.

Third, I would like to respond to your comments about bishops. You began your reflection on episcopacy with the observation “that unity, unanimity and *koinonia* (communion) are fundamental concepts in the New Testament and in the early Church (p.7).” Triads remind me of other triads, and my mind went immediately to “personal, collegial, and communal” as marks of episcopacy in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* as well as the more recent Faith and Order text, *The Nature and Mission of the Church*.

You remind us that “Bishops are the sign and the instrument of unity within the individual church, just as they are between both the contemporary local churches and those of all times within the universal Church (p. 8):” I *saw* a sense of what you describe in the opening Eucharist at the cathedral on the first Sunday of the conference as the bishops of the local Anglican churches, with clergy and laity, and ecumenical participants gathered around the Archbishop of Canterbury in this historic see: there was the diachronic and the synchronic expressions of *koinonia* lived out before us in the Eucharist. I also saw it last Thursday as the same people marched with the archbishop in central London in support of Millennium Development goals. These were expressions of the “nature” and “mission” of the Church. The same *koinonia* may not seem as neat and tidy as the bishops deliberate in the different sessions at this Lambeth Conference, but it is there.

You have named for Anglicans of a great challenge when you spoke of the common catholic truth of the unity of the college of bishops. Anglicans need to hear this again and again. There is a weakness in parliamentary-style decision making which creates winners and losers, hence division which may lead to disunity. Consensus models or the Indaba model of this conference have the potential for something much better for the Church, and much better for the college of bishops. *Koinonia*, however, is not broken by difference and disagreement, as the history of the Church shows, as well as the biblical witness of St Peter and St Paul. *Koinonia* may well be diminished by such disagreement, especially when it is quite public. This all points to the challenge of belonging to an episcopal church, where *episcopate* in the ecclesial Body of Christ can only be exercised by earthen vessels, treasures in clay jars (2 Cor. 4:7). God takes such a risk with us in episcopal churches, and we take this risk with one another, especially those churches which synodically elect their bishops. But these are the risks of being a member of a catholic church, not a docetist one.

Fourth, I would like to comment on the word “unanimity.” Anglicans, or some of us, are often baffled by the universality and apparent degree of unanimity they see in the canon law tradition, liturgy, doctrine, and discipline of the Catholic Church. Yet such a degree of universality and unanimity are in the service of the unity of the church and its mission. It seems to me that Roman Catholics are equally baffled by an Anglican accent on comprehensive and tolerance, however messy and costly this can be. The Anglican experience of living with diversity, however, serves the very same end as the Roman Catholic accent on unanimity: to serve the unity and mission of the Church. This last point takes us right back to the opening questions around intent, and the recognition that difference in practice may arise from the identical intentions.

Fifthly, I would like to challenge you when you say that “It now seems that full visible communion as the aim of our dialogue has receded further, and that our dialogue will have less ultimate goals and therefore will be altered in its character (p.14).” I am not sure that the ultimate goal of full visible communion has changed, or can change, for that matter, since the goal is that unity for which Christ prayed on the night before his suffering and death. On the other hand, the penultimate goals, or even the antepenultimate goals can change, and likely have in the dialogue between our two churches, but not the ultimate goal. As Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Runcie affirmed together in their Common Declaration of 1989, seven years after their meeting together in this See of Canterbury:

Against the background of human disunity the arduous journey to Christian unity must be pursued with determination and vigour, whatever obstacles are perceived to block the path. We here solemnly re-commit ourselves and those we represent to the restoration of visible unity and full ecclesial communion in the confidence that to seek anything less would be to betray our Lord’s intention for the unity of his people.

In conclusion, thank you for being a friend to the Anglican Communion, and for your care of you Anglican sisters and brothers. Your clear and cogent presentation gives us an invaluable reflection of ourselves, and important challenges to the bishops of the 2008 Lambeth Conference. Your very presence reminds us of the unity we seek.

### ***3. From Bishop Christopher Hill:***

May I first make four short preliminary observations:

1. The Cardinal’s address shows him to be a ‘critical friend’ personally embodying the critical friendship of the Roman Catholic Church for the Anglican Communion. May I also express thanks for this ‘critical friendship’ in Pope Benedict’s recent statement expressing the Roman Catholic Church’s desire that Anglicans should not be further split or divided by schism.
2. At the end of the Cardinal’s paper it is clear that the status of the dialogue will almost certainly change, nevertheless I rejoice in the Cardinal’s opening paragraphs in which he speaks of his hope to remain in serious dialogue in search for full unity, so that the world may believe. In spite of our apparently contradictory behaviour Anglicans remain committed to the goal of full, visible unity.
3. I want to underline a particular sentence pregnant with meaning in the Cardinal’s address: ‘the questions and problems of our friends are also our questions and problems . . . .’
4. I also wish to thank the Cardinal for something he expanded on his written text, his desire for transparency in the problematic for the Pontifical Council of having more than one Anglican voice seeking dialogue for unity. This would merit further practical discussion.

## Ecclesiological Issues

I now want to touch on three ecclesiological issues raised from the Cardinal's stimulating, frank and profoundly ecumenical address.

1. I warmly welcome Cardinal Kasper's stress on St. Cyprian of Carthage, who ought always to be a congenial Church Father for Anglicans. His Eminence picks up in particular the unity of the episcopate in space and time, synchronic and diachronic unity, citing *The Gift of Authority*: the bishop is 'both a voice for the local church and one through whom the local church learns from other churches' and 'no local church . . . can regard itself as self-sufficient.' With all this I profoundly agree. The Cardinal questions whether *The Windsor Report* pays sufficient attention to 'the importance of being in communion with the faith of the Church through the ages'. This criticism is also implicit in the Cardinal's later remarks about the ordination of women to the presbyterate and the episcopate. I agree that *The Windsor Report* should be stronger on diachronic communion in faith. But at whatever level our theological dialogue continues, I would like a conversation about the nature of the Tradition of the faith down the ages. I am sure the Cardinal and I would agree that Tradition must be in continuity with the Apostolic faith in the deposit of the Scriptures: and also that Tradition is nevertheless dynamic, led by the Spirit, and not mere historicism. We might disagree perhaps whether the ordination of women breaches Tradition (with a capital 'T') or whether the question of the ordination of women has truly been extensively and seriously engaged by the 'mind of the Church', the *sensus fidelium*, until relatively recently. I am not here referring to the well-known though not intensive references in the Fathers and the Scholastics, where nevertheless some of the arguments would not be commended today, but rather as to whether Tradition has really engaged with this question until relatively recently. In which case it can be argued we are in a time of reception or rejection still. There is a further point to consider in that as the churches of the Anglican Communion are considered by the Roman Catholic Church to include some real traditions and institutions of the Church of Jesus Christ (the Cardinal cites the Second Vatican Council), what does the ecclesial *fact* of women's ordination say about the universal Tradition? If Anglican churches are in some albeit impaired but real sense churches, what does this say of our emerging tradition (small 't') of ordaining women to priesthood and episcopate. What of our ecclesial, sacramental intention in such ordinations?
2. Cardinal Kasper speaks cautiously of Anglican churches as, in the well-known phrase, 'episcopally led and synodically governed'. I believe this phrase is extremely unhelpful and confusing. Metropolitan John Zizioulas of Pergamon was present for part of the recent meeting of the General Synod of the Church of England in York, his comment – also in critical friendship – was that the Church of England Synod was not so much a synod as government. Indeed it is modelled on British Parliamentary procedure. I would like to see some fundamental ecclesiological discussion with ecumenical partners on how far the Christian churches have adopted secular models of governance into their life. Anglicans have taken parliamentary or constitutional

models (The Episcopal Church, for example, has a constitution echoing that of the United States); the Byzantine Church took much from the late Eastern Roman Empire. The Roman (and I mean Roman here) Catholic Church took much of the wisdom of ancient Roman Civil Law into Western Canon Law (for great good); we are trying *indaba* from Africa. How far should any church take such models uncritically and how far should they be ‘baptised’ so to speak? Synod means to walk along the way together, not necessarily to vote by majority with consequential winners and losers.

3. Finally, may I make a comment on the Cardinal’s disappointment that the Windsor process has not achieved more tangible results thus far? Many bishops will echo this, though others have reservations about the appropriateness of ‘universal sanctions’. It would be good to share more fully with the Pontifical Council some profound questions of ecclesiology which arise here. In particular, the historic autonomy, even independence, of the various canonical structures of the Anglican Communion. The Cardinal fears that the Anglican Communion is in danger in moving closer to a Protestant understanding of ministry and Church. I do not myself accept that the ordination of women necessarily requires this interpretation. Catholic arguments in favour of the ordination of women have long been part of the framework of understanding in which Anglican churches have moved on this matter. The correspondence between Archbishop Runcie and Cardinal Willibrands is indicative of this. But I do believe the Cardinal’s point is rather important and could point us to a seriously neglected area of ecclesiology. Anglicans claim to be catholic and reformed (evangelical could be a better word). I believe this to be the case. But our ecclesiological structures are Protestant. I am not, of course, referring to holy orders but to structures of jurisdiction. It would be good to examine ecumenically the Protestant inheritance of national or regional autonomous and independent jurisdictions. The break in communion with Rome in the sixteenth century coincided with the secular rise of the Nation State. In England Henry VIII’s common lawyers, who framed the Acts of Parliament that broke communion with Rome, spoke about England as an Empire Sole. Almost accidentally, once universal jurisdiction was severed, the ‘default position’ became a national or territorial jurisdiction. And ‘default positions’ are notoriously difficult to change! Yet independent national jurisdictions are not particularly scriptural, evangelical or catholic. The Cardinal has vigorously engaged in discussion about the balance between the local and the universal poles of the Church, for this his ecumenical partners are hugely grateful and I absolutely agree with the Cardinal that both poles are equally necessary. But where on that register should we put the Protestant historical inheritance of national or regional expressions of the Church? And what ecclesial density might they have? *The Windsor Report* (and *The Virginia Report* before it, sadly neglected at the last Lambeth Conference) invites the Communion to look at minimal trans-national ecclesial structures with fresh eyes. Yet the only models are the very fragile primacy of the Ecumenical Patriarch, and the perhaps over-strong juridical expression of the Roman Primacy, though there is also the ecumenical conciliar model (strictly speaking pre-conciliar as the WCC is not in fact a Council in the classical sense). Perhaps we could ponder again on the historic Conciliar Movement and what it might

teach us ecumenically even though it failed. To Cardinal Kasper's laudable invitation for Anglicans to rediscover their Patristic inheritance in a new Oxford Movement, I would respectively add a rediscovery of the conciliar tradition as it emerged in the Middle Ages out of the Patristic era.

These observations are offered in huge admiration of the Cardinal's address to the Lambeth Conference and in the spirit of 'critical friendship' that he has himself so eloquently exhibited.

#### **4. From Bishop David Beetge:**

As Anglican Co-Chair of IARCCUM, I would like to thank you, Cardinal Kasper, for:

- your interest in and support of IARCCUM (along with that of the Archbishop of Canterbury)
- your presence at the Informal Talks each year, which are held in a spirit of honesty and with a deep desire to continue that search for unity that is Christ's will for us; and for the hospitality enjoyed in Rome on those and other occasions. In thanking you, our appreciation also extends to Bishop Brian Farrell and Monsignors Jack Radano and Don Bolen.

Like you, I too found the Mississauga meeting a moving experience. Mississauga also functions as a model: bishops journeying and sharing together. Your address at Mississauga ended with the words: "In our ecumenical efforts we should keep in mind that one day we will rub our eyes and be surprised by the new things that God has achieved in his Church. It is true that in the course of history we have done much against love and unity, but God- this is our hope - will make things good again." We were brought down to earth after Mississauga with the publication of *Dominus Iesus*.

Of course, events within the Anglican Communion, to which you referred in your address, might well make the reality of our goal of full communion more distant. But we have continued our dialogues through ARCIC and then, since Mississauga, through IARCCUM.

IARCCUM produced *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*. But it also fostered:

- practical initiatives
  - "a sign of and instrument for seeking peace in the world";
  - witnessing in the world in areas of conflict such as South Africa - the struggle against *apartheid* united churches under the leadership of people like Archbishop Denis Hurley and Archbishop Desmond Tutu;
  - we also need such partnership and co-operation in areas such Zimbabwe; also in facing the HIV-AIDS pandemic;
  - Bishop Lucius Ugorji (here today) and I were mandated to try to bring together the Anglican and Roman Catholic episcopal conferences in Africa - CAPA and SECAM. To this point we have not succeeded in doing so.

- the reception process - responding to the agreed statements in particular of the second phase of ARCIC dialogue;
- the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity for a sub-committee of IARCCUM, in order to make a contribution to the Lambeth Commission on Ecclesiology. This contribution was not only given to the Lambeth Commission, but was also made available to the whole Anglican Communion on the Communion's website. I am aware of a number of dioceses that have used this text as a basis for study. The sub-commission text noted that: "The Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops who gathered in Mississauga in May of 2000, after reviewing the extensive progress made both in theological agreement and in practical relationships since the Second Vatican Council, confidently observed that the communion we already share is 'no longer to be viewed in minimal terms'. It is 'a rich and life-giving, multi-faceted communion. We have ... moved much closer to the goal of full visible communion than we had at first dared to believe'" (citing Mississauga's statement *Communion in Mission*, nn.5-6). This focus on being 'life-giving' resonates with what we heard from Archbishop Rowan on Tuesday evening.

Our relations have also been strengthened by:

- ARCIC's *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*;
- The Informal Talks;

We also recognize other elements of our common life in Christ:

- the sacraments;
- the daily offices;
- the religious life;
- spirituality.

Our dialogues could also reflect on the invitation of Pope John Paul II in *Ut unum sint* to engage in discussion on the way in which the Petrine ministry is exercised and the results of that invitation.

In your address you suggest that our dialogue will have less ultimate goals and therefore will be altered in character. The issues of ecclesiology, the historic episcopate and the Church as *koinonia*, mentioned in your address, will be of great importance in such dialogue. I also hope that this dialogue will continue to be strengthened by what we have already achieved in our journey together, by what we already share, and by what we do together, and can do together, for the sake of Christ's Church and the world; and that the goal of full, visible unity will still be held before us in our future work together.