

The Kyoto Report
of the
Inter-Anglican Standing Commission
on
Ecumenical Relations
2000 - 2008

The Vision Before Us

Compiled and Edited by
Sarah Rowland Jones



The Vision Before Us

The Kyoto Report
of the
Inter-Anglican Standing Commission
on Ecumenical Relations
2000 - 2008

Compiled and Edited by
Sarah Rowland Jones



Published by
The Anglican Communion Office, London, UK

Acknowledgements

With grateful thanks to the staff of the Anglican Communion Office for their help in the production of this report; in particular Gregory Cameron, Terrie Robinson, Neil Vigers, and Ian Harvey. Thanks are also due not only to all the members of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations for their work throughout the years of its mandate, but also to all those many others around the world who have supported the Commission's work and assisted in the smooth running of its meetings.

Copyright © 2009 The Anglican Consultative Council
A Registered Charity in the United Kingdom, No. 276591

Design & layout by Ian Harvey, Anglican Communion Office
Printed in the UK by Apollo Print Generation, London

ISBN 978-0-9558261-6-0

...The vision which rises before us is that of 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...

Lambeth Conference Resolution 1920:9 (iv)
An Appeal To All Christian People
from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Contents.....	5
Foreword	9
<i>by the Most Revd Drexel Gomez</i>	
Preface	11
<i>by the Revd Canon Dr Gregory K Cameron</i>	
Part One: Introduction	
1. The Work of IASCER	15
The Origins of IASCER	15
Our Context	18
Addressing our Ecumenical Life	19
Themes in Ecumenism	19
Anglican Identity	20
Unity, Faith and Order	21
Drawing Conclusions	21
Some Lessons Learned	22
Reflections on the Life of IASCER	22
2. Anglicans and Ecumenism.....	29
Four Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism	31
The Goal of the Ecumenical Movement.....	35
The Task of the Ecumenical Movement.....	36
The Processes of Ecumenism	39
The Nature of Church Unity.....	41
Part Two: Themes	
3. Communion.....	44
4. Baptism and Eucharist	50
Baptism	51
<i>Admission to the Eucharist of the Non-Baptised</i>	51
Lay and Diaconal Presidency at the Eucharist.....	67
<i>'The Sacraments duly administered'?</i>	68

5. Holy Order	71
Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations: Guidelines	75
Anglican Response by IAS CER to the Lutheran paper ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’	77
Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues	96
6. Reception	132
Reception in the Anglican Communion: Responding Responsibly to Ecumenical and Inter-Anglican Developments	135

Part Three: Dialogues

7. Churches in Communion.....	142
United Churches	143
The Mar Thoma Syrian Church of India	144
The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht	144
Iglesia Filipina Independiente (the Philippine Independent Church)	146
Continuing Churches	147
8. Bilateral Dialogues	149
Baptists	151
Eastern Orthodox Churches	152
Lutherans	156
Methodists	162
Moravians	164
Oriental Orthodox Churches	165
Reformed Churches	171
Roman Catholic Church	172
9. Schemes of Union and Regional Agreements.....	184
Brazil	185
England	186
Papua New Guinea	186
Scotland	190
Southern Africa	191
Sri Lanka	193
United States of America.....	194
Wales.....	195
10. Multilateral Relations.....	198
Christian World Communions	198
Faith and Order	199
Global Christian Forum	202
World Council of Churches	204
Message to the World Council of Churches	207

Part Four: Anglican Issues

11. Liaison with other Anglican Bodies	210
Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation	210
Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission	213
Theological Education in the Anglican Communion Working Group	219
12. Developments within the Anglican Communion	221
The Windsor Process	221
An Anglican Covenant	228
The Canon Law Project	231
13. The Lambeth Conference 2008	233

Part Five: Looking to the Future

14. The Challenges Ahead	238
--------------------------------	-----

References

IASCER Meetings	242
The Membership of the Commission and Meetings Attended	243
Index of Acronyms	246
Endnotes	249
Useful References and Resources	256

Foreword

by the Most Revd Drexel Gomez,
formerly Primate of the Church in the Province of the West Indies
Chairman of IASCER, 2000-2008

When George Carey, the 103rd Archbishop of Canterbury, approached me to become the Chairman of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission for Ecumenical Relations (IASCER) in late 1999, I did not hesitate to accept the challenge. Throughout my ministry I have been inspired and guided by a vision of the catholicity of the Church of God, which calls us all into a common faithful discipleship and into the riches of communion. It has been my conviction that the Churches of the Anglican Communion bear a special witness and a special responsibility to the wider *oikumene*, the household of faith. Anglicanism has always sought to be faithful to the strictures of the Vincentian canon, that as Anglicans we believe that which has been believed everywhere, always and by all in the Christian revelation. But we view that inheritance through a distinctive prism, that of the Reformed Catholic faith, informed by the spiritual insights of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It is a tradition that has benefited from the dynamic spirituality and worship developed across two thousand years, first in the British Isles and then throughout the globe by Anglicans drawn from every continent and background.

IASCER was charged by the Lambeth Conference and by the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) with caring for the integrity of Anglican engagement with the ecumenical movement. We were asked to advise on the consistency of our ecumenical conversations and the coherence of our ecumenical agreements. In our annual meetings the agenda seemed ever to grow as we received and reviewed the publication of Agreed Statements from the bilateral conversations, and received reports of ecumenical engagement at regional and national level. We were asked to advise on specific projects and particular aspects of ecumenical co-operation. We were invited to address some of the major developments in the life of the Communion and to advise on their ecumenical impact.

In the nine years of our work, we have managed to do that with good humour, despite differences of perception and conviction, on a whole range of the issues which challenge the Anglican Communion, and indeed, all Christian World Communions. The members of IASCER have prayed and worshipped together; we have been frank in our conversations, and rigorous in our researches. I hope we have been faithful to the task set for us and have

produced something of value for the ongoing life of the Communion, and for the ecumenical movement.

I would like to express my own gratitude for all my colleagues on the Commission; for David Hamid and Gregory Cameron, who successively served as Secretary from the Anglican Communion Office, and both of whom were subsequently called to serve the Church as bishops. Thanks are also due to Bishop John Baycroft, who oversaw ecumenical affairs in the period between the two Directors. I am grateful for the wisdom and patience of all the members, and for the other staff of the Anglican Communion Office, who laboured to ensure that our meetings ran smoothly - for Christine Codner, Matthew Davies, Gill Harris-Hogarth, Frances Hillier and Terrie Robinson. We benefited also from the contribution of our communion partners, the representatives of the Old Catholic Churches and the Mar Thoma Church, who journeyed with us at various times. I am particularly grateful to Sarah Rowland Jones for her work as editor of this current volume.

IASCER now offers the work of nine years to the ACC. However, we hope that there is work here of a wider value to the Communion as we discern the way ahead, and continue that task of living into the unity which is the Lord's will for his people.

Drexel Gomez
The Bahamas
March 2009

Preface

When I took up office as Director of Ecumenical Affairs in the Anglican Communion Office in 2003, the first thing I had to do was become acquainted with the vast array of acronyms that orbit in the ecumenical biosphere. There may not have been the ‘Anglican Communion Regional Organisations for New Youth Ministries’ to contend with, but there were ARCIC and IARCCUM, AOOIC and WARC, PCPCU and many others to comprehend. Chief among the acronyms of the Anglican Communion’s ecumenical work was IASCER (I ask ‘er), a graceful acronym for a very important body.

The constitution of the ACC has, within the description of its object, four points with an ecumenical dimension.¹ The Secretary General employs a Director of Ecumenical Affairs to carry this work forward. I quickly found that it would be impossible to do this work, however, without the assistance and wisdom of IASCER, which, meeting annually, would review the full extent of the Communion’s engagement with ecumenism and advise upon it.

Between 2000 and 2008, IASCER was composed of an extremely talented body of people drawn from across the Communion. There was a high degree of expertise and experience in ecumenism; there was theological and ecumenical knowledge and skill, reflecting a wide range of engagement and the different perspectives, both from the diverse Provinces of the Communion, and of theological outlook. Two things were exceptionally impressive - the ability of members of the group to get clearly and concisely to the heart of the many matters discussed, and then to formulate a response in polished text, often within a matter of an hour or two.

This volume attempts to distil the wisdom and counsel generated at those meetings. A quick perusal of these pages will indicate the breadth of the discussions at IASCER and the invaluable assistance that they offered me in shaping, guiding and advising on the conduct and content of the Communion’s engagement with ecumenism. There are resolutions which reflect the Commission’s readiness to work with the minutiae of the vast literature generated by the ecumenical movement; there are position papers and reflections which set out a broad and well-founded Anglican response to ecumenical developments elsewhere. My hope is that *The Vision Before Us* will prove to be more than a report of the work of IASCER to ACC-14; that it will become a handbook for Anglican ecumenical work, setting out both some of the specifics and some of the fundamental principles of the quest of the Anglican Churches to answer the call of God to his people to be one even as the Father and the Son are one.

Sarah Rowland Jones was one of the very many talented members of IASCER. A former diplomat and priest of the Church in Wales who undertook a remarkable personal journey of faith and commitment which saw her travel from one end of the globe to the other during her own membership of IASCER, Sarah brought a sharp analytical talent and a facility for expressing good common sense to the deliberations of IASCER. She was always one of the first to volunteer when there was hard work to be done, and there was no contest when it came to identifying the member of IASCER who could pull all the material of nine years hard work together and make sense of it. Sarah cheerfully took on the task, combining it with the important research ministry that she offers to successive Archbishops of Cape Town, and all this while completing her own doctoral studies. The Communion owes her a deep debt of gratitude for this work. Thank you, Sarah.

During the six years that I have been Director of Ecumenical Studies, I have seen many transitions in the ecumenical scene: the ending of one pontificate, and the opening of another (John Paul II and Benedict XVI), the Ninth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, and the 14th Lambeth Conference. I have shared in the heart-searching of the Anglican Communion during the tensions sparked off by developments in North America, and tried to understand what Anglicans are doing in conversation with our ecumenical partners. Some speak of an ecumenical winter; that has not been my experience. We have had to admit that the Christian Churches do not yet stand on the threshold of the goal of full visible unity, and even that many intermediate targets seem elusive. However, the convergences are profound, the friendships are intense, the creativity is perennial. In these pages are the celebration of success, the dissection of challenges, the deep searching of the purposes and wisdom of God. Above all else *The Vision Before Us* is a witness to the fact that the Holy Spirit is not letting Christians rest easy with the divisions of the past, but is calling us into a future in which all Christians discover within the full implications of their own communion with Christ a demand for that communion to be lived and experienced across the Christian traditions.

Gregory K Cameron

Director of Ecumenical Affairs

Anglican Communion Office

2003-2009

PART ONE

Introduction

1. The Work of IASCER

On the night before he died, Jesus prayed that his disciples might ‘all be one’ (John 17.21). The fact that relations between Christians have too often been marked by difficult and painful divisions does not lessen the compulsion upon us to heed our Lord’s prayer – not only for the sake of his people themselves, but for the sake of all humanity, ‘so that the world may believe that you have sent me’.

This book offers a record of some of the ways in which the Anglican Communion has responded to this imperative through the work of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER), which met for a week or so annually from 2000 to 2008. It carries the texts of all major decisions, resolutions, recommendations, statements and other IASCER documents, within a narrative account of IASCER’s work that offers some broader analysis of, and reflection on, our methodology and achievements. While primarily a report to the ACC’s fourteenth meeting, in Jamaica in May 2009, it also aims to serve as a resource for all who are interested in the Anglican approach to ecumenical relations, whether Anglicans working at international, provincial, diocesan or local level, our partners in the ecumenical journey, academics, or indeed anyone else who shares ‘the vision that rises before us’ of full visible unity, in which ‘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’.²

This chapter covers the genesis of the Commission, and records the evolution of its working methodology, and how this led to the fruits that are harvested here. At times, resolutions of other Anglican bodies, particularly the Instruments of Communion, are printed here where they have made important contributions to our ecumenical life, though IASCER does not pretend in any way to speak on their behalf. The chapter concludes with some more personal reflections on IASCER’s pursuit of our ecumenical vocation.

While Commission members own jointly the IASCER resolutions and other texts recorded in this volume, the narrative commentary and the personal reflections are mine, and for them I take full responsibility.

The Origins of IASCER

The genesis of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations lies in the Lambeth Conference of 1998 and, before that, the tenth

meeting of the ACC in Panama, in October 1996, since the ACC has within its Constitution a specific responsibility for ecumenism.

The Ecumenical Advisory Group (IASCIER's precursor) submitted to the ACC its first draft of the *Agros Report*,³ summarising 'the richness and diversity of ecumenical life in the Anglican Communion' so that, revised in the light of the ACC's comments, it could be forwarded as a resource to the 1998 Lambeth Conference. In this report, the Ecumenical Advisory Group proposed that the Group be replaced by a standing commission with a new and fuller mandate. The ACC endorsed this recommendation:

**ACC-10 Resolution 16: Agros Report:
Replacement of the Ecumenical Advisory Group
by an Inter-Anglican Standing Commission**

Resolved that this ACC endorses the proposal contained in the Agros Report that the Ecumenical Advisory Group be replaced by an Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations following the Lambeth Conference, whose tasks would be:

- a) to monitor and enable Anglican participation in multilateral and bilateral dialogues;
- b) to monitor and encourage the process of reception, response and decision;
- c) to ensure theological consistency in dialogues and conversations by reviewing local, regional and provincial proposals with ecumenical partners and when an agreement affects the life of the Communion as a whole, to propose, after consultation with the ACC and the Primates' Meeting, that the matter be brought to the Lambeth Conference before the Province votes to enter the new relationship;
- d) to address issues of terminology; and
- e) to facilitate the circulation of documents and ecumenical resources throughout the Communion.

This report and resolution then came before Lambeth 1998, and contributed to the comprehensive review of Anglicanism's ecumenical vocation conducted by Section IV of the Conference, under the heading *Called to Be One*.⁴ More than twenty resolutions were passed as a result of the Section's work (some of which are referred to in later chapters). These included an affirmation of the proposed commission, together with a summary

description of the work which the commentary within *Called to Be One* proposed it might address:

Lambeth Conference 1998: Resolution IV.3: An Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations

This Conference

- a) while noting that expense will be involved, endorses the proposal of the Ecumenical Advisory Group, endorsed by the ACC-10 in Panama (Resolution 16), that the EAG be replaced by an Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations; and
- b) proposes that the tasks of this Commission should be:
 - i. to monitor and enable Anglican participation in multilateral and bilateral dialogues, both regional and international
 - ii. to monitor and encourage the process of response, decision and reception
 - iii. to ensure theological consistency in dialogues and conversations by reviewing regional and provincial proposals with ecumenical partners and, when an agreement affects the life of the Communion as a whole, after consultation with the ACC, to refer the matter to the Primates' Meeting, and only if that Meeting so determines, to the Lambeth Conference, before the Province enters the new relationship
 - iv. to give particular attention to anomalies which arise in the context of ecumenical proposals with a view to discerning those anomalies which may be bearable in the light of progress towards an agreed goal of visible unity, and to suggest ways for resolving them
 - v. to consider, when appropriate, if and how an agreement made in one region or Province can be adopted in other regions or Provinces
 - vi. to address issues of terminology
 - vii. to facilitate the circulation of documents and ecumenical resources throughout the Communion, as far as possible in the languages of the Communion.

As a result, in Nassau on Advent Sunday 2000, Archbishop Drexel Gomez (as Chair) and Canon David Hamid, the Anglican Communion's Director of

Ecumenical Affairs (Secretary) sat down for the first time with some 14 of 15 appointees, to begin the work of IASCER.

Our Context

We began our work guided by IASCER's mandate, and the bishops' report *Called to Be One*, which contained the relevant Lambeth Conference resolutions. The report had particularly highlighted 'Consistency and Coherence – Response and Reception' as an overarching concern across the proliferating bilateral and multilateral networks of ecumenical encounter, internationally and regionally. The challenge had come in many forms, and not only faced Anglicans. Many terms, particularly those such as 'communion' and 'full communion', were not being used in a consistent way. Differences in use of terminology were sometimes the result of divergent visions of the unity being sought, or sometimes the opposite was true – a shared vision differently described. For example, it was clear that Anglican - Lutheran regional dialogues launched in the 1990s in Europe and the USA were using very different language: the Porvoo Common Statement described a goal of visible unity entailing 'agreements in faith with the common celebration of the sacraments, supported by a united ministry and forms of collegial conciliar consultation in matters of faith, life and witness'; while the Episcopal – Lutheran Concordat looked towards 'full communion'. There needed to be clarity both over what we were seeking, and the language we used to express it.

Ensuring consistency between dialogues proved to be a challenge in other ways. Our relationships with each of our partners have a range of histories, some easier than others. Our partners also have their own particular characteristics, self-understandings, priorities and practices, and their own emphases in matters of faith and order. We needed to consider how far it was possible for the methodologies and focuses legitimately to vary among bilateral encounters, and how careful attention to context could help ensure underlying consistency. Similar close attention would also be required in the cross-reference to multilateral fora, for example where the World Council of Churches (WCC) had developed its own particular methodologies and language of operation.

Alongside these, there was a deeper challenge to Anglicans to consider consistency and coherence in the way we speak to our various partners. As recent years have shown, there are both strengths and weaknesses in the breadth of diversity that has characterised Anglicanism. On the plus side, this has enabled individual Anglicans to develop close affinities across almost the entire span of the global Christian family. (In one multilateral gathering,

Anglicanism was described as ‘jam that holds the ecumenical sandwich together’.) However, while some might be on a close wavelength to the Roman Catholic Church, and others to Pentecostals, we needed to ask whether the two Anglican channels were compatible. We needed to ensure that in essence, the same message was being conveyed, even if through very different media.

Addressing our Ecumenical Life

We began our first meeting with a long and thorough review of every Anglican bilateral international dialogue: its history, its achievements, its current state, its aspirations. We also reviewed dialogues with Churches in Communion, multilateral dialogues, regional dialogues, local ecumenical initiatives and relationships with Continuing Churches. We looked at what work might be required from IASCER to support and encourage a dialogue or relationship, or to further the reception of its achievements through the Communion. We considered what advice we might give, or what note of caution we needed to sound.

Alongside this review we began to develop lists of overarching issues to which we realised we needed to pay particular attention. Many of these became lasting themes running through the entire life of the Commission. While, over subsequent years, we devoted the bulk of our time to the continuing review of dialogues (recorded in Chapters 7 to 10), it was the ongoing thematic work that prompted some of our deepest and most substantial reflection, much of which we attempted to summarise in various documents.

Themes in Ecumenism

At the end of our first meeting we identified four key areas around which we needed to focus work, which, apart from minor amendment and change of emphasis, remained largely unaltered.

The first was the question of communion with and within the Anglican Communion, embracing such aspects as how one comes into communion with the Communion; the ability of the Communion as a whole to take decisions on ecumenical matters; the question of whether a relationship of communion of one Province had implications for other Provinces – the concept of ‘transitivity’, and the anomaly of parallel jurisdictions.

Second was a related set of issues around communion and relationship, including the breadth of terminologies of full, partial and impaired communion.

A third cluster of concerns related to Holy Orders, including coherence in the expression of our understanding of ordination and of the three-fold ministry and, within this, particularly the nature of episcopacy and *episcopate*, and of the diaconate.

Fourth came broad questions of Anglican identity and coherence of Anglican engagement in our ecumenical encounters (as well as coherence within other families of churches), and their implication for relations at international level as well as nationally or regionally.

Other, often related, thematic issues arose in subsequent meetings. Together they evolved into the four overarching topics which are addressed in Chapters 3 to 6: Communion, Baptism and Eucharist, Holy Orders, and Reception. 'Reception' refers to the broad area that is encapsulated in questions of how, as Anglicans, we pursue our ecumenical vocation as a worldwide Communion, and how we corporately take account of our ecumenical encounters and incorporate their fruits into our common life.

Anglican Identity

Lying even more deeply than these themes was the question of what it is to be Anglican. If Anglicans were to talk with others, we realised that we needed a sense of clarity and confidence in our own identity and our own vocation as Anglicans. Ultimately, consistency and coherence with this self-understanding were required, even if we believed that Anglicanism in and of itself has no eschatological destiny other than being found within the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of God. Nonetheless, we concluded that there is a distinctiveness and authenticity about our character which bears some reflection of the true Body of Christ, and which we would want to uphold and preserve of itself and in our relations with others – even if it given expression through the multiplicity of contexts in which Anglicans find themselves.

In 2003, the implications of Anglican diversity for ecumenical dialogue came more starkly into focus following the election and consecration as bishop in the Episcopal Church (TEC) of a priest in a committed same sex relationship. IASCER's membership ranged from those who were supportive of the consecration to others who were highly critical. The IASCER meeting that followed a few weeks after the consecration was particularly fraught with

tensions that then ebbed and flowed through subsequent years, even as we negotiated ways of working together in and through our differences.

There were of course significant ecumenical consequences from the consecration (and it was generally to this, rather than to developments in Canada, that partners referred). Elements of these are considered in Chapter 12 together with the Anglican Covenant proposals and the Canon Law project.

Unity, Faith and Order

In responding to ecumenical concerns, we found ourselves required to consider at an even more fundamental level the nature of Anglican identity. Questions about whether we were a reliable and consistent partner overlay more basic doubts. As one ecumenical partner put it, ‘We no longer knew to whom we were speaking’. Beyond human sexuality, there were matters of ecclesiology and authority which became the primary issue in many of our relationships, and to which we also had to give consideration.

This brought into higher relief what was becoming apparent through our thematic work – that it was not possible to separate matters of ecumenism from matters of doctrine, ecclesiology, liturgy, or any other aspect of Anglican life. (In this vein, the 2008 Lambeth Conference also acknowledged the theological core that lies at the quest for unity.⁵) It is the totality of Anglican belief and practice which others perceive, and with which they engage. More than this, the questions asked of us by ecumenical partners can often prompt us to deeper self knowledge and draw out clearer enunciation of who we understand ourselves to be. Thus we found that inevitably we had to trespass into other fields, and our interactions with other Anglican bodies’ prime areas of responsibility are recorded in Chapter 11.

In consequence, as the mandates of both IASCER and of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (IATDC) neared their end, we recommended that any successor body concerned with doctrine and ecclesiology should also address ecumenism. Chapter 14 sums up our conclusions in this area and offers some reflections on the future work of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order (IASCUFO) which succeeds IASCER, and will indeed have a comprehensive remit.

Drawing Conclusions

The work of IASCER addressed only a short phase within the far longer journey of God’s people towards the unity which is God’s will. We began our

work in the middle of the life-time of many ecumenical dialogues. Though the mandate of IASCER has concluded, these relationships continue, and ecumenical understandings and methodologies will keep evolving. The Commission recognised that many of the decisions taken and conclusions reached might represent little more than milestones along the way, and will soon be overtaken as the progress for which we prayed and laboured continues.

Even so, we tried to identify signposts that could assist us as we journey forward. Chief among these was the development of a set of ‘Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism’ setting out an Anglican understanding of, and approach to, the pursuit of the full visible unity of God’s Church. At the request of IASCER, these were developed by Gregory Cameron, Director of Ecumenical Affairs at the Anglican Communion Office, from a snap-shot description he had previously presented to a multilateral ecumenical gathering. Though these Principles were the final fruit of IASCER’s work, they also express our fundamental starting point, addressing the goal, task, processes and content of ecumenism. Therefore they form the heart of Chapter 2, which sets out a comprehensive account of Anglican engagement with ecumenism as the context for all that follows in this volume.

Some Lessons Learned

For the most part, the conclusions that IASCER reached on particular issues are reflected in the decisions, resolutions, and various other documents that are printed in this book. However, there are more general insights that have been recorded within the commentary contained in each chapter. Some observations are only tentative, and they are offered for further consideration and development by IASCUFO.

Reflections on the Life of IASCER

An account solely of ecumenical principle and practice would be only a partial description of all that IASCER was, and did, and aspired to be. What follows is a more personal reflection on the life and work of the Commission, and how these were shaped by who we were and the contexts in which we operated – both our own corporate sharing in worship and fellowship, and our engagement with our brothers and sisters in Christ, Anglican and others, in the places we met.

Those who first gathered in Nassau in 2000 arrived armed with the Report and Resolutions of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, a two-inch thick file of documents, and the dawning realisation that our remit ran very wide indeed.

While three of our number, together with the Secretary, had served on the Ecumenical Advisory Group and could provide an invaluable measure of continuity, it was also clear that developments within the ecumenical movement now called for a fresh and more comprehensive approach. The bishops at Lambeth had identified a range of questions and concerns. It was now for us to address them.

Initial appointments to IASCER were made for three years, with a distinction between ‘members’ who represented the various international dialogues involving Anglicans, and ‘consultants’, who brought particular expertise – perhaps in a region, or to provide a link with other Anglican bodies (such as the Theological and Doctrinal Commission or Liturgical Consultation). Over time, as dialogues concluded, began, or entered new phases with different participants, and as some of our own group moved to other responsibilities, resigned, retired, or died, the distinction between members and consultants was dropped. New members were brought in as replacements or to ensure adequate representation of geography, dialogues and expertise, while the original appointees, where possible, continued to serve as it became apparent that the task before us would require sustained commitment. A full list of members is given at the back of this book. Six stalwarts stayed the course for every one of the nine meetings and a number of others served from start to finish. This allowed us to reflect on the important balance between continuity and evolution in our ecumenical endeavours.

Membership was primarily composed of bishops (entrusted with a particular vocation to promote and care for the unity of the Church), full-time ecumenists and academics. All were ordained. This brought a wealth of knowledge and expertise, particularly of engagement in formal ecumenical forums on matters of faith and order, without which our work would not have been possible. IASCER was also enriched by the fresh perspectives of those with other backgrounds and rather less experience in the details of ecumenism – sometimes a question for clarification on some matter taken for granted by the ‘experts’ could open up new and productive avenues of debate. Through our corporate learning, IASCER could also strengthen the Communion’s own resources in ecumenical expertise. (It is intended that the composition of IASCUFO, a larger body, will enjoy an appropriate balance of specialisation, gender, age, geography and church tradition, as well as ordained and laity, and have a concern for developing expertise across the whole Communion.)

With only three members in our initial meeting engaged in parish ministry, and none of those present at our final gathering, IASCER was aware of the risk (that runs far wider than Anglicanism) of a ‘professionalisation’ of

ecumenism that can distance it from the clergy and people of our congregations – the great majority of whom are likely to have little awareness of what is under discussion or of the significance of the issues being debated and the fine distinctions being drawn. Such distance brings two major drawbacks. It can hinder the ability of local ecumenism to benefit from the riches of formal dialogues and agreements. It can also impede the churches' ability effectively to harness the energies of local ecumenical activity, which may be very extensive in terms of person-hours and the breadth of encounter, in support of institutional relationships. (Thus the *Indaba Reflections*, 80, recorded the question raised at the 2008 Lambeth Conference of whether future ecumenism should be considerably more 'bottom up'.)

IASCER was assisted in addressing this concern through its engagement with the local Anglican (or Episcopal) churches in the places where it met (listed at the back of the book). We were also helped by grounding our meetings in worship, often shared with our hosts. Some provided chaplains to lead Morning and Evening Prayer or preside at the Eucharist. Everywhere we shared in Sunday worship – from the Cathedrals of Nassau and the Seychelles, to the South African township of Gugulethu or the elegant synergy between Japanese and Western styles of church building and fabric in Nara. Sometimes we went together, sometimes we divided ourselves among many parishes, and often one or more of us preached. We also enjoyed social encounters with local Anglican clergy and lay leaders, and with it the challenge to explain our work, and make connections between our deliberations and parish life. This kept us mindful of local contexts and their needs when we commissioned or produced study guides and other documents to help the fruits of ecumenism be enjoyed at every level of church life.

Meeting only as Anglicans, rather than with an ecumenical partner, allowed us considerable freedom in the choice of venues, and IASCER hoped that through our visits we were able to offer encouragement to those we met, and strengthen their sense of partnership and belonging within the world-wide Communion. Ours was, for example, the first international Anglican meeting of its kind in the Nippon Sei Ko Kai (the Anglican Episcopal Church in Japan).

Our presence was frequently a catalyst for ecumenical meetings, both formal and informal. So, for example, in Cairo we, with our hosts, were received by His Holiness Pope Shenouda III, Pope of Alexandria and Patriarch of the See of Saint Mark, and His Beatitude Patriarch Antonious of the Coptic Catholic Church; and some members had discussions with His Eminence Metropolitan Bishoy of Damiette, Co-Chair of the Anglican – Oriental Orthodox International Commission (AOOIC), together with its Co-Secretary Bishop

Nareg Alemezian. Each time the Commission met, we also had opportunities to share in more relaxed conversations with our hosts' ecumenical partners, and representatives from the local communities.

The dynamics of IASCER's own membership also undermined any tendency towards over-reliance on an 'ecumenism of the head' to the detriment of the rest of our humanity. Introducing ourselves at our very first session, we learned that two of our number had recently been bereaved, and the rawness of their grief encountered in conversations and in worship could not be forgotten in the midst of more academic discussion. Companionship in the gospel and in the victory of Christ over life and death was also deepened in the celebration of the marriage between myself and Justus Marcus – and in the loving and prayerful support that surrounded us from the diagnosis of his cancer just before the 2002 meeting through to his death during the course of the 2003 meeting, exactly three years from the day we first made our introductions. For this particular journeying together, my gratitude to these brothers and sisters in Christ, and to the God whose love we shared, cannot be understated.

In all things God works for good, and though this is not the place to write at greater length of the more than sufficiency of the God's grace even through these sad times, what is certain is that bonds forged beyond the merely professional in these and other ways eased our ability to work constructively together from the first, across great differences of church tradition, background, culture, experience and personality. In the storms that followed developments in North America, though there was often friction among us, there was also considerable freedom to speak frankly, and so perhaps be challenged by a wider and fuller picture with which to wrestle together. It was never easy, but we felt that we could nonetheless pursue our work together with honesty and integrity before God, both despite and through our disagreements and the degree of impaired eucharistic fellowship among us (which also reflected differing views on the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate).

Frankness in debate was accompanied by an important commitment to confidentiality. Though we maintained an informal narrative record of our discussions, from the first it was agreed that this was to be shared only among our membership. This freed us in our exchanges to range as widely and as forthrightly as we felt the topic in hand required, which greatly enhanced our work. Thus in this book though the subjects of our discussions are recorded, and their ramifications analysed and reported, no views are assigned to individuals (the exceptions being where thanks are recorded for certain pieces of work). Meanwhile, decisions of our earliest meetings, resolutions

(as they subsequently became termed), and other texts are presented as corporately owned and endorsed. IASCER warmly commends this methodology to IASCUFO for consideration.

Though there may have been great diversity among us on various levels, we shared a concern for faithful obedience to our Christian calling – and to our ecumenical vocation as part of this – not only as Anglicans but primarily as members of the Body of Christ. Some of us reflected at our final meeting that our ability both to love the best of all that Anglican tradition offers and yet to sit lightly to it, had significantly benefited our work. Our inheritance could (and should) be seen as stepping stone, more than straitjacket, on the ecumenical journey.

While we considered the content of our ecumenical engagement in considerable detail, there was no intention that IASCER should attempt to micromanage dialogues and agreements. IASCER's aim was rather to resource and encourage, to ensure that the insights and experiences gained in one place could be shared in others, to offer caution (with detailed explanation) where required, and to provide a broad and balanced context of coherence and consistency against which Anglicans might confidently pursue ecumenical encounter at every level. Those who served on particular dialogues or other Anglican bodies were expected to act as two-way conduits.

Chapter 14, Looking to the Future, includes IASCER's reflections on outstanding issues and areas where more might be done. I should like to offer some additional personal comments on the challenges and frustrations IASCER has faced.

The nature of the Anglican Communion is such that there is an unavoidable disparity in the resources on which different Provinces are able to draw and devote to the pursuit of ecumenism. Those that are well-resourced tend to have larger numbers of ecumenists, who have greater training and experience, and generally enjoy superior access to everything from journals and other publications to conferences and exchanges between experts. These Provinces are likely to provide many skilled candidates for appointment to bodies such as IASCER and the dialogues. All of this, though valuably enhancing expertise, risks exacerbating disparities across our family of Churches. At times, IASCER heard perhaps too much from the better resourced and represented Provinces – and certainly too little from those who were not represented in our membership.

There are three particular challenges here: to develop and resource expertise more widely across the Communion (though this is of course a concern not limited to ecumenism alone); to improve communications between

Communion-wide bodies and Provinces, dioceses and their clergy and people (which this book is in part aimed at addressing); and to explore further the ways in which the ecumenical advances of those who have the resources to devote to them can be better appropriated elsewhere in the Communion (point b(v) of IASCER's mandate relates to this, and some consideration is given in Chapters 3 and 6, in their engagement with issues of transitivity and reception).

Another challenge to IASCER was the time that members were able to devote to the Commission. We worked intensely during the week that we met each December, but there was little capacity to carry this forward between meetings. Our retired members worked disproportionately hard, but they should not be exploited! Others were more than occupied with their primary responsibilities. It was not possible to pursue all the areas of research we would have liked (as is noted in relation to questions of communion, in Chapter 3). We considered commissioning work from others – perhaps research students – but recognised that this would probably require funding of some sort. Nevertheless, it is a matter to which consideration ought to be given, if IASCUFO is to fulfil its mandate.

May I register my thanks to all who participated in the meetings and work of IASCER over the years, and in the production of this book. Most of all I am grateful to the Commission's members and staff over the years: for worship shared, wisdom imparted, expertise offered, insights exchanged, fellowship cherished and friendships forged and strengthened, not least in our difficult yet determined wrestling together over the issues that have recently so strained the Communion, and to say nothing of companionship in Christ through marriage, illness and widowhood.

Today's world presents many challenges, not only to Anglicans, in following our Saviour Jesus Christ in faithful obedience. Rapid technological change confronts us with new situations and poses new questions; secularisation and other faiths offer their contending views; while globalising information systems bring greater awareness of and interchange between our many different and evolving cultures. Of course, Christians always and everywhere have had to wrestle with authentic expression of the gospel in their own contexts, discerning between appropriate inculturation and erroneous syncretism. My hope and prayer is that this book will help Anglicans and other Christians in similar discernment of how we can most truly respond to our Lord's prayer that we should be one, and thus more fully 'lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called, with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one

body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in all' (Ephesians 4.1-6).

Amen.

2. Anglicans and Ecumenism

Anglican ecumenical engagement has a long history. While the contemporary ecumenical movement is often dated from the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910, Anglicans were explicitly conscious of their vocation to work for Christian unity some half a century earlier, as the seeds of today's Anglican Communion structures were being sown – and, of course, contacts and conversations with other Christian traditions far pre-date either of these.

As Owen Chadwick records,⁶ when the Bishop of Montreal was urging the Archbishop of Canterbury to call the very first Lambeth Conference, among his arguments was the assertion that such a Conference would serve an invaluable role in pursuing 'reunion' between Anglicans and other Christians. Though the suggestion was originally 'taken up only with politeness', soon a significant part of Lambeth Conference agenda was devoted to relations with other church traditions, even if these did, in early years, give rise to some rather prickly resolutions on the Roman Catholic Church.

The first two Lambeth Conferences of 1867 and 1878 made only brief reference to Christian unity, but in 1888, nine of the nineteen resolutions had an ecumenical dimension, among them, in Resolution 11, the affirmation of what is now known as the 'The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral', whose four articles 'in the opinion of this Conference ... supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards home reunion'. The full text of these articles is carried later in this chapter, and to a very considerable degree they remain a touchstone for Anglican encounters with other Christian traditions, as was reaffirmed in Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV:2.

All subsequent Lambeth Conferences have given significant consideration to ecumenical matters, both in addressing the details of particular relationships and in issuing broad resolutions on the nature of our vocation to strive for unity. One such is Resolution 9 of 1920, from which the title of this book is drawn. These have formed the bedrock on which subsequent endeavours have built. (Further consideration of the Lambeth Conference's role in ecumenical relations is given in Chapter 13.)

When the 1966 Lambeth Conference endorsed the proposal for an Anglican Consultative Council, four of the eight listed functions ('e' to 'h') addressed ecumenical issues. Though others have been added to what is now described as the Object of the ACC, the four remain unchanged:

- e. To keep before national and regional churches the importance of the fullest possible Anglican collaboration with other Christian churches.

- f. To encourage and guide Anglican participation in the ecumenical movement and the ecumenical organisations, to co-operate with the World Council of Churches and the world confessional bodies on behalf of the Anglican Communion, and to make arrangements for the conduct of pan-Anglican conversations with the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Churches, and other Churches.
- g. To advise on matters arising out of national or regional church union negotiations or conversations and on subsequent relations with united churches.
- h. To advise on problems of inter-Anglican communication and to help in the dissemination of Anglican and ecumenical information.

Reports on IASCER's work were made by incumbent Directors of Ecumenical Affairs to ACC-12 and 13, which passed affirmative resolutions. Among these, 12.26 reminded member Churches of IASCER's role in advising and supporting national and regional ecumenical initiatives; and 13.32 endorsed IASCER's resolutions passed between 2002 and 2004, particularly commending the Guidelines on Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations (carried in Chapter 4). Reports have also been made from time to time to the Primates' Meeting, and to the Joint Standing Committee (JSC) of the Primates and the ACC which has in turn referred work to IASCER. Because of the distinctive *Indaba* approach taken at the 2008 Lambeth Conference, no formal report was made, but IASCER's input was received in other ways, including through advice offered to the Lambeth Conference Design Group (on all of which see Chapter 13).

In this way the work of IASCER has been integrated into the wider life of the Communion at a formal level, particularly through the Instruments of Communion. That said, there are serious concerns about how the fruits of our ecumenical endeavours can be more tangibly and comprehensively received and incorporated into Anglican life, and these are addressed in Chapter 6.

In pursuing its mandate, IASCER of course drew heavily on the views of the Instruments of Communion (particularly the Resolutions and Report, *Called to Be One*, of Section IV of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, as previously mentioned). From all this, and from what was developed and became implicit in its own deliberations, IASCER endorsed a set of principles of the Anglican approach to ecumenism.

These principles were first offered by the Director of Ecumenical Affairs, Gregory Cameron, as part of an overview of Anglican ecumenical engagement to the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogues facilitated by the

Faith and Order Commission of the WCC, in Breklum in March 2008. In reviewing this contribution, IASCER realised that a clear explication of such principles could provide a valuable resource for all Anglicans engaged in relationships with other Christian traditions, and passed a resolution commending them for consideration and further development by ACC and IASCUFO:

**Resolution 17.08:
Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism**

IASCER:

- welcomes the document ‘Principles of Anglican Engagement with Ecumenism’ prepared by the Director of Ecumenical Affairs, and commends it to ACC-14 for reflection and discussion
- hopes that the document may be further developed by IASCUFO as a resource for ecumenical work in the Anglican Communion.

A more mature form of these principles, now reduced from six to four, was refined by Canon Cameron through the discussion at IASCER and in subsequent informal consultations:

Four Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism

1. The Goal of the Ecumenical Movement

The Anglican Communion is organised as a family of national and regional Churches living in communion with one another. These Churches understand themselves to belong to the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ. The Anglican Communion is a therefore a partial expression of a deeper reality, and the Communion is not self-contained. Anglicans believe that God calls all Christians into the full visible unity of the one Church of Jesus Christ in order to be a living expression of God’s purposes for the reconciliation of the whole of creation. Anglican Churches are therefore committed to the full visible unity of the Church, according to the ancient understanding of church unity (as first developed in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, c100): namely, all the people of God in one place gathered around their bishop in one eucharistic fellowship, sharing one proclamation of one faith, with one ministry in the service of the Gospel, and oriented towards mission.

We believe that the unity which is both God’s will and his gift to his Church is being made visible as all in each place who are baptised into Jesus Christ and confess him as Lord and Saviour are brought by the Holy Spirit into one fully committed fellowship, holding the

one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel, breaking the one bread, joining in common prayer, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all, and who at the same time are united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are accepted by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls his people.

WCC 3rd Assembly, New Delhi, 1961

In this conciliar fellowship each local Church possesses, in communion with the others, the fullness of catholicity, witnesses to the same apostolic faith, and therefore recognises the others as belonging to the same Church of Christ and guided by the same Spirit.

WCC 5th Assembly Nairobi, 1975

2. The Task of the Ecumenical Movement

Anglicans acknowledge that communion with the Triune God, which is a gift established by grace through faith, entails a serious obligation to grow into fullness of communion with all Christians. The task of Anglican engagement in the ecumenical movement is therefore to 'recognise and receive' those elements of the one true Church which Anglicans apprehend in their ecumenical partners. This task calls for and promotes ecumenism on many different levels - not just in doctrinal dialogue, but also in the invitation to share worship, prayer and the exploration of spirituality. It also entails shared engagement with the world, and the development of a common mission and witness. The ecumenical commitment of the Anglican Communion should be expressed all round (*towards all ecumenical partners without favour*) and at every level (*from the local to the global*).

'We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in his Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church. ... This united fellowship is not visible in the world today. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communion in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great non-episcopal Communion, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communion, and our own, may be led

by the Spirit into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organised 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. ... The vision which rises before us is that of 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.'

*From the Appeal to all Christian People, Resolution 9, 1920
Lambeth Conference*

3. The Processes of Ecumenism

Anglicans seek to live 'in the highest degree of Communion possible', and should strive to avoid breaking or impairing the degree of expression of the communion given to us in Christ which is already manifested. Anglicans seek to participate in the greatest possible practical expressions of the communion we share with our ecumenical partners. This often means moving towards eucharistic hospitality at an early stage of relationship. (The most common formula in Anglican Churches being admission of all baptised and communicant members of trinitarian Churches to eucharistic communion in Anglican Churches.) Anglicans are willing to move towards unity by stages. This means Churches will consider entering into expressed degrees of recognition of communion as steps on the way to full visible communion. Anglicans are even prepared to live with degrees of 'bearable anomaly', in which current differences of practice are tolerated for a temporary period, provided there is a commitment to move beyond them.

'This Conference recognises that the process of moving towards full, visible unity may entail temporary anomalies, and believes that some anomalies may be bearable when there is an agreed goal of visible unity, but that there should always be an impetus towards their resolution and, thus, towards the removal of the principal anomaly of disunity.'

Lambeth Conference 1998, Resolution IV.1.c

(Notes: The concept of 'the highest degree of communion possible' was originally developed in the context of intra-Anglican conversations in relation to the potential divisions which might arise in response to the ordination of women to priesthood or episcopate. The Eames Commission understood its task as seeking to find ways for Anglicans,

faced with differences on this issue, to be able to maintain ‘the highest degree of communion possible’.

‘Proceeding by stages’ may involve specific agreements or covenants of appropriate co-operation in mission, in fellowship, in the sharing of worship, of Eucharistic hospitality and of Eucharistic sharing in advance of the recognition of ‘full Communion’. Full Communion is a term which must be handled with care, and is usually regarded as itself a stage on the way to organic unity, but which implies full interchangeability of ministry and membership. Anglicans are therefore familiar with agreements of ‘mutual recognition’, ‘communion’ or ‘full communion’, even though there remains some discussion about the proper use of such terminology.)

4. The Content of Church Unity

Anglicans take very seriously questions about the content of the teaching of the Christian faith. This faith embraces the whole of life and the ordering of the Church according to God’s will. Anglicans seek the proclamation of a common faith, the celebration of common sacraments and the exercise of a common ministry, which implies a high degree of convergence and agreement. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, adopted at the 1888 Lambeth Conference and which adapts principles formulated first at the 1886 Chicago Missionary Conference, remains the continuing Anglican understanding of the basis upon which ‘reunion’ between the Churches might be built:

- i. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as ‘containing all things necessary to salvation’, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- ii. The Apostles’ Creed, as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
- iii. The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself – Baptism and the Supper of the Lord – ministered with the unfailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him;
- iv. 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.

Canon Gregory K Cameron
ACO, March 2009 ...

These Principles encapsulate the essence of many years of discussion. The issues raised during these deliberations are likely to remain pertinent as the Anglican Communion pursues its ecumenical vocation in various and

evolving circumstances. It is therefore worth looking at the thinking behind the Principles in some detail.

The Goal of the Ecumenical Movement

As with every aspect of the Christian life, the goal of Anglicans in our engagement with ecumenism is to be conformed to Christ and to live as he would have us live.

From early on IASCER members were explicitly clear that we held no brief to preserve or defend something labelled ‘Anglicanism’. As one person put it, ‘Anglicanism in and of itself has no eschatological destiny’. While Anglicans hope and trust that within Anglican tradition we have been gifted with elements that authentically reflect aspects of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ to which we belong, we acknowledge that such reflection is at best partial. We have never seen ourselves as ‘self-sufficient’.⁷ Therefore, though we believe we have much to share with others, we also know we remain impoverished as long as we remain divided; and, more than this, that our divisions undermine and impede the ability of the people of God to express God’s reconciling purposes for all creation. We cannot remain as we are, nor can we wait for eschatological fulfilment. For the sake of God’s mission, Anglicans, as faithful and obedient Christians, have no option but to labour for unity in Christ, and in the Body of Christ.

Anglicans are therefore committed to nothing less than ‘the full, visible unity’ of the Church. This is the terminology that we have come to use to describe our vocation, and that was upheld in Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV:1 and reaffirmed in 2008, in *Indaba Reflections*, 71. We use it in preference to other descriptions such as ‘full communion’, which may have other interpretations, for example, often describing some form of reconciled diversity between continuing parallel ecclesial jurisdictions, or even organic unity between two or more partners. Important though such agreements can be, they are only one stage (see ‘Process’ below) on a longer journey to our goal. Yet communion as the fellowship, the *koinonia*, we share in Christ, is at the heart of what we are called to seek. As *Indaba Reflections*, 72 puts it, ‘We recognise that all the baptised are brought through their grafting into the Body of Christ, into a relationship of communion with one another. The vocation of the Anglican Communion and the ecumenical vocation are therefore one and the same: to deepen our expression of the gift of full communion imparted to us already through our communion with and in Christ’. Chapter 3 records how IASCER discussed what we might mean by such affirmations, and attempted to clarify the various ways we use and

understand the term ‘communion’, and explore some of the questions that all this has raised.

While in some respects, the contemporary pursuit of ecumenism has its roots in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, in fact Anglicans look back to the very earliest Christian times for an understanding of what Jesus’ prayer of John 17:22 might mean in the ‘lived life’ of the Church. We share with those fellow members of the Body of Christ of the first and second centuries a vision that finds practical expression in the unity in faith of all the people of God in one place gathered around their bishop in one eucharistic fellowship, and so sharing together in God’s mission to God’s world. For this reason, our understanding of Eucharist (along with Baptism, as the two sacraments ordained by Jesus) and of episcopacy and the whole ordained ministry, are among the most central areas for discussion in our ecumenical encounters. The considerable work that IASCER pursued in these two areas is recorded in Chapters 4 and 5.

It may be worth noting why we generally refer to the Anglican Communion as a family of Anglican Churches, and rarely speak of ‘the Anglican Church’. Anglicans acknowledge a creative tension between the understanding of ‘local Church’, which is that portion of God’s people gathered around their bishop, usually in a territorial diocese, and ‘Church’ as a term or description for a national or regional ecclesial community, which is bound together by a national character, and/or common liturgical life, governance and canon law. Traditionally, Anglicans have asserted the ecclesial character of the national Church as the privileged unit of ecclesiastical life. The Church of England’s very existence was predicated upon such an assumption at the time of the Reformation. Recognised in most cases as ‘Provinces’, these national or regional Churches are the bodies through which the life of the Anglican Communion has been expressed. In practice, Provinces enjoy a considerable degree of autonomy – which we believe we are called to retain, even if we are searching for better ways of expressing and living out our interdependence and the mutual commitment we have to one another through the ‘bonds of affection’ of this family of Churches. Alongside all this, Anglicans also acknowledge that to speak of being a Church at the global level is to make a very high ecclesial claim, not least of our own unity in faith and life where, for all our aspirations, we know we fall short of what we are called to be.

The Task of the Ecumenical Movement

Though in one sense IASCER sat lightly to preserving Anglicanism, in another, we shared strong convictions that Anglican tradition has been gifted

by God with distinctive aspects that to a considerable degree authentically reflect elements of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ to which we belong. And the same is true of other Christian traditions.

As noted in Chapter 1, Anglican ecumenists therefore need a strong sense of Anglican identity so that we can articulate this, and share all that we believe is good about it with our partners. The publication of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* was warmly welcomed by IASCER as a particularly helpful resource in this area (see further comment in Chapter 12).

The task of ecumenism is for us to ‘recognise and receive’ these elements from one another, and through this to grow together in the unity of the faith we profess. In this we believe that the best and most authentic aspects of each will be preserved as we journey ever more closely with one another. We are not in pursuit of some ‘lowest common denominator’ across the whole spectrum of Christian expression. Rather, each in our partialness can expect freely and joyfully to be enriched by our increasing mutual openness and closeness, as we learn better to share the gifts of God, given in the manifestation of the Spirit to us for the common good, that is, for building up the Body of Christ until we all of us come to unity in faith and knowledge and to maturity in Christ our Lord (cf. 1 Corinthians 12.7, Ephesians 4.7-13).

One way that we can be helped in our efforts to recognise God’s gifts in each other is to pursue, as Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV.2 put it, ‘the further explication of the characteristics which belong to the full, visible unity of the Church (described variously as the goal, the marks, or the portrait of visible unity)’. Some of IASCER’s work, particularly in addressing key themes, began to do this.

It is worth noting that it soon became clear to IASCER that every dialogue is different. Each partner is unique, and often our common history (or lack of it) or the context in which we now meet also has distinctive aspects that we share with no others in quite the same way. What there is for us to recognise and receive, as well as offer, may vary considerably between ecumenical relationships.

An expectation that we should be ready to receive from others challenges us to fresh consideration of what it means to live with ‘unity in diversity’. As we are now experiencing within the Anglican Communion this is not always easy. Yet our understanding of our vocation to full visible unity calls us to explore what it might mean for us from an ecumenical perspective. IASCER’s consideration of what we meant by coherence and consistency in dialogues and agreements also had to embrace such legitimate variation.

The experiences of the four United Churches of South Asia give tremendous ground for encouragement. They are members of the Anglican Communion alongside thirty-four Anglican Provinces and six further Churches, two of which were not Anglican in origin but have come into full membership of the Communion: the Lusitanian Church in Portugal and the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church. In their joys in coming together and sharing their distinctive gifts, and even in their honesty over the struggles they faced in pursuing unity, they have much to teach us (see further comment in Chapter 7).

While pursuit of Christian unity through formal dialogues has tended to centre on questions of faith and order, it is not just in areas of theology and ecclesiology that we are called to be open to ‘recognise and receive’ from one another. Just as God’s loving and redemptive purposes reach to every part of his creation, so every part of Christian life is called into the unity that is God’s gift. Over the last decade or so the significance of this has increasingly been recognised and addressed in new ways in what might be termed ‘institutional ecumenism’, though co-operation at local level in everything from mission and social justice to prayer and Bible study is far more long-standing. The importance of ecumenism for all aspects of mission, not least advocacy and social justice, relief work and care of the environment, was stressed at the 2008 Lambeth Conference.⁸

A particularly significant development has been an engagement in what might be called ‘spiritual ecumenism’. There has been a growing realisation that through sharing our ‘faith journeys’, that is, experiences of the Christian life, people from different traditions can recognise that God is graciously at work in one another in ways we often had not previously appreciated. We have learned that recognition at this affective level of our shared fellowship in the gospel can provide a compelling glimpse of the unity to which we are called, and offer a powerful stimulus to the pursuit of this vocation, as well as broadening and strengthening our traditional modes of encounter. This approach can also enable our encounters with newly emerging non-denominational churches whose different structuring can make traditional forms of engagement less appropriate or effective.

IASCER strongly affirmed that our ecumenical vocation should not only embrace every aspect of the Christian life, it must also be pursued at every level. Conscious of the risk of becoming a rather rarefied and technical body, we aimed to counteract such tendencies, for example, through our contacts with the local churches, often with their ecumenical partners, in the places where we met (as mentioned in the previous chapter). Alongside this, we encouraged local and regional ecumenical initiatives, offering constructive assistance and suggestions where we could, sometimes through formal

resolutions (see Chapter 9) and sometimes informally through correspondence and conversation. We also bore in mind the needs and contexts of local churches in our production and promotion of study material so that the fruits of our ecumenical life could more easily be harvested and enjoyed. It is hoped that this book also may assist in sharing the riches of our ecumenical pilgrimage more fully among Anglicans and our partners on the ecumenical journey. Communication is not an easy task among a global family of some eighty million members, and IASCER passes to IASCUFO its concern that we should aim to do more and do better in this area.

It was also IASCER's intention that our work should strengthen our ability to express our ecumenical commitment 'all round', that is, towards all partners without favour. Our pursuit of consistency and coherence among all our ecumenical activities helped us address this task, even as we recognised that some of our partners were closer to us than others at the present moment of our journey. Ultimately full visible unity must embrace us all.

Ecumenism is thus an all round, every level, whole life undertaking, to be pursued through extending and strengthening webs of interconnection.

The Processes of Ecumenism

As already noted, 'communion' is a slippery word, yet it remains somehow at the centre of what we seek through the broadening and deepening relationships we pursue with other Christians.

Communion with one another arises from our communion with Jesus Christ, established in our incorporation into the Body of Christ in Baptism. It should therefore come as little surprise that mutual recognition of Baptism is often one of the most basic steps we can take to come closer to one another. In some parts of the world it can take time to achieve even this level of concord. IASCER strongly encouraged pursuit of such agreements where they do not currently exist, and warmly welcomed those recently reached at regional and local level, as recorded in Chapters 8 and 9.

Mutual recognition of Baptism opens the door to considering the extension of eucharistic hospitality – the admission to Holy Communion of baptised and communicant members of other trinitarian Churches. From these, further levels of agreement may follow, including various commitments to co-operation in mission, fellowship, and worship. Questions that arise early in dialogues tend to focus on 'mutual recognition' or 'interchangeability' of ministries and of ministers, which is why Baptism and Eucharist (Chapter 4) and Holy Orders (Chapter 5) were such significant elements of IASCER's work.

Reviewing the whole breadth and diversity of Anglican ecumenical engagement, IASCER concluded that it was generally helpful to look at progress towards full visible unity in terms of stages, though with some flexibility of approach. Thus Decision 15.01, commenting on conversations between the Church of England and its Methodist and United Reformed partners (see Chapter 9), affirmed ‘the importance of (a) seeking unity by stages, with theological agreement accompanying each step, while recognising that ecumenical progress is not always sequentially linear, and (b) the avoidance of short-cuts in ecumenical dialogue’.

IASCER’s support for stages arose in part from our recognition that it is essential that partners should be clear about their goals, and that they are fully shared, when entering into dialogue or conversation. Sometimes goals can be too broadly and aspirationally drawn and look too far into some undefined future, or be over-ambitious and unachievable within the current context. It is not a failure of faithfulness, but rather godly wisdom, to begin with what is realistic before attempting further steps. To aim too high and then fall short risks demoralisation or, worse, a sense of failure and betrayal between ecumenical partners. Going forward by means of clear stages can help avoid such set-backs.

Proceeding by stages requires careful handling in some specific areas. As noted above, while committed to expressing ‘all round’ ecumenism, often we find ourselves closer to certain partners than to others. We must therefore be sensitive to ways in which a step forward with one partner may mean moving away from, or delaying rapprochement with, another. Furthermore, our various agreements must be compatible and coherent with one another. We must also consider questions of ‘transitivity’ – how far elements within the relationship between A and B have consequences for relations not only between B and C, but even between A and C (a complex issue, considered in Chapter 3).

In various ways agreements can throw up anomalies, especially during transition periods. Some of these will be more bearable than others. Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV.1 recognised ‘that the process of moving towards full, visible unity may entail temporary anomalies, and believes that some anomalies may be bearable when there is an agreed goal of visible unity, but that there should always be an impetus towards their resolution and, thus, towards the removal of the principal anomaly of disunity’. In reviewing various international and national agreements and proposals, IASCER was encouraged to find that, provided there were clear commitments to when and how anomalous situations might be overcome, rather more could be considered bearable than was initially supposed (for example, see the

comments on United Churches in Chapter 7). Precedent and tradition should be seen as more of a springboard to new possibilities than a constraint on innovation (though attention should be paid to the contexts of agreements and the objectives they set themselves in considering their translatability into new circumstances). Imaginative initiatives might often provide new and helpful precedents, and, provided they are carefully thought through (and here we hope that the material in this book will prove particularly useful), should be given serious positive consideration as far as possible.

It is of course the case, and should be explicitly recognised (as it was in *Called to Be One*), that lasting division within the Body of Christ is the least bearable of all ecumenical anomalies.

Though not made explicit within these principles, IASCER recognised that humility in the face of human fallibility, and repentance for the sin of division and all that follows from it, are unavoidable and necessary elements in ecumenical processes. In our own dialogues with others, and in others' dialogues, during recent years there has been a growing willingness to make such admissions, and to address specific pains and hurts between Christian traditions – even where through history lives had been taken. Healing of memories is a necessary part of reconciliation. This was reflected in the process that led to the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification, made by the Lutherans and Roman Catholics (see Chapter 8, in the Lutheran section). It is also a central issue in the work being pursued by the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC on 'The Cloud of Witnesses' (see the section on Faith and Order, in Chapter 10).

The Nature of Church Unity

Inseparable from the goal, task and processes of ecumenism, is its content.

While truth and unity have sometimes been juxtaposed in the debates within the Anglican Communion, ultimately for us and for all Christians, the fullness of truth and the fullness of unity will only be found when they are found together, as 'all things' are reconciled with God in Christ (cf. Colossians 1.17-20). In responding faithfully to our vocation to be the Body of Christ, we can neither pursue unity at the expense of truth, nor truth at the expense of unity – though in this respect as in others, we may have to grapple with questions of what are bearable or unbearable anomalies.

However, what has not been negotiable in the work of IASCER, nor should be in any part of Anglican ecumenical engagement, is the commitment to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as 'containing all things necessary to salvation' and being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and

to the Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

This echoes the first two clauses of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, to which IASCER endlessly returned in its discussions. First adopted in 1888, it was reaffirmed in 1998, Resolution IV.1, which commended 'continuing reflection' upon its 'contribution to the search for the full, visible unity of the Church', while *Called to Be One* described it as a 'skeletal framework'. IASCER sought to pursue such reflection throughout its work. The third clause addresses the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself, Baptism and Eucharist, the theme of Chapter 4. The subject of its fourth clause can be seen as underlying IASCER's work on Holy Orders, considered further in Chapter 5.

More than all this, by affirming the position of the Quadrilateral within its enunciation of the Principles of Anglican Ecumenical Engagement, IASCER sought to provide in a comprehensive way a considered reflection, as requested by the bishops at Lambeth in 1998, of how, in our current context, it can continue to contribute to the search for the full visible unity of the Church.

Finally, however much we strive for right structures and procedures in our relationships with other Christians, they alone are not enough. We must remember that the life of the Church is always dependent upon the indwelling of God's Spirit among us. May the Spirit direct, inspire and bless us in our ecumenical engagement, and make us a blessing to God's world.

PART TWO

Themes

3. Communion

One of the major areas of complexity and confusion in ecumenical relations identified by the bishops at the 1998 Lambeth Conference and referred to IASCER was the issue of consistency not only between dialogues and agreements, but in the terminology we employ. IASCER attempted to introduce greater consistency and clarity in our own usage, and to share that with others.

A fundamental term in ecumenical discourse is *koinonia*, or communion: the scriptural term for the relationships of fellowship we share as fellow members of the Body of Christ. At IASCER's first meeting it rapidly became clear that the use of this term was an area of major confusion, inconsistency and complexity. Ecumenically we had spoken of inter-communion, being in communion, and full communion. Other descriptions included pulpit-and-table fellowship, mutual recognition, and reconciliation of ministries. The precise intentions behind these terms needed to be clarified. We needed to address what it meant to speak of a relationship of communion with the Anglican Communion, or with member Churches of the Communion; to answer how one comes into communion with the Anglican Communion; and to address the anomalies to which such relationships can give rise. There were also questions of how Anglicans could act as a single Communion in our ecumenical relations with others.

IASCER recognised it would need to take a far wider perspective than the brief on 'communion' given to the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission. This Commission was mandated 'to study the meaning of communion and how it can be nurtured within the church', exploring 'whether the nature of the communion that Anglicans share is sufficient to hold them together in a common calling during a time [of conflict over human sexuality]'.⁹ With two IASCER members serving also on IATDC, account was taken of its work. The differing starting points of the two bodies sometimes led to the highlighting of different priorities or insights. For example, IASCER found that work on Holy Orders (see Chapter 5) brought to light areas of difference with IATDC's paper, 'The Anglican Way: The Significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church'.¹⁰ IASCER produced a detailed response, and this, with Resolution 10.06, is carried in Chapter 11.

Conscious, therefore, of the ongoing work on the nature of communion as shared by Anglicans, and the continuing development of a draft Anglican Covenant, IASCER did not attempt definitive recommendations in many of the areas outlined above. Rather the aim became to bring greater clarity from

an ecumenical perspective to the underlying questions and to the issues at stake within them, and to draw these to the attention of those concerned with the debate within Anglicanism. Through this IASCER hoped to share insights that might be of value and ensure that wider understandings of the nature of communion within the whole Body of Christ were appropriately taken into account in internal Anglican debate (see also Chapter 12, on Developments within the Anglican Communion).

In attempting to consider the fundamental issues around ‘communion’ in relation to our ecumenical vocation it is helpful to begin with Principle 94 of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*:

Principle 94: Ecclesial communion

1. Ecclesial communion between two or more churches exists when a relationship is established in which each church believes the other to hold the essentials of the Christian faith and recognises the apostolicity of the other.
2. Full communion involves the recognition of unity in faith, sacramental sharing, the mutual recognition and interchangeability of ministries, and the reciprocal enjoyment of shared spiritual, pastoral, liturgical and collegial resources.
3. Inter-communion is an ecclesial relationship in which at least one but not all of the elements of full communion is present.
4. Churches in communion become interdependent but remain autonomous.
5. The relationship of communion does not require the acceptance of all theological opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of another church.

This reflects the dominant historic usage of these terms. Those wanting to enter into new agreements, and desiring to refer in some way to ‘communion’ should be guided by these principles, though they should also recognise that terms such as ‘inter-communion’ are rarely used today. Furthermore, within recent agreements, IASCER encouraged references to communion to be contextualised by acknowledgements that full visible unity of the Church remains the goal of ecumenical endeavours, and that this still remains to be further pursued.

The Waterloo Declaration, between Anglicans and Lutherans in Canada (text available through www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/ecumenical/) is a good

example of such language, as is the Porvoo Declaration, between Anglicans and Lutherans in Northern Europe.

Where agreements give rise to a relationship of [full] communion, care should still be taken in the use of language. IASCER members expressed unhappiness at the tendency of some to speak of ‘the Porvoo Communion’, rather than ‘the Porvoo Churches’, as a loose shorthand for the relationship under this Agreement. The degree of interdependent autonomy between these partners (as in *The Principles of Canon Law* 94:4) is far greater than that between member Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Historically it has generally been assumed that in order to be in communion with the entire Anglican Communion it was sufficient to be in communion with the See of Canterbury. Yet in Resolution 67 of the 1948 Lambeth Conference, the 1931 agreement in Bonn ‘between representatives of the Anglican Communion and of the Old Catholic Churches’ is recorded as having ‘resulted in the establishment of a state of intercommunion between the Old Catholic Churches and certain Churches of the Anglican Communion’. The Conference recommended ‘that this agreement be considered by those Churches of the Anglican Communion which have not yet considered it’. Evidently, the situation then was already more complex than before. As *Called to Be One* pointed out, it is now the case that ‘the juridical autonomy of the Churches of the Anglican Communion means that each Church has finally to make its own decisions about entering into a relationship of communion’. (The difficulties of taking decisions ‘as the Anglican Communion’, that are implicit here, are considered further in Chapter 6, Reception.)

The consequence of this appears to be that for any church to come into communion with the whole Anglican Communion would require a separate decision from each Anglican member Church. If a partner wished actually to join the Anglican Communion, then it would be necessary as a minimum to take into account the Constitution of the ACC, and its schedule of membership, amendment of which requires assent of two thirds of the Primates (Article 3.a). But whether more is required in terms of agreement from each member Church of the Communion is unclear.

This is an area requiring more work than IASCER was able to complete during its mandate. It might prove illuminating to research the details of how each of those ecclesial partners known as the Churches in Communion were deemed to have acquired such a status, and to compare this with what may be parallel, if distinct, processes, by which the Spanish Reformed Episcopal

Church and the Lusitanian Church in Portugal came into membership of the Communion.

The Principles of Canon Law sheds limited light on the ambiguities between how a relationship of communion and membership of the Communion is seen in canon law. Principle 10.4, on the Fellowship of the Anglican Communion, says ‘The relationship of ecclesial communion within the Anglican Communion is based on the communion of a church with one or more of the following: (a) the See of Canterbury; (b) the Church of England; (c) all the Churches of the Anglican Communion; (d) all churches in communion with the See of Canterbury; or (e) all churches which profess the apostolic faith as received within the Anglican tradition.’ Yet it is possible to fulfill all these criteria, as the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht did (prior to the Porvoo Agreement, which then excluded (d)), and not be a member of the Communion itself.

Where an ecumenical partner does come into a relationship of communion with one or more member Churches of the Communion, various anomalies arise.

First, as the bishops of the 1998 Lambeth Conference noted, given our particular self-understanding as a family of Churches, it is anomalous for other churches to be in communion with some Provinces but not others. However, it is a consequence of provincial juridical autonomy that there is in these circumstances no ‘transitivity’ (as IASCER has come to term it). This has, for example, given rise to various incongruities in relations between Anglicans and Lutherans around the world. Thus, while it would be possible for a Lutheran presbyter from the Church in Sweden to be licensed to the Church of England’s Diocese of Gibraltar in Europe, that person’s ministry would not be accepted by the Convocation of American Churches in Europe, even though the Convocation would accept a presbyter from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA). An ELCA presbyter, in turn, would not be recognised by the Church of England. Anglicans and Lutherans in other parts of the world have also expressed frustration that they cannot directly benefit from agreements reached elsewhere by better resourced Provinces, but are expected to pursue their own local dialogues. This is an area requiring further consideration.

A second anomaly results from the parallel jurisdiction of bishops that arises where coterminous churches come into relationships of communion. This is, strictly speaking, incompatible with our understanding that the full visible unity of the Church will find expression through all the people of God in one place gathered round their bishop in one eucharistic fellowship (see the first

Principle of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism, Chapter 2). This is already a longstanding challenge within the Anglican Communion in places like mainland Europe where there are bishops of the Church of England, the Convocation of American Churches in Europe, the Lusitanian Church in Portugal and the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church. Ecumenical agreements further complicate the picture. Thus, through the Bonn Agreement, all these Anglican jurisdictions are fully in communion with the bishops of the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht. Now, through the Porvoo Agreement, there is additional overlapping jurisdiction between its Lutheran members and the Church of England bishops. The same is true elsewhere where there are agreements of 'full communion'. This shows how such reconciled diversity can only be a temporary step on the journey to greater unity. Where it is unclear that there is a commitment to move forward in this way, the bearability of the anomaly is brought into question.

The concept of transitivity raises other ecumenical questions. IASCER had to consider whether, where one partner has a relationship of communion with a second, who in turn has a similar relationship with a third, there are any implications for relations directly between the first and third partners. In general IASCER tended to conclude that there is no such transitivity, but nonetheless recommended sensitive handling. When Canon David Hamid, the Anglican Communion Office's former Director of Ecumenical Relations, was consecrated as a suffragan bishop in the Church of England's Diocese of Gibraltar in Europe, the Old Catholic Churches, in accordance with longstanding practice, were invited to send a bishop to participate – but so too were the Lutheran partner churches of the recent Porvoo Agreement. Yet the Old Catholics were not in communion with these Lutherans, and did not recognise their episcopal ministry, and so were faced with the question of whether participation might imply some tacit recognition. After some discussion, it was felt that there was no element of transitivity, and all participated together.

That said, presuming a lack of transitivity requires that we should still strive for coherence between the various relationships into which we enter. IASCER was strongly of the view that commitments made to one partner must be compatible with commitments made to others, and commended that care be taken with the increase in potential complications as the number of agreements of 'communion' grew.

Different aspects of transitivity are pertinent where a church is invited to align itself with some form of agreement already reached between other parties. Sometimes it is clear within the shared text that, for example, a relationship of communion can be extended to include others (as has been

done with the Porvoo Agreement and the Anglican Churches of the Iberian peninsula). Alternatively, it may be that an agreement has been reached as the result of a very particular process of reconciliation and, where others have not been party either to the historic differences or to the journey of healing, assenting to shared conclusions may not always be appropriate. (In this way, as recorded in Chapter 8, IASCER felt it was appropriate that Anglicans should welcome the Lutheran - Roman Catholic Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification, and affirm its substance, but not 'sign up' to it.)

Other aspects of our *koinonia* within the Body of Christ remain on the table for further consideration. IASCER's work on Holy Orders, particularly the episcopate, underlines the importance of communion in time, as well as space. We should not forget the diachronic as well as synchronic dimension.

Other issues arise. One is what IASCER termed 'ecclesial density', that is, the extent to which a Christian community possesses sufficient characteristics, or 'critical mass', to be regarded as a fully-fledged church, and as a partner in ecumenical dialogue. While not attempting to define this closely, IASCER noted the importance of the marks indicated in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, or, at least, commitment to the common faith of the historic Church, a rule of faith, an established ordained ministry, and willingness and intentionality to move towards the full visible unity of the Church. Size and geographical presence may also be significant when it comes to deciding the level and nature of a dialogue. In this way, for example, the Anglican Communion has looked to the Anglican Church in Southern Africa to take the lead in conversations with the Ethiopian Episcopal Church.

It is evident that much work remains to be done in this complex area. Setting faith and order alongside church unity within a single mandate should allow IASCUFO to conduct a mutually beneficial dialogue between what it means to live in communion with one another in the Anglican Communion, and our exploration of the challenge of this vocation within the wider Body of Christ.

4. Baptism and Eucharist

The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, in its third point, underlines the importance of ‘the two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself – Baptism and the Supper of our Lord – ministered with the unailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him’ as one of the bases upon which we can build ecumenical relations and pursue Christian unity (see Chapter 2).

Both Baptism and Eucharist have been at the heart of important IASCEC discussions. Resolution 3.08 reaffirmed the Quadrilateral’s insistence that Baptism be unfailingly administered ‘in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’. As noted in Chapter 2, this is vital not only in itself, but in that mutual recognition of Baptism is the fundamental first step of mutual recognition within the Body of Christ. While it may be acceptable in certain other circumstances to use alternative trinitarian formulae (such as ‘in the name of the Creator, the Redeemer and the Sustainer’), such substitution is not acceptable within the context of Baptism. The Quadrilateral similarly upholds the unailing use in the Eucharist of the elements ordained by Christ. IASCEC addressed the discussion on this within the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in its Decision 17.01 and Resolution 11.06 - see Chapter 11.

The importance of Baptism as the sacramental sign of full incorporation into the Body of Christ is underlined in Resolutions 4.05 and 4.07 and the appended paper by Canon John Gibaut on ‘The Eucharistic Communion of the Non-Baptised’, written in response to concerns at instances in some parts of the Anglican Communion of inviting non-baptised persons, including members of non-Christian religious traditions, to receive Holy Communion. This is an example of how variations of internal Anglican practice may raise significant questions from ecumenical partners about the integrity of the whole Communion - questions which are often not anticipated by those who adopt these practices.

Decision 18.01 (reaffirmed in 2002) and Resolution 5.08 respond with concern to proposals in the Diocese of Sydney to allow diaconal and/or lay presidency at the Eucharist. This would be a significant breach with the traditional teaching and practices of the Church Catholic. Chapter 5 on Holy Orders, particularly in the paper on ‘Holy Orders in Ecumenical Dialogue’, gives additional and detailed consideration of Anglican understanding of who may preside at the Holy Eucharist.

Finally, at its last meeting, IASCER offered to IASCUFO reflections and questions on what Anglicans might mean by ‘the Sacraments duly administered’ within ecumenical agreements. In particular IASCER invited the new commission to address the conditions for which Anglicans should be looking to enable them to make an agreement with an ecumenical partner for mutual recognition or ‘interim eucharistic sharing’ that falls short of communion or ‘full communion’ with an interchangeable ordained ministry.

The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion is a helpful resource in addressing questions in these areas, in particular Principles 61-64 on Baptism, and Principles 66-69 on Holy Communion.

Baptism

Resolution 3.08: On the Baptismal Formula

IASCER

- noting with appreciation the Responses of the Vatican dicastery, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, (1 February 2008) concerning certain questions on the formula of Baptism, affirms, in accordance with scripture (Matthew 28.19) and the Catholic tradition as embodied in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, that to be valid, Baptism must invariably be administered ‘in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’.

Admission to the Eucharist of the Non-Baptised

Resolution 4.05: Admission of the Non-baptised to Holy Communion

IASCER

1. notes with grave concern instances in some parts of the Anglican Communion of inviting non-baptised persons, including members of non-Christian religious traditions, to receive Holy Communion in Anglican celebrations of the Eucharist, and that this practice is contrary to Catholic order as reflected in the canonical discipline of our churches, and undermines ecumenical agreements and partnerships

2. undertakes to study further the ecumenical consequences of communion of the unbaptised.

Resolution 4.07:

Admission of the Non-baptised to Holy Communion

IASCER

1. affirms that Christian initiation leads us from incorporation into the Body of Christ through Baptism to full participation in the life of grace within the Church through Holy Communion
2. notes again with grave concern instances in some parts of the Anglican Communion of inviting non-baptised persons, including members of non-Christian religious traditions, to receive Holy Communion
3. reminds all Anglicans that this practice is contrary to Catholic order as reflected in principles of canon law common to all the Churches of the Anglican Communion
4. believes that the invitation to Holy Communion of non-baptised persons undermines ecumenical agreements on Baptism and the Eucharist, current policies of offering eucharistic hospitality to 'Christians duly baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity and qualified to receive Holy Communion in their own Churches' (as expressed in Resolution 45 of the Lambeth Conference 1968), and eucharistic sharing agreements between churches
5. believes that the communion of the non-baptised undermines the very goal and direction of the ecumenical movement, namely the reconciliation of all things in Christ of which the Eucharistic Communion of the baptised is sign, instrument and foretaste.

The Eucharistic Communion of the Non-baptised¹¹

A Working Paper Prepared for IASCER, December 2007; revised January 2009

Introduction

In parts of the Anglican Communion, the presumption of baptism as the sacramental requirement for admission to holy communion is presently being questioned, challenged, and rejected. Invitations to holy communion are extended to the non-baptised, who may be Christian believers, seekers, the curious, as well as practising members of other

faith communities. The issues around the communion of the non-baptised are complex and inter-connected, dealing with questions of mission ecclesiology, Christian initiation and sacramental theology, canon law, liturgy, the formation of Christian identity, Christian hospitality, interreligious dialogue, and so on. The practice of admitting the non-baptised to holy communion—with its theological rationale—creates serious ecumenical challenges in the present, and calls into question the major ecumenical achievements of the past.

This reflection will locate the question of the admission of the non-baptised to communion within two larger contexts: baptism as sequentially and integrally related to the eucharist, and the ecumenical context since the 20th century in which eucharistic hospitality has been extended to baptised members of other churches. The reflection then continues with an overview of the recent practice of inviting non-baptised people to receive holy communion. It will consider the challenges to Anglican ecumenical engagement posed by the practice of admitting the non-baptised to holy communion.

A Historical Overview of Admission to Communion

Questions about who may, and who may not, receive holy communion at the celebration of the eucharist have historically been asked in many different ways within Christianity in general, and within the Anglican Communion in particular. Early Christianity understood baptism and the eucharist as intimately and integrally linked together as sacraments of Christian initiation, the only repeatable element of which was the weekly reception of holy communion. Given this constitutive nexus between baptism and the eucharist, the idea of admitting to holy communion those not baptised would have been inconceivable in the early Church; in fact, the evidence from patristic liturgical sources indicates that the non-baptised members of the Christian community were not permitted to attend the eucharistic liturgy after the proclamation of the word, and did not join in the general intercessions, let alone receive holy communion. It is clear in Western Christianity that until the 12th century, infant baptism included the reception of the eucharist; once the chalice was removed from the laity at that time, the ancient connection between baptism and the eucharist as integral parts of the rite of initiation was severed, at least in the West. Reception of the eucharist at baptism remains part of the rites of initiation of Eastern Christianity. Late medieval Christianity questioned whether baptism was the sole sacramental requirement for the reception of holy communion, or, as in the case of the late 13th century English church, whether baptism and confirmation together constituted the sacramental requirement. Related questions were posed about the appropriate age for 'first communion', ranging from various proposals concerning an 'age of discretion' to the recovery of infant communion in

the early 15th century Bohemian reforms. The restriction of holy communion to those baptised and episcopally confirmed was enshrined in the English Prayer Book tradition from 1549 onwards. Some manoeuvring room was added in the 1662 Prayer Book with the inclusion of the words 'or those desiring' to be confirmed; by the mid 17th century, clearly not all Anglicans had access to bishops and confirmation, and were not to be deprived of holy communion.

Since the 1960s, some of the older questions have resurfaced, giving rise in some Anglican provincial churches to the practice of communion of all the baptised, including newly baptised infants, while others continue the practice of limiting admission to holy communion to those baptised and confirmed. A reflection of this at the level of the Anglican Communion is found in the documents of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC). The findings of the 1991 meeting of IALC, *Walk in Newness of Life*, propose the following:

10. Baptism is the sacramental sign of full incorporation into the body of Christ. Thus, all who are baptised should be welcomed into the eucharistic fellowship of the church. We affirm the statement, 'Children and Communion', of the 1985 Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Boston.
11. Communion of all the baptised represents a radical shift in Anglican practice and theology. Over the past two decades there has been an increasing acceptance of this practice in the Anglican Communion, although some provinces continue to require confirmation for admission to communion. We encourage provinces to reflect upon baptismal theology and eucharistic discipline and to implement the recommendations of the Boston Statement.
14. Unbaptised persons who through faith in Christ desire participation in the eucharistic fellowship should be encouraged to make their commitment to Christ in baptism, and so be incorporated within the one body which breaks the one bread.¹²

This striking restatement of the bond between baptism and eucharist in both Anglican sacramental theology and pastoral praxis both reflects and gives rise to an ecumenical perspective on the same, which from the 1960s has ushered in a level of eucharistic hospitality to baptised members of other churches to the churches of the Anglican Communion.

The Ecumenical Experience of Admission to Communion

From the 19th century, new questions around admission to holy communion were posed from the emerging ecumenical movement. For example, may Christians from other churches, many of whom may not

have been (episcopally) confirmed, receive holy communion at Anglican celebrations of the Eucharist.¹³ Deeper questions around the restored eucharistic communion between the churches became the expressed goal of the ecumenical movement.

Until the mid-20th century, the possibilities of eucharistic hospitality were limited, and indeed, considered 'irregular'. The 1920 Lambeth Conference cautiously dealt with a number of these issues. It recommended that in projects of reunion the:

... bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any bishop who, in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of reunion, shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptised but unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.¹⁴

The 1930 Lambeth Conference added a pastoral reason for a further broadening of eucharistic hospitality:

The Conference, maintaining as a general principle that intercommunion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union, and bearing in mind the general rule of the Anglican Churches that 'members of the Anglican Churches should receive Holy Communion only from members of their own Church', holds, nevertheless, that the administration of such a rule falls under the discretion of the bishop, who should exercise his dispensing powers in accordance with any principles that may be set forth by the national, regional or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned. The bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any bishop who may, in his discretion so exercised, sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas, where the ministrations of an Anglican Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptised communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican churches, when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special or temporary circumstances.¹⁵

The resolution reflects the general principle within the Anglican Communion prior to 1968 that eucharistic communion is the goal rather than the means to Christian unity. This resolution, with the resolution noted from the 1920 conference, explicitly notes baptism as the sacramental requirement for admission to communion, affirming within the ecumenical context the sequential nexus between baptism and the eucharist.

From the 1960s, questions around eucharistic hospitality in its various gradations have been immensely complicated for Anglicans. An important benchmark in the development of policies around eucharistic hospitality is the resolutions of 1968 Lambeth Conference, which significantly opened new possibilities for the churches of the Anglican Communion. The most ardent and lengthy debate (six hours!) of the 1968 Lambeth Conference was around these questions on intercommunion.¹⁶ Resolutions 45 and 46 regarding Admission to Communion, together with Resolution 47 dealing with Reciprocal Acts of Intercommunion, mark a change of direction in Anglican policy regarding eucharistic sharing and hospitality, particularly on the possibility of eucharistic sharing with churches which do not have the historic episcopate, and hence what Anglicans would have understood as a validly conferred rite of confirmation. Once again, the nexus of baptism and the eucharist is central, forming the basis of an expanded eucharistic relationship with the members of other churches. Resolution 45 states:

The Conference recommends that, in order to meet special pastoral needs of God's people, under the direction of the bishop Christians duly baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity and qualified to receive Holy Communion in their own Churches may be welcomed at the Lord's Table in the Anglican Communion.¹⁷

The section report of the 1968 Lambeth Conference which gives rise to Resolution 45 is *The Renewal of the Church in Unity*. In its discussion on 'Intercommunion in a Divided Church' the report defines five levels of eucharistic sharing. First, there is 'full communion', which involves mutual recognition of ministers and members. Second, 'open communion' is the practice whereby a Church welcomes all baptised and communicant members of other Churches to receive holy communion. Third, 'free communion' is the practice whereby all are invited to share in holy communion regardless of their standing within their own churches, or even whether they have been baptised at all. Fourth, 'reciprocal communion' is the occasional and reciprocal practice of eucharistic sharing between churches which are working towards full communion; this practice arises from the relationships between Churches. Lastly, 'admission to communion' designates the practice of controlled eucharistic hospitality where a Church defines its own domestic discipline and the conditions under which members of other Churches may be welcomed to holy communion.¹⁸ The members of the subcommittee on Intercommunion in a Divided Church advocated positions four and five, that is, 'reciprocal communion' and 'admission to communion'. While the report insists that in both instances the goal of full communion must be kept in view, eucharistic sharing was also

seen as a means to that unity, especially in instances of reciprocal intercommunion.

The theological basis for this shift in the discipline of eucharistic hospitality in both the 1968 Lambeth Conference resolutions is the perception of a degree of Christian unity based on a common baptismal unity. As Thomas Ryan, a well-known North American Roman Catholic ecumenist and sometime member of the Anglican - Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, has commented:

The Anglican attitude to eucharistic sharing has changed as the Anglican attitude to baptism has changed. As baptism has been recognised as the universal sign of Christian belonging, Anglican attitudes to eucharistic sharing have softened and changed. This is a development of only the last few decades. The Anglican intuition now is to view baptism and Eucharist as inseparable; to affirm and even rejoice in the common baptism shared with others and then to deny that common life at the Lord's table is seen as depriving baptism of its meaning theologically.¹⁹

An interesting question here is to what extent by 1968 the bishops of the Anglican Communion had been influenced by the profound ecclesiological changes which had taken place in the Roman Catholic Church through the Second Vatican Council. Both the Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, and the Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, promulgated together on 21 November 1964, employ an underlying baptismal ecclesiology, which proposed a real, but imperfect, communion of all baptised Christians with the Catholic Church. I am convinced that the case can be made for the 1968 Lambeth Conference as an instance of 'reception' of *Lumen Gentium*, and I have made it elsewhere,²⁰ but this belongs to another discussion. We will return to the Council documents below.

The Admission of the Non-baptised to Communion

What the ecumenical questions and the internal liturgical and pastoral Anglican questions have in common is an elemental assumption that we are never not talking about the communion of baptised persons. In recent years, however, a new set of questions has arisen around the admission to holy communion of the non-baptised: people who are not baptised. As Anglicans, it is tempting to see this as an Anglican issue. In fact, many Christian traditions, usually Western Protestant, communicate the non-baptised as a matter of policy. Within an Anglican context, it is equally tempting to treat this issue as an initiative emerging exclusively within the Episcopal Church, which I suspect has wrestled with the issue a great deal more openly and in greater depth than other parts of the Anglican Communion. Yet the admission to communion of the non-baptised happens also in parishes of the

Anglican Church of Canada, the Church of England, and without doubt in many other provinces of the Anglican Communion.

It is important to clarify what the issue is actually about. In many places within the Anglican Communion, the communion of the non-baptised probably happens more than we could possibly ever know (or admit), particularly in larger communities where there are many visitors at celebrations of the eucharist. At such celebrations, few would argue for an inquiry of every stranger as to whether she or he is baptised. The explicit situation which needs to be addressed is when the non-baptised are expressly invited to receive holy communion through verbal invitation by the presiding bishop or priest, instructions in bulletins, and the like. In these instances, the admission of the non-baptised becomes articulated policy, even when the canons of particular dioceses and provinces do not support the practice. For instance, although considerable debate on the communion of the non-baptised has taken place within the Episcopal Church, the canon on this question has not changed and remains unequivocal: 'No unbaptised person shall be eligible to receive Holy Communion in this Church.'²¹

It is difficult to assess how widespread the practice is within the Anglican Communion. Even within the Episcopal Church, there are vastly different accounts. Professor James Farwell observed in 2004 that while 'the actual practice of offering communion to the unbaptised does not appear to be widespread, its profile is high enough to have warranted a resolution before the 74th General Convention asking for the appointment of a task force to consider the ecumenical and theological ramifications of this growing practice.'²² The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations of the Episcopal Church, which dealt with the question, however, noted within its report to the 2003 General Convention that 'It has become increasingly common for Episcopal clergy to invite all persons, whether baptised or not, to receive Holy Communion.'²³ The same is likely true in other provinces.²⁴ Although the unauthorised practice of the communion of the non-baptised is clearly at odds with official policy, it remains a major issue which poses serious questions to significant parts of the Church's life and mission, including ecumenism.

The motives for the communion of the non-baptised are mixed. In evangelical traditions, the motives are conversion and encouragement for any or all who seek or love Jesus. Within more liberal traditions, communion of the non-baptised is encouraged on the understanding that the eucharist must be grounded in the radical meal hospitality of Jesus. Here, the non-baptised may well include members of other faith traditions, who clearly do not seek or love Jesus, as well as seekers who attend Anglican celebrations of the Eucharist. There are two dimensions to this question: the admission of non-baptised seekers to

holy communion, and the admission of members of other faith traditions to communion. While these are vastly different questions, sacramentally and ecclesiologically they are the same. What the various approaches share is a sincere concern *not* to be perceived as inhospitable to visitors.

While the proponents of admitting the non-baptised to holy communion may be too quickly dismissed as having missed the point,²⁵ there is a significant level of theological reflection on the question, by both its proponents and its opponents. Of particular merit is a series of articles published in *The Anglican Theological Review* in 2004-2005 by Professor James Farwell of the General Theological Seminary, and Professor Kathryn Tanner of the University of Chicago. The three pieces are worth reading together.²⁶

Kathryn Tanner begins with an appeal to New Testament evidence, particularly Jesus' own radically inclusive meal hospitality, which she asserts became increasingly restrictive even within the New Testament itself, and certainly beyond. The inclusive sense of mission evidenced in Jesus' meal hospitality is significantly diminished once the Lord's Supper is restricted to the disciples of Jesus alone. Such a viewpoint reads the Lord's Supper within the context of the feeding of the multitudes and other meal narratives in the Gospels. As Tanner states, 'The Lord's Supper in this way takes on the quality of unconditional fellowship found unambiguously in Jesus' prior meals with sinners and outcasts, and it is this unconditionality that advocates of open communion purport to take to its logical conclusion in present church practice of the eucharist.'²⁷

The communion of the non-baptised is related to mission and pastoral care. The celebration of the eucharist poses questions that would never have occurred in the older Sunday pattern of matins and evensong, or non-eucharistic celebrations of baptism, marriage, or funerals. Given that Anglican churches are more likely to celebrate the eucharist as the main Sunday celebration, to exclude the non-baptised is to, in effect, exclude them from the Church. Within American culture, Tanner observes: 'The U.S. context, with its well-justified disparagement on the political front of anything less than full citizenship as 'second class,' is bound to foment this sense of exclusion on the part of the unbaptised adults not permitted to the communion rail.'²⁸

Rather than simply being understood as not being inhospitable and avoiding harm, there are positive ways in which the communion of the non-baptised is promoted in terms of Christian formation and initiation. On the grounds that so many of the new rites of baptism assume adult candidates as normative, including a deliberate and informed decision, that full participation at the eucharist becomes a weighty element of

that formation: 'You need the gift of a new shape of life (the eucharist) before you can commit yourself to living it (by being baptised).'²⁹ In other words, 'Open communion is essentially turning the eucharist into some sort of preparation for or element within an initiation rite – it is viewed as helping to make people members of the church, of the Body of Christ.'³⁰ Such a view could only be proposed within a Western church, which from the medieval period has inherited a disintegrated rite of initiation which does not see baptism and the eucharist *together* as consecutively constitutive of Christian identity.

James Farwell argues against the communion of the non-baptised through an exploration of relevant biblical, historical, theological, and pastoral evidence. While employing the term 'open communion', Farwell expresses misgivings about its use given its previous ecumenical usage.³¹ Farwell challenges the notion central to supporters of open communion that there is one meal tradition reflected in the ministry of Jesus. Rather, Farwell proposes that there are two: a wider, more 'open' meal tradition reflected in the feeding miracles, and a second, more 'focussed' one with Jesus' disciples. Accordingly, the hospitality expressed in the wider meal traditions in the life of the church, such as public meals, meals for the poor and the homeless, community celebrations and the like, is not in conflict with the ancient linkage between baptism and the eucharist. Farwell goes on to point out how the communion of the non-baptised threatens the 'soteriology' of the sacraments by an overemphasis on divine gift, as opposed to a more balanced approach which emphasises faith and commitment:

To offer eucharist without baptism sets aside the call to redemption and human flourishing as a *life lived*, and replaces it with a welcome that should at any rate have already been offered through the public efforts of outreach, evangelism, and acts of hospitality.³²

Farwell suggests that there is a mutually interpreting connection between baptism and the eucharist as '*proclamation of divine gift without reservation and call to response without reserve*'³³ which makes little sense when the historic sequence between the two is confused by open communion. Moreover, there is an inherent risk of being inhospitable by communicating the non-baptised, because the church no longer offers them a life: a life in Christ, 'both a gift given to us and a call laid upon us'.³⁴ This has consequences for pastoral practice, mission, and evangelism.

Neither Tanner nor Farwell deals with the interreligious aspects of open communion, and its consequences for interreligious dialogue. If Anglicans, with other Churches, posit officially that receiving holy communion is integral to Christian faith and ecclesial identity, those who unofficially offer holy communion to faithful members of other

religious traditions will be causing more harm than good. If proponents of the admission of the non-baptised to communion believe that some degree of Christian identity is shaped by eucharistic communion, is there a kind of indiscriminate sort of Christian imperialism going on in terms of eucharistic practice that once characterised baptismal practice of another imperialist phase in Christian history? Canadian Jewish leader, Rabbi Reuven Bulka comments on 'open communion' from an interreligious perspective:

Unless I am mistaken, communion is more than full participation. It is full embrace of the faith. If that is the case, then it would hardly make sense for a member of a distinct faith community to wade into another faith, unless it was for the purpose of conversion. Otherwise, the interchangeability is an insult to the integrity of the faith in question.

Good relations between faiths are not achieved via interchangeability. Instead, they are achieved through the profound respect that faith communities have for each other, a respect for the faith and the delineating borders that preserve the uniqueness of each faith.³⁵

Ecumenical Considerations on the Communion of the Non-baptised

Similarly, neither James Farwell nor Kathryn Tanner raises any ecumenical implications stemming from the communion of the non-baptised, which is surprising given the depth and thoroughness of the three articles. The ecumenical significance, our task, has not gone unnoticed. The report of Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to the 74th General Convention of the Episcopal Church noted the following ecumenical consideration:

The unauthorised practice of 'open communion' is at apparent odds with the official teachings of this church on Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. In official dialogues between this church and others, our appointed members are to represent the official position of this church. In light of the increasingly widespread practice of 'open communion', it is increasingly difficult for them to do so with credibility. Further, the practice appears to invite members of other churches to receive communion when to do so is contrary to their own church's eucharistic discipline.³⁶

Any dichotomy between sacramental theology and praxis is bound to be an inherent ecumenical issue, and on its own merits serious discussion. Because questions around baptism and eucharist are so central to the ecumenical agenda, the admission to eucharistic communion of the non-baptised demands serious assessment from an ecumenical perspective.

In addition to internal Anglican conversations about eucharistic hospitality, there are important ecumenical dialogues of which Anglicans have been a part. Here we will consider the WCC Faith and Order Commission's *Baptism Eucharist and Ministry*, as well as Anglican - Roman Catholic, Anglican - Reformed, and Anglican - Orthodox dialogues. In the survey of ecumenical texts used in the preparation of this paper, it is interesting to note that very few deal explicitly with the necessity of baptism for admission to holy communion that characterised earlier Anglican texts. However, as the communion of non-baptised persons is a relatively recent phenomenon, one would not expect to find mention of it. Moreover, it can only be recently regarded as a church-dividing issue, even though official policies have not been changed. Yet the move toward Christian unity presumes the sequential and integral relationship between baptism and the eucharist, especially *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)*. On baptism, *BEM* states:

Administered in obedience to our Lord, baptism is a sign and seal of our common discipleship. Through baptism, Christians are brought into union with Christ, with each other and with the Church of every time and place. Our common baptism, which unites us to Christ in faith, is thus a basic bond of unity.³⁷

On the eucharist, *BEM* states:

The eucharistic communion with Christ who nourishes the life of the Church is at the same time communion within the body of Christ which is the Church. The sharing in one bread and the common cup in a given place demonstrates and effects the oneness of the sharers with Christ and with their fellow sharers in all times and places.³⁸

The ecumenical consensus on baptism and the eucharist, and the relationship between the two dominical sacraments, is irreconcilable with policies which admit the non-baptised to holy communion.

The theological and ecclesiological bases for admitting other Christians to holy communion in the various plans of 'full communion', 'open communion' (in the classic ecumenical sense), 'reciprocal communion' and 'admission to communion' are consistently predicated on the baptismal reality of the members of other churches, whose members enjoy degrees of eucharistic hospitality with Anglicans. The recognition of a common baptism has made ecumenical ventures possible. A move toward the official communion of the non-baptised undercuts, threatens, and in the end denies basic ecumenical tenets, reflected in the conviction of the *BEM* document:

When baptismal unity is realised in one holy, catholic, apostolic Church, a genuine Christian witness can be made to the healing and

reconciling love of God. Therefore, our one baptism into Christ constitutes a call to the churches to overcome their divisions and visibly manifest their fellowship.³⁹

When the nexus between baptism and the eucharist is disjoined by policies which admit the non-baptised to the eucharist, it becomes difficult for Anglicans to continue to affirm or to adhere to such historic ecumenical consensus statements.

Historically, the lack of communion between the baptised gave rise to a sense of scandal which initiated the ecumenical movement in the first place. To cite Fr. Thomas Ryan once again: 'The Anglican intuition now is to view baptism and Eucharist as inseparable; to affirm and even rejoice in the common baptism shared with others and then to deny that common life at the Lord's table is seen as depriving baptism of its meaning theologically.'⁴⁰ Again, the praxis and theological justification for the admission of the non-baptised to communion posit a very different reality.

As noted above, Roman Catholic ecclesiology through the experience of the Second Vatican Council became profoundly baptismal. This would have a profound effect on the Roman Catholic Church's engagement in the ecumenical movement. As the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, promulgated 21 November 1964, states:

The Church knows that she is joined in many ways to the baptised who are honored by the name of Christian, but who do not however profess the Catholic faith in its entirety or have preserved its unity or communion under the successor to Peter. For there are many who hold sacred scripture in honour as a rule of faith and of life, who have a sincere religious zeal, who lovingly believe in God the Father Almighty and in Christ, the Son of God and the Saviour, who are sealed by baptism which unites them to Christ, and who indeed recognise and receive other sacraments in their own Churches or ecclesiastical communities.⁴¹

The Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, promulgated as well on 21 November 1964, continued in the same tone with perhaps even more vigour:

For men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptised are put in some, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church. Without doubt, the differences that exist in varying degrees between them and the Catholic Church – whether in doctrine and sometimes in discipline, or concerning the structure of the Church – do indeed create many obstacles, sometimes serious ones, to full ecclesiastical communion. The ecumenical movement is striving to overcome these obstacles. But even in spite of them it remains true

that all who have been justified by faith in baptism are incorporated into Christ; they have the right to be called Christians, and with good reason are accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church.⁴²

The underlying baptismal reality and its integral relationship to the eucharist are reflected in a degree of ecumenical eucharistic hospitality by the Roman Catholic Church. The 1983 Code of Canon Law specifies under what conditions Christians not in full communion with the Catholic Church may receive the sacraments from Roman Catholic ministers. Anglicans would likely be considered within Canon 844§4, if 'danger of death is present or other grave necessity.'⁴³

While Roman Catholic theological and canonical treatment of eucharistic hospitality is far more tentative than Anglican practice, it nevertheless arises from the same conviction of the underlying dignity of all baptised persons, who are in real, though imperfect, communion with the Roman Catholic Church. Like the Anglican Communion prior to the 1968 Lambeth Conference, the Roman Catholic Church regards admission to holy communion as the goal of, rather than the means to, the restoration of full communion. Such is the expressed goal of Anglican - Roman Catholic ecumenical dialogue, and the methodology of the Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission. The admission to holy communion of non-baptised persons can only undercut the Anglican - Roman Catholic quest for full communion at its very theological core.

In a very different bilateral dialogue, a significant ecumenical statement on the relationship between baptism and the eucharist appears in the 1984 agreed statement of the Anglican - Reformed dialogue, *God's Reign and Our Unity*:

Baptism and the eucharist rest alike upon the finished work of Christ in his incarnation, death, resurrection and ascension. Our baptism is a participation in the baptism of Jesus begun in Jordan and consummated on Calvary. By the same token when we are obedient to the words and deeds of Jesus on the eve of his passion, our celebration of the eucharist is a participation in the benefits of his death and resurrection. Both have, therefore, their basis in the one work of Jesus, accomplished once and for all, proclaimed and made effective for us by the continuing work of the Spirit. Our baptism engages us to follow Jesus on the way of the cross; when we share in the eucharist Christ renews that same engagement with us and enables us to renew our engagement to him.⁴⁴

It is in the Anglican dialogue with the Orthodox Churches where the consecutive connection between baptism and the eucharist is most explicit. In first section of the 2006 *The Church of the Triune God*,

‘Trinity and the Church’, the members of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue (ICAO TD) state:

To reach eternal life in communion with God and each other, we must be open in humility to the gift of God’s new life; we must die to the old life and be born again in the waters of baptism (John 3.3,7). In order to come to the table of the Lord for the eucharistic banquet of his Body and Blood we must first be baptised in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28.18-20), and so be conformed to his death and resurrection. But that is not all. The grace of God in sacramental mystery draws us to a life in the world of love for God and neighbour expressed in devotion to ‘the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of the bread and the prayers’ (Acts 2.42) and in charity to the poor (Acts 2.44-45; 4.32).⁴⁵

Later, in the section on ‘Priesthood, Christ, and the Church’, the Anglican - Orthodox agreed statement returns to the theme in a different way:

11. The whole Church is taken into the movement of Christ’s self-offering and his eternal praise of the Father. In baptism, the human person enters into this movement and is configured within the ecclesial community to the priesthood of Christ. The First Letter of Peter, an early baptismal homily, says that the baptised are to let themselves ‘be built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ’, and calls them a ‘chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation’ (1 Peter 2.5,9). The priesthood of the Church is inextricably linked with the priesthood of Christ.
12. ... Christians seek to be true to their sacrificial and priestly calling to be ministers of reconciliation and servants in this sinful world. The life of the Church can be called ‘eucharistic’ in the fullest sense of the term, as it participates in the self-offering of the Son to the Father in the Spirit. Such participation includes sacrificial service to the world. As Jesus consecrated himself in self-giving both to the Father and to the human race, so the Church consecrates herself and enters into his self-offering as a ‘royal priesthood, a holy nation’ (1 Peter 2.9). We offer and present to God ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice. The whole Church is priestly.⁴⁶

Such a ‘priestly’ consideration of the life of the Church rooted in baptism and the eucharist makes no sense when the non-baptised are invited to receive holy communion. In fact, again, they are antithetical positions.⁴⁷

Conclusion

There are four ecumenical issues that bear on the practice of admitting the non-baptised to holy communion. Given the centrality of both baptism and eucharist on the ecumenical agenda, Anglican credibility is threatened when Anglican theological, liturgical and canonical texts say one thing, while Anglican praxis may suggest another. Our ecumenical partners deserve a consistent Anglican convergence on questions of baptism and the eucharist.

A cornerstone of the modern ecumenical movement has been the recovery of a real, though imperfect, sense of an underlying Christian unity through a commonly recognised baptism. In light of this point, ongoing Christian eucharistic disunity is a scandal which the ecumenical movement seeks to heal, towards the recovery of visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship. While earlier Anglican and current Roman Catholic and Orthodox policies understand eucharistic communion as the goal to full communion rather than as a means to it, present Anglican policy allows for a measure of eucharistic sharing with other Christians attending Anglican celebrations of the eucharist. Yet this Anglican latitude is embedded in the ecumenical recognition of the deep nexus between baptism and the eucharist, over which even the varying degrees of Christian division cannot prevail. The practice of admitting non-baptised people to the eucharist overthrows a century of ecumenical insight and growth.

Anglicans have been members of both multilateral and bilateral dialogues with other churches which have said important things about baptism and the eucharist, and the relationship between the two. The ongoing process of reception of these dialogue statements and the movement towards restored eucharistic fellowship can only be impaired if Anglicans are saying one thing to ecumenical partners, and something very different in pastoral praxis. Lastly, if Anglicans in certain contexts need to challenge our own dialogue partners, whose official policies include the communion of the non-baptised, it would ring more than false if the practice is unchecked within our own communities.

Canon John St-Helier Gibaut
IASCER, December 2007

Lay and Diaconal Presidency at the Eucharist

Decision 18.01:

Lay Presidency of the Eucharist – Sydney Diocese

IASCER concurs most strongly with the view expressed in the Report of the 1998 Lambeth Conference concerning lay presidency of the Eucharist, that:

- Such a development would challenge the tradition of the church catholic that ordained ministry serves the church by uniting word and sacrament, pastoral care and oversight of the Christian community. Presiding at the Eucharist is the most obvious expression of this unity. Lay presidency would also create major difficulties with many of our ecumenical partners as well as within the Anglican Communion. We are not able to endorse this proposal. (Lambeth Conference 1998 Official Report p.202)

The Commission is aware that among ecumenical agreements which have been formally received by the Churches of the Anglican Communion is the Anglican – Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) elucidation on Ministry (1979), which the 1988 Lambeth Conference recognised as ‘consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans’. That statement asserts that:

- At the Eucharist Christ's people do what he commanded in memory of himself and Christ unites them sacramentally with himself in his self-offering. But in this action it is only the ordained minister who presides at the eucharist, in which, in the name of Christ and on behalf of his Church, he recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper, and invokes the Holy Spirit upon the gifts. (ARCIC *The Final Report, Elucidation on Ministry* 1979, paragraph 2).

The Faith and Order text *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, about which the Lambeth Conference of 1988 stated ‘Anglicans can recognise to a large extent the faith of the Church through the ages’, states that:

- The minister of the eucharist is the ambassador who represents the divine initiative and expresses the connection of the local community with other local communities in the universal Church. (*BEM*, ‘Eucharist’, paragraph 29)

It is the consensus of this Commission then, that a diocese or Province which endorses lay presidency of the Eucharist would be departing from the doctrine of the ministry as Anglicans have received it, and from the

practice of the undivided Church. Such action would jeopardise existing ecumenical agreements and seriously call into question the relation of such a diocese or Province to the Anglican Communion.

Decision 18.01 above was reaffirmed in 2002.

**Resolution 5.08:
Non-Presbyteral Presidency**

IASCER

- notes the recent resolution of the Diocese of Sydney concerning diaconal and lay presidency at the Eucharist and reaffirms its own resolution (18.01)
- and further notes that in *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*, Principle 66 on ‘Holy Communion: nature and celebration’, it is clearly stated (66.7) that ‘Presidency at the Holy Communion is reserved to a bishop or priest’ and (66.9) that ‘a deacon, or a lay minister specially authorised by the bishop as a eucharistic assistant, may assist in the distribution of the Holy Communion’
- believes that there needs to be further theological reflection and engagement with the theological and ecclesiological perspectives that have shaped the Sydney proposal, noting that Anglicans have never taken a *sola scriptura* position, but have recognised the place of tradition as well as Scripture in shaping the faith and order of the Church
- asks that ecumenical partners be assured that the position of the Anglican Communion as a whole has not changed in the matter of eucharistic presidency.

‘The Sacraments duly administered’?

‘The Sacraments duly administered’? - A task for IASCUFO

1. What conditions should Anglicans be looking for to enable them to make an agreement with an ecumenical partner Church for mutual recognition or ‘interim eucharistic sharing’ that falls short of communion or ‘full communion’ with an interchangeable ordained ministry?
2. A standard formula employed in agreed statements involving Anglicans is ‘the word is truly preached and the sacraments duly

administered'. This expression echoes Article XIX of the Thirty-Nine Articles, which in turn derives from Article VII of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession of 1530.

3. What is meant by 'duly'? What degree of sufficiency is implied? Can the sacraments be duly administered, where a threefold ministry in historical succession is not present?
4. To answer these questions, we need to look at the full text of the Article:

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite and necessary to the same.

5. In referring to Christ's institution and to what things 'of necessity are requisite' to the celebration of the sacraments, the 16th century Reformers intended to speak of where the Church is to be found and where salvation is to be had.
6. In that light the stock formula regarding word and sacrament should be seen as affirming that, in non-episcopally ordered churches, there is a real participation of the faithful in the saving work of Christ through the means of grace that he has ordained. This was affirmed in the Appeal to All Christian People of the 1920 Lambeth Conference and has been pivotal to a wide range of ecumenical agreements involving Anglicans. In this respect, the Lambeth Conference and the ecumenical agreements faithfully reflect the position of the classical Anglican writers of the seventeenth century.
7. At the same time, however, the stock formula on word and sacrament is highly compressed and lacking in nuance. It needs to be accompanied by – and in practice is normally accompanied by – an insistence that Anglicans require an ordained ministry in historical episcopal succession in order to enter into a relationship of Communion and that such a ministry belongs to the full visible unity of Christ's Church. It rests on the theological conviction that Christ instituted a ministry of personal *episkope* in the form of the college of the Apostles and their successors.
8. Anglicans look, therefore, for a consistent intention to remain in visible continuity with the mission of the Apostles and believe that this is served by a threefold ministry ordained within the historic episcopate.
9. These two affirmations – that a real and effectual ministry of word and sacrament can be acknowledged in non-episcopally ordered churches, and that Anglicans require a ministry in historic

succession in order to enter into ecclesial communion - are supported by a vast range of official Anglican documents, including the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, the *Niagara Report* (1987), the *Meissen Agreement* (1991) the *Reuilly Agreement (1999) Called to Common Mission* (2001), and the *Anglican - Methodist Covenant* (2003).

10. A resolution of the Lambeth Conference 1968 (Resolution 46: Relations with other Churches - Anglicans Communicating in other than Anglican Churches) is particularly pertinent:

The Conference recommends that, whilst it is the general practice of the Church that Anglican communicants receive the Holy Communion at the hands of ordained ministers of their own Church or of Churches in communion therewith, nevertheless under the general direction of the bishop, to meet special pastoral need, such communicants be free to attend the Eucharist in other Churches holding apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and summarised in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and as conscience dictates to receive the sacrament, when they know they are welcome to do so.

11. IAS CER commends further development of this topic to its successor body, IASCUFO.

5. Holy Order

At the first meeting of IASCER it was decided to set up a working group to address issues of Holy Order. It was evident that there was no place within Anglican Communion structures where questions in this sphere that were being raised in, or as a result of, ecumenical encounters, could be addressed. Yet these were among the most central areas of debate for the Commission, particularly in relation to the episcopacy, as stressed in Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV.2:

Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV.2: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral

This Conference

- a. reaffirms the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888) as a basis on which Anglicans seek the full, visible unity of the Church, and also recognises it as a statement of Anglican unity and identity
- b. acknowledges that ecumenical dialogues and experience have led to a developing understanding of each of the elements of the Quadrilateral, including the significance of apostolicity, pastoral oversight (*episcopate*), the office of bishop and the historic episcopate; and
- c. commends continuing reflection upon the Quadrilateral's contribution to the search for the full, visible unity of the Church, and in particular the role within visible unity of a common ministry of oversight exercised in personal, collegial and communal ways at every level.

Existing dialogues and agreements, as *Called to Be One* noted, had raised serious questions of consistency and coherence across all ecumenical relationships. Particular issues were also being highlighted, such as the nature of order, and the representative quality of ordination.

Though ecumenical conversations had encouraged a welcome resurgence within Anglicanism of the distinctive or permanent diaconate, dialogue particularly with Lutherans continued to raise questions. These generally related to the nature of the diaconate, both sacramentally and functionally (for example, whether deacons are regarded as in holy orders, and the scope of a deacon's responsibilities). Where there was a divergence of understanding there needed to be careful consideration of how much, and in what circumstances, this constituted a church-dividing issue, or could be

regarded as a bearable anomaly. Furthermore, the relationship of the diaconate to the presbyterate brought into question the nature of the priesthood and with it the possibility of direct ordination, and understandings of the three-fold ordained ministry.

The Holy Order working group tackled this work with gusto and through the following years made a substantial contribution to IASCER's work. Some of this responded to particular situations or requests, such as Resolution 10.01 which followed difficulties between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America over the reinterpretation of terms within their agreement *Called to Common Mission*; or Resolution 1.04 and its related paper of Advice on Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations (carried below, following the Resolutions). Resolution 3.05 registered IASCER's concern that within the Anglican Communion instances of bishops being consecrated in one Province with the intention that they would serve in another, were inconsistent with Anglican understandings of episcopacy as generally expressed in ecumenical discussions, agreements and commitments, and pointed to the need for further study.

The working group also produced two significant papers. The first was a response to the Lutheran Lund Statement, 'The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church'. In this response, endorsed by IASCER, commonalities and distinctions between Anglican and Lutheran understandings are finely dissected. It is noteworthy that the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) invited Anglican comment while the Lund Statement was still in draft, in order that these perspectives might be taken into account.

The second was the document 'Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues', for which IASCER is indebted to Dr William Crockett who undertook the greater part of this comprehensive review of the approach to the ordained ministry within all major recent Anglican ecumenical dialogues. It is a monumental piece of work, and provides not only a thorough and detailed account of all that has been written and agreed, but also an incisive analysis of areas of potential inconsistency and of the underlying matters which these reflect. Dr Crockett also supplied questions which draw clear attention to the issues at stake. IASCER strongly affirmed his invitation to Anglicans to give these questions careful theological and ecclesiological consideration.

These two papers raised the issue of the anomaly of parallel jurisdiction where bishops 'in communion', and so with collegial relationship, exercise their ministry in the same place. This was considered in more detail in Chapter 3.

In future work across the whole area of Holy Order, the resources supplied in *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* are likely to be of considerable value. In particular, Part IV, especially Principles 31 to 47, addresses matters relating to the ministry of the whole Church, including ordained ministry.

**Decision 10.01:
Working Group on Holy Order**

IASCER is concerned about unilaterally altering agreements after they are signed, in light of the developments in Anglican - Lutheran relations in the USA, namely the implications of the ELCA bylaw concerning ordination ‘in unusual circumstances’, which contradicts the agreement in *Called to Common Mission*. Such a development seems to undermine ecumenical method and could potentially hinder progress in dialogue between Anglicans and Lutherans in other parts of the world. IASCER maintains that the ordination by pastors in Lutheran Churches which have entered binding agreements with Anglican Churches is an inconsistency which would be difficult to explain to other ecumenical partners, especially the Orthodox and Oriental Churches and the Roman Catholic Church. Anglicans do not consider ordination solely by pastors/presbyters to be an acceptable practice within an agreement of this nature which is intended to bring about a fully interchangeable ministry. IASCER has a similar concern about the continuing practice of ordination by Deans in the Church of Norway, which Anglicans had anticipated would be phased out in the light of the Porvoo Agreement

Further, that IASCER

- requests the Joint Anglican - Lutheran Commission in Canada to make more explicit the commitment, understood implicitly in the *Waterloo Declaration*, to the ancient norm (Canon 4 of the Council of Nicaea) that at least three bishops in the historic succession lay on hands in the ordination of bishops
- that IASCER will discuss the difference between the priesthood of the whole body and the priesthood of the ordained at a future meeting and noted that the papers from ICAOTD may be helpful to this discussion
- that IASCER encourages those Provinces considering a renewed diaconate to explore good examples of the practice of a distinctive diaconate in other parts of the Anglican Communion in Churches in Communion and in the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches

- that IASCER welcomes the substantial work presented in the paper on Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues from Dr Bill Crockett and Professor Bob Wright, and is grateful for the stimulus it has provided to the discussion on many aspects of the doctrine of the ministry. The Commission acknowledges the potential wider use of this paper and encourages the authors to consider publication of this work when finalised.

Decision 10.01 above was reaffirmed in 2002.

**Resolution 1.04:
Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations**

IASCER

adopts the attached statement (see below) on the participation of Anglican bishops and clergy in ordinations outside the Anglican Communion, and of the clergy of other churches in Anglican ordinations, and refers these guidelines to Primates and Provincial Secretaries, and to the Primates' Meeting.

**Resolution 3.05:
Episcopal Collegiality**

IASCER

1. notes with concern the recent growth of instances of the consecration of a bishop by the bishops of one Province with the intention that the person consecrated serve in another, and the appointment of bishops or priests for missionary work in other Provinces
2. believes that such actions challenge the canonical and ecclesiological understanding of a bishop as chief pastor of a local church and a member of the episcopal college, which has been a consistent part of the Anglican understanding of episcopacy in ecumenical discussion, agreement and commitment
3. recognises that provincial decisions that impinge on the collegiality of the episcopate have consequences for existing and emerging ecumenical agreements and commitments
4. resolves to undertake a study of the compatibility of decisions concerning the ordained ministry, including episcopal collegiality with ecumenical agreements and commitments

5. recommends Provinces to weigh carefully the potential ecumenical implications of any decisions on, or proposals for, action concerning episcopal ministry and seek the advice of IASCER whenever such ecumenical implications may be involved.

Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations (see Resolution 1.04)

The following guidelines were written in December 2004 by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, a body appointed by the Instruments of Communion to oversee ecumenical work both internationally and by the Churches of the Anglican Communion. They were adopted by the Primates and Moderators of the Anglican Communion at their meeting in Northern Ireland in February 2005, and are commended to the Provinces and Churches of the Anglican Communion.

The guidelines are addressed to situations in which Anglican bishops and priests are invited to participate in ordinations of clergy in churches outside the Anglican Communion, or in which clergy of churches outside the Anglican Communion are invited to participate in Anglican ordinations.

Recognising that such acts can have wider consequences than originally intended, and in response to many requests from bishops and others for guidelines and clarifications concerning the standards for individual Anglican bishops or priests participating in such ordinations, or clergy of other churches desiring to participate in Anglican ordinations, IASCER commends the following guidelines for adoption throughout the churches of the Anglican Communion.

These guidelines are not intended to address situations in which a church of the Anglican Communion is engaged in a process leading toward the establishment of communion with another church or churches. In these cases, Anglican churches are requested to consult with IASCER in advance of such participation.

Guidelines:

1. (a) It is appropriate for Anglican bishops, when invited, to participate in episcopal ordinations or consecrations in churches with which their own churches are in communion, including the laying on of hands. Within this ecclesial context, the laying on of hands is an indication of the intent to confer holy orders, and a sign of the communion that we share.

(b) Anglican bishops should refrain from participating in the laying on of hands at the ordination or consecration of a bishop for a church with which their own church is not in communion.

Ordination is always an act of God in and through the church, which from the Anglican perspective means that bishops are representative ministers of their own churches. Ordination is not the individual act of bishops in their own persons.

(c) Similarly, bishops from other churches not in communion should not take part in the laying on of hands at the ordination or consecration of Anglican bishops, for the collegial and sacramental sign of the laying on the hands by bishops belongs within the context of ecclesial communion.

(d) Anglicans welcome the participation of bishops from other churches in the Liturgy of the Word and elsewhere in celebrations of episcopal ordination or consecration. Their very presence and prayers are valued ecumenical signs, even when the present state of ecclesial relations does not permit the interchangeability of sacramental ministries.

2. (a) It is appropriate for Anglican priests, when invited, to participate in ordinations of presbyters in churches with which their church is in communion, including the laying on of hands. Such acts are a sign of the communion that we share.

(b) Anglican priests should not take part in the laying on of hands in the ordinations of ministers of word and sacrament in churches with which their own church is not in communion, because such an act belongs within the context of ecclesial communion.

(c) Similarly, ministers from churches not in communion should not take part in the laying on of hands at the ordination of Anglican priests, because this too belongs within the context of ecclesial communion.

(d) Anglicans welcome the participation of presbyters and other ministers of word and sacrament from other churches in the Liturgy of the Word and elsewhere in celebrations of priestly ordination. The very presence and prayers of such ministers are valued ecumenical signs, even when the present state of ecclesial relations does not permit the interchangeability of sacramental ministries.

IASCER
Montego Bay
December 2004

An Anglican Response by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’

This document was considered at the Anglican - Lutheran International Commission meeting of January 2006 and then forwarded to the March 2006 meeting of the LWF Council.

IASCER welcomes the Lutheran document ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ as an important contribution to the ongoing dialogue between Lutherans and Anglicans on episcopal ministry. The reflections and questions offered in this response are an invitation to further engagement leading towards the potential universalisation of present regional Anglican - Lutheran agreements.

I. Mission, Apostolicity, and Apostolic Succession

‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ (hereafter EMAC) sets the ministry of oversight (*episkope*) firmly within the context of God’s mission and the mission of the church as the whole people of God. This reflects the starting-point of *The Niagara Report* (hereafter *Niagara*) which established the initial benchmark for Anglican - Lutheran regional agreements on *episkope* and episcopacy.⁴⁸ Likewise, in *The Porvoo Common Statement* (hereafter *Porvoo*) the apostolic continuity of the church is understood in the context of God’s ultimate purpose and mission in Christ, which is the restoration and renewal of all creation, the coming of the reign of God in its fullness. For EMAC the handing on of this mission, in which the Holy Spirit makes Christ present as the Word of God, is the primary meaning of apostolic tradition. While IASCER affirms this setting of episcopal ministry within the framework of the apostolicity of the church, it notes that a theology of episcopacy needs also to be related to the unity, holiness, and catholicity of the church.

Following *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (hereafter *BEM*) EMAC affirms that ‘Apostolic tradition in the Church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the Church of the apostles: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation and fresh interpretation of the Gospel, celebration of baptism and the eucharist, the transmission of ministerial responsibilities, communion in prayer, love, joy and suffering, service to the sick and the needy, unity among the local churches and sharing the gifts which the Lord has given to each.’ (*BEM*, ‘Ministry’, 34) According to both EMAC and *BEM* ‘the primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the Church as a whole. The succession is an expression of the permanence and, therefore, of the continuity of Christ’s own mission in which the Church participates.’ (*BEM*, ‘Ministry’, 35) Apostolic succession means continuity in this tradition. For EMAC ‘the

Reformation aimed at the renewal of the church catholic in its true continuity with the evangelical mission of the apostles.’ (EMAC, p.2)

The affirmation that apostolic succession is primarily a characteristic of the church as a whole in its varied witness has become a hallmark of the ecumenical dialogues. There are a variety of means by which the church maintains continuity in the apostolic tradition. These include the scriptures, the ecumenical creeds, the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, and an apostolic ministry. Apostolic succession cannot be limited to ministerial succession. Succession in the sense of the succession of ordained ministers must be seen within the succession of the whole church in the apostolic faith. How then is the ordained ministry to be understood as apostolic and how can episcopal ministry be understood as an aspect of and a service to the apostolic succession of the whole church?

II. Apostolicity and Ordained Ministry

EMAC affirms that ‘within the apostolic continuity of the whole church there is a continuity or succession in the ordained ministry’ which serves the church’s continuity in the apostolic tradition of faith and life. ‘The ordained ministry belongs to God’s gifts to the church, essential and necessary for the church to fulfil its mission.’ The ordained ministry is ‘constitutive for the church,’ (EMAC, p.3) but its shape is determined by the mission of the church in a particular time and place.

There is a growing ecumenical consensus on the nature of ministry reflected in *BEM* and other ecumenical agreements. Fundamental to this consensus is the affirmation that the context for understanding the ordained ministry is the calling of all the baptised. ‘All the baptised are called to participate in, and share responsibility for, worship (*leitourgia*), witness (*martyria*), and service (*diakonia*).’ The ordained ministry of word and sacrament exists to serve ‘the mission and ministry of the whole people of God’. (EMAC, p.3)

All ministries in the church, including the ordained ministry, are gifts (*charisms*) of the Spirit for the building up of the body of Christ (Romans 12.4-8; 1 Corinthians 12.4-11). ‘The Holy Spirit bestows on the community diverse and complementary gifts.’ (*BEM*, ‘Ministry’, 5) This charismatic understanding of ordained ministry is reflected in *BEM*’s interpretation of the meaning of ordination: ‘Ordination denotes an action by God and the community’ which through long tradition takes place ‘in the context of worship and especially of the eucharist... . The act of ordination by the laying on of hands of those appointed to do so is at one and the same time invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*); sacramental sign; acknowledgement of gifts and commitment. Ordination is an invocation to God that the new minister be given the power of the Holy Spirit in the new relation which is established

between this minister and the local Christian community and, by intention, the Church universal.' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 40-42)

Ordained ministry is not only a gift of the Spirit. It is also a representative ministry. While all baptised Christians represent Christ and the church, the ordained ministry represents Christ and the church in particular ways. In his book *A Ministry Shaped by Mission* Paul Avis explores the concept of representation as applied to the ordained ministry. According to Avis, the ordained ministry does not act as intermediary between God and the community, but represents God to the community and the community to God. The ordained minister represents Christ to a community which is already united to Christ in baptism. The ordained ministry acts as the representative and organ of the whole body in the exercise of responsibilities which belong to the body as a whole. Does the ordained minister represent Christ or the Church? Does the ordained minister act *in persona Christi* or *in persona ecclesiae*? Avis argues that this is a false dichotomy. If the ordained ministry is a representative rather than a mediatorial ministry, the church's ministers can be seen to represent both Christ and the church, because Christ cannot be separated from his body.⁴⁹ *EMAC*, following the Augsburg Confession, explicitly speaks of the bishop as acting *in persona Christi*, but immediately qualifies this by saying that the bishop 'stands simultaneously within and over against the community in service to continuity in the apostolic faith' (*EMAC*, p.5) thus implying that the bishop acts both *in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae*. The concept of *in persona Christi* is important, because it brings out the relationship between the ordained ministry and the High Priesthood of Christ, especially in relation to eucharistic presidency. The concept of *in persona ecclesiae* is equally important in bringing out the role of the ordained ministry as representative of the whole baptised community. Together, the two concepts express the patristic notion of the 'whole Christ,' Head and members joined together.

The understanding of ordained ministry as a gift of the Spirit and as a representative ministry together with the language of 'sign' and 'symbol' used in ecumenical agreements in connection with the ordained ministry challenge a purely functional understanding of ordained ministry, including episcopal ministry. 'Because Christ's ministry is present to us only through the Spirit, ecclesial ministry is necessarily *charismatic*. For the same reason, it is *relational*. The nexus of relationships established by the Spirit creates a new way of being, which transforms both the one ordained and those for whom he is ordained, making it futile to debate whether ordained ministry in the church is functional or ontological in nature.'⁵⁰ *BEM* points in this direction when it speaks of ordination as establishing a 'new relation' between the ordained minister and the local and universal church.

Ordained ministry is neither a status nor a set of functions, but a *charism* of the Spirit. It is a gift and a service to the community.

A further guiding principle articulated by *BEM* and repeated in *EMAC* and numerous ecumenical agreements is that ‘the ordained ministry should be exercised in a personal, collegial, and communal way. It should be *personal* because the presence of Christ among his people can most effectively be pointed to by the person ordained to proclaim the Gospel and to call the community to serve the Lord in unity of life and witness. It should also be *collegial*, for there is need for a college of ordained ministers sharing in the common task of representing the concerns of the community. Finally, the intimate relationship between the ordained ministry and the community should find expression in a *communal* dimension where the exercise of the ordained ministry is rooted in the life of the community and requires the community’s effective participation in the discovery of God’s will and the guidance of the Spirit.’ (*BEM*, ‘Ministry’, 26)

Today the great majority of Lutheran and Anglican churches ordain both women and men, reflecting new theological reflection in both our churches on the relationship between gender and ministry, and expressing ‘the conviction that the mission of the church’ needs ‘the gifts of both men and women in the ordained ministry ... as a sign of God’s reconciled Kingdom (Galatians 3.27-28)’. (*EMAC*, p.3) Women exercise episcopal ministry in several Anglican provinces and Lutheran churches.

III. *Episkope* and *Episcopos*

Historical scholarship and ecumenical agreements concur in their judgment that the New Testament bears witness to a variety of forms of ordained ministry and that it was not until the second and third centuries that the ‘threefold pattern of bishop, presbyter and deacon became established as the pattern of ordained ministry throughout the Church.’ (*BEM*, ‘Ministry’, 19)

There is ecumenical agreement that pastoral oversight (*episkope*) is an essential strand in this witness, but the New Testament does not allow us to assert that it was exercised by a uniform structure of ministry inherited directly from or transmitted by the apostles. As the *Niagara Report* asserts, it is this ministry of ‘oversight or presiding ministry which constitutes the heart of the episcopal office’. (*Niagara*, 54) In the early patristic period this ministry of oversight (*episkope*) found its focus historically in the office of the bishop.

Historians commonly agree that there are three principal images or models of the office of a bishop in the pre-Nicene church, which are best exemplified in Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, and Cyprian.⁵¹ For

Ignatius, the bishop is primarily the one who presides at the eucharist. This is central for Ignatius because of his understanding of the nature of the church. 'The church, in Ignatius' view, is essentially eucharistic by nature: there is an organic relation between the Body of Christ understood as community, and the Body of Christ understood as sacrament. For Ignatius, then, the bishop is ... the one who presides at ... the eucharistic liturgy.'⁵² The theme of unity and the interdependent relationship between one bishop, one eucharistic body, and one church is common in his writings. 'The context of the emphasis on unity in Ignatius, of course, must be kept in mind. Ignatius is writing at a time when there was probably only one bishop for any city and also no more than one eucharistic assembly for any city; a situation which greatly reinforced the bishop's function as the visible focus of unity ...'⁵³

Irenaeus, on the other hand, while echoing the eucharistic teaching of Ignatius, places primary emphasis on the bishop's role as teacher of the faith. The context here is the conflict with Gnosticism. For Irenaeus, the bishop is above all the one who preserves the continuity of apostolic teaching in unbroken succession from the apostles. It is through the bishop's faithful proclamation of the Gospel in each local church that the unity of the church and the continuity of the church in the apostolic tradition is preserved.

For Cyprian, the bishop serves as the bond of unity between the local church and the universal church. Here the collegial aspect of the bishop's role comes to the fore. The bishop is one member of a worldwide 'college' of bishops who are together responsible for maintaining the unity of the churches. Cyprian's primary emphasis, therefore, is upon the bishop as the bond of unity between the local church and the church universal. In his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae* 'he stresses the conciliar or collegial character of the worldwide episcopate, of bishops meeting in council and together reaching a common mind under the Spirit's guidance, and so he calls our attention to this conciliar and collegial feature of any episcopate that would claim to be truly 'historic' ... Each bishop shares in the one episcopate, not as having part of the whole but as being an expression of the whole; just as there are many local churches but one universal church, so there are many individual bishops but only one worldwide episcopate.'⁵⁴ In each of these models, therefore, the bishop is the sign of unity between the local and the universal church, either through the maintenance of eucharistic communion, continuity in apostolic teaching, or common oversight of the churches.

There is, however, a deeper theological unity to these models than is apparent from what has been said so far. As Mark Dyer has pointed out, the early church considered episcopal ministry to be a divine gift for the preservation and nurture of communion (*koinonia*) with the Triune

God. ‘The bishop is called by God from within God’s People to serve the mystery of our communion with one another and with God. The ministry of the episcopate is a series of sacred acts that serve, preserve and nurture communion. As president of the eucharistic assembly, chief teacher of the Word of God and the Holy Tradition, sign of unity between the local church and the church universal,⁵⁵ the bishop is a sign that communion in the one body of Christ, the church, involves communion in the very life of the Triune God. This communion is nurtured by the life of prayer, which finds its centre in the liturgy. That is why the presidency of the eucharist is at the heart of the bishop’s ministry. ‘In celebrating the Eucharistic meal the Church, in time, becomes identified with and prefigures that communion with God the Holy Trinity that will come when the kingdom of God is finally established. Word and sacraments signify the church’s essential participation in the mystery of the life of God.’⁵⁶

As the Orthodox theologian John Erickson observes, ‘the church ... cannot be understood simply in sociological categories. It is above all a sacramental reality, which ‘finds its model, its origin, and its purpose in the mystery of God, one in three Persons ...’ At the same time, the church is not an abstraction. Rather, it is a ‘local’ reality, ‘placed’ in the midst of the world to be the prototype of renewed human community. It is a *koinonia* which most fully realises itself in the eucharistic assembly of the local church, gathered around the bishop or the priest in communion with him as one body. This *koinonia* is eschatological, in that it anticipates’ and models life in the coming reign of God. ‘It is also kerygmatic,’ since it announces and realises the proclamation in the liturgical assembly. ‘Within this context of communion, the bishop exercises a ministry which is’ not primarily administrative, but organic and sacramental; therefore presiding at the eucharist lies at the heart of the episcopal role.

The early church reflects a theology of ministry in general, and of the episcopal office in particular, which is both charismatic and relational. The *koinonia* of the one Body of Christ is built up through the mutual interdependence of the gifts of ministry bestowed by the one Spirit. The bishop ‘stands at the heart of the local church as the minister of the Spirit to discern the *charisms* and take care that they are exercised in harmony, for the good of all, in faithfulness to the apostolic tradition. He puts himself at the service of the initiatives of the Spirit, so that nothing may prevent them from contributing to building up *koinonia*.’⁵⁷ The episcopal office should be ‘focused on the bishop’s relation to the entire worshipping community, animating and orchestrating its diverse gifts ...’⁵⁸

The thread which unifies the bishop’s various roles, therefore, is the the nurturing of communion within and among the churches for the sake of

the building up of their communion with one another and with the Triune God. This understanding of the unity of the bishop's office fits well not only with the understanding of the episcopal office in the early church, but also with the emphasis on a communion ecclesiology, which has guided a great deal of recent ecumenical work as exemplified in both multilateral and bilateral ecumenical dialogues. This communion has both an historical and an eschatological aspect. The bishop is both a sign of the communion of the churches with one another in time and in space and a sign of the eschatological fulfilment of communion with the Triune God, a foretaste of which we already share in the eucharist. This tension between the historical and the eschatological dimensions of ecclesial communion and the bishop's role in its nurture is developed by the Orthodox theologian and bishop John Zizioulas in his book *Being as Communion*.⁵⁹

Zizioulas explores this tension as a way of understanding the nature of apostolic continuity in the church, and in particular the meaning of apostolic succession. It can also be explored as a sign of promise which allows for the possibility of steps or stages along the way towards the full communion of the churches. In a divided church, all churches stand in a position of imperfect communion with one another. As Avery Dulles has observed, 'the theology of communion admits of many degrees and modalities ...'⁶⁰ The establishment and maintenance of communion is an ongoing ecumenical project, which will only be realised in steps and stages as the churches seek to grow towards the goal of full communion.

While the threefold pattern of bishops, presbyters, and deacons continued in both East and West until the Reformation, the shape of episcopal ministry continued to evolve historically: As EMAC observes, 'from the beginning of the 4th century, the bishop came to oversee, not just one eucharistic congregation, but a group of congregations headed by presbyters ...' (EMAC, p.5) This raises the following questions: What is the local church? Is it the congregation or the diocese? What is the relationship between the bishop and the local church? We will explore these questions in a separate section below. What remains consistent between the pre-Nicene and the post-Nicene periods is the bishop's pastoral oversight of the diocese and the bishop's role as the symbol of unity between the local and the universal church. This encompasses the roles of leadership in the mission of the church, presidency of the eucharist, guardianship of the apostolic tradition, and presiding at ordinations. EMAC expresses this as follows: 'Concern for the unity of the church belongs to the very nature of the episcopal office ... The relation between the ministry of the bishop and the unity of the church makes it theologically and symbolically appropriate that those who carry out episcopal oversight preside at ordinations of those who will exercise the office of ministry. Ordination is into the ministry of the one

church, not simply into the ministry of one denomination or national church or of one diocese or synod. The presiding minister at an ordination, acting on behalf of the whole people of God, is thus rightly the person who instrumentally and symbolically is concerned with the unity of the one church's ministry.' (EMAC, p.7)

At the Reformation Anglicans continued to preserve the threefold ministry and the historical succession of bishops. Some Lutheran churches maintained the threefold ministry in historic succession; others maintained the office of bishop with a break in historic succession, while others maintained a ministry of pastoral oversight without the title of bishop. In recognising one another as apostolic churches in contemporary ecumenical dialogue both Anglicans and Lutherans acknowledge that their churches have maintained apostolic continuity in a variety of ways including a ministry of pastoral oversight (*episkope*). Anglican - Lutheran regional agreements have also made possible the establishment of visible unity or full communion between some of our churches. In all these cases, the key issue has been the re-establishment of an episcopal ministry within the framework of the historical succession. The Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888) has provided the touchstone for Anglican ecumenical relations in this regard by setting out the four pillars which Anglicans believe are necessary for the restoration of visible unity between the churches. These are: 1) The Holy Scriptures as the rule and ultimate standard of faith, 2) The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, 3) The sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, and 4) '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.'⁶¹ It is important, therefore, to explore more fully the relationship between *episkope*, *episkopos*, and historical succession.

IV. Historical Episcopal Succession

The Porvoo Common Statement is particularly helpful in clarifying the relationship between apostolic succession, episcopal ministry in the service of the apostolicity of the church, and historical episcopal succession, and is worth quoting fairly extensively. It begins with the common affirmation that 'the primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the Church as a whole'. It then goes on to affirm that 'within the apostolicity of the whole Church is an apostolic succession of the ministry which serves and is a focus of the continuity of the Church in' the apostolic tradition of faith and life. Historically, 'the threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons became the general pattern of ordained ministry in the early Church, though subsequently it underwent considerable change in its practical exercise and is still developing today.

“The diversity of God’s gifts requires ... a ministry of co-ordination. This is the ministry of oversight, *episcopate*, a caring for the life of a whole community, a pastoring of the pastors and a true feeding of Christ’s flock, in accordance with Christ’s command across the ages and in unity with Christians in other places. *Episcopate* is a requirement of the whole Church and its faithful exercise in the light of the gospel is of fundamental importance to its life.’ Historically this ministry of oversight has found its focus in the office of the bishop. The role of bishops is to ‘preach the word, preside at the sacraments, and administer discipline ... as ... representative pastoral ministers of oversight, continuity and unity in the Church. They have pastoral oversight of the area to which they are called. They serve the apostolicity, catholicity and unity of the Church’s teaching, worship and sacramental life. They have responsibility for leadership in the Church’s mission ... [This] ministry of oversight is [to be] exercised personally, collegially and communally ... at the local, regional, and universal levels of the church’s life.’ ‘In most ... [Lutheran and Anglican] churches today this takes synodical form. Bishops, together with other ministers and the whole community, are responsible for the orderly transfer of ministerial authority in the church.”

“The ultimate ground of the fidelity of the Church, in continuity with the apostles, is the promise of the Lord and the presence of the Holy Spirit at work in the whole Church. The continuity of the ministry of oversight is to be understood within the continuity of the apostolic life and mission of the whole Church. Apostolic succession in the episcopal office is a visible and personal way of focusing the apostolicity of the whole church. Continuity in apostolic succession is signified in the ordination or consecration of the bishop ... [by] the laying on of hands ... with prayer ... In the consecration of a bishop the sign is effective in four ways: first it bears witness to the Church’s trust in’ the faithfulness of the Triune God; ‘secondly, it expresses the Church’s intention to be faithful to God’s initiative and gift, by living in the continuity of the apostolic faith and tradition; thirdly, the participation of a group of bishops in the laying on of hands signifies ... the catholicity of the churches; fourthly, it transmits ministerial office and its authority in accordance with God’s will and institution.’

“The whole Church is a sign of the Kingdom of God; the act of ordination is a sign of God’s faithfulness to his Church, especially in relation to the oversight of its mission. To ordain a bishop in historic succession (that is, in intended continuity from the apostles themselves) is also a sign.’ It signifies the Church’s care for the continuity of its apostolic life and mission as a whole. “The use of the sign of the historic episcopal succession does not by itself guarantee the fidelity of a church to every aspect of the apostolic faith, life and mission. There have been schisms in the history of churches using the sign of historic succession. Nor does

the sign guarantee the personal faithfulness of the bishop. Nonetheless, the retention of the sign remains a permanent challenge to fidelity and to unity, a summons to witness to, and a commission to realise more fully, the permanent characteristics of the Church of the apostles.

Faithfulness to the apostolic calling of the whole Church is carried by more than one means of continuity. Therefore a church which has preserved the sign of historic episcopal succession is free to acknowledge an authentic episcopal ministry in a church which has preserved continuity in the episcopal office by an occasional priestly/presbyteral ordination at the time of the Reformation. Similarly, a church which has preserved continuity through such a succession is free to enter a relationship of mutual participation in episcopal ordinations with a church which has retained the historical episcopal succession, and to embrace this sign, without denying its past apostolic continuity.

The mutual acknowledgement of our churches and ministries is theologically prior to the use of the sign of the laying on of hands in the historic succession. Resumption of the use of the sign does not imply an adverse judgement on the ministries of those churches which did not previously make use of the sign. It is rather a means of making more visible the unity and continuity of the Church in all times and in all places. To the degree to which our ministries have been separated, all our churches have lacked something of that fullness which God desires for his people (Ephesians 1.23 and 3.17-19). By moving together, and by being served by a mutually recognised episcopal ministry, our churches will be both more faithful to their calling and also more conscious of their need for renewal. By the sharing of our life and ministries in closer visible unity, we shall be strengthened for the continuation of Christ's mission in the world.' (*Porvoo*, 39-54)

These affirmations of *Porvoo* have been foundational also for *Called to Common Mission* (hereafter *CCM*) and *The Waterloo Declaration* (hereafter *Waterloo*). In *CCM* the Episcopal Church USA (ECUSA) and the ELCA agree that their 'churches will over time come to share in the ministry of bishops in an evangelical historic succession ... [and] promise to include regularly one or more bishops of the other church to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordinations/installations of their own bishops ...' (*CCM*, 8,12) Similarly in *Waterloo* full communion will initiate a process that will result in the ordained ministries of both the Anglican Church of Canada and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCIC) sharing the sign of the historical episcopal succession in the service of the Gospel. While there are differences between the regional agreements, what they share in common is their embrace of the historic episcopal succession.

We can sum up the consensus reached in these regional Anglican - Lutheran agreements as follows:

1. The primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the church as a whole.
2. Apostolic continuity is maintained by a variety of means, including an ordained ministry, which is constitutive for the life of the church.
3. Within the apostolic succession of the whole church is an apostolic succession of the ministry which serves and is a focus of the continuity of the Church in the apostolic tradition of faith and life.
4. An essential strand in this ministry is a ministry of oversight or presiding ministry (*episkope*) in the service of the apostolicity of the whole church. Historically this ministry of oversight has been focused in the office of the bishop.
5. Because apostolic succession is a characteristic of the church as a whole and cannot be limited to historical episcopal succession, churches which have maintained the historical episcopal succession are free to recognise churches as apostolic churches which maintain an episcopal ministry (*episkope*) without the title 'bishop' or where there has been a break in the historical succession.
6. For the sake of the restoration of visible unity and as a sign, though not a guarantee, of apostolic continuity, churches which maintain an episcopal ministry (*episkope*) without the title 'bishop' or where there has been a break in the historical succession are free to recognise the value of the sign and embrace the historic episcopal succession without denying their own apostolic continuity.

EMAC can be said to affirm 1. through 5., but is not explicit about 6. This raises the question, for Anglicans, whether those Lutheran churches which are presently not part of these regional agreements would or would not agree to bring their episcopal ministries within the historic episcopal succession

V. The Bishop and the Local Church

A particular question that needs consideration is the relationship between the bishop and the local church. EMAC observed that 'from the beginning of the 4th century, the bishop came to oversee, not just one eucharistic congregation, but a group of congregations headed by presbyters ...' (EMAC, 5) This raises the following questions: What is the local church? Is it the congregation or the diocese? What is the relationship between the bishop and the local church? 'In the 2nd and 3rd centuries, the congregation, which celebrated the eucharist under the presidency of the bishop, was understood as the local church. From the beginning of the 4th century, the bishop came to oversee ... a group

of congregations headed by presbyters ... The local church [then] came to be identified with the church headed by the bishop [the diocese]' rather than with the local 'eucharistic congregation'. (EMAC, p.5) Given this history, Anglicans have regarded the diocese as the local church and the bishop as its chief pastor. EMAC, on the other hand, while recognising this historical shift, views the congregation as the local church: 'Every worshipping congregation gathered around word and sacrament is the church in the full ecclesiological sense, [nevertheless] all local congregations are indissolubly connected across the boundaries of space and time with the one church, on earth and in heaven.' (EMAC, p.4)

In this ecclesiological vision, episcopal ministry is regarded as 'a supra-congregational ministry ... [which] fosters the one mission of the church' and safeguards the unity, catholicity, and apostolicity of the church, linking local congregations with the universal church. 'Unlike the parish pastor ... the bishop's ministry is regional and oversees a group of local churches.' (EMAC, p.4) 'The episcopal ministry carries responsibility for larger geographical areas of the church than individual congregations or parishes.' (EMAC, p.5) 'Most Lutheran churches [today] have a regional minister of oversight, most often named "bishop" (EMAC, p.4). 'Persons who carry out this ministry of oversight should be understood as carrying out the episcopal office. Ecumenical and popular understanding would be facilitated if such persons were uniformly called "bishop" (EMAC, p.6).

It is instructive to bring both Lutheran and Anglican visions of the relationship between the bishop and the local church into conversation with the Orthodox vision. The most prominent spokesman for the Orthodox view of episcopal ministry in ecumenical conversations has been Metropolitan Zizioulas. Zizioulas gives primacy to the Ignatian model of episcopal ministry, where the bishop is primarily the president of the local eucharistic community. The historical shift that takes place in the fourth century when presbyters normally came to preside at the eucharist in local communities and the bishop became the chief pastor of a diocese creates an ecclesiological question of considerable importance for Zizioulas, since it is primarily as president of the eucharistic assembly that the bishop represents the local church in the communion of the local churches. According to Zizioulas the result of this historical shift is that the bishop becomes detached from the local community and becomes primarily a teacher and administrator, and the 'college' of bishops tends to become a superstructure 'above' the local churches rather than representatives of their local eucharistic communities. Zizioulas recognises that since the fourth century the diocese rather than the local congregation has become the local church in both the East and the West, but he sees this as creating a rupture in the Orthodox church's eucharistic ecclesiology.

The Orthodox theologian John Erickson, on the other hand, while also setting a high value on the Ignatian model, is critical of Orthodox exponents of eucharistic ecclesiology for tending 'to uphold an idealised second-century church order as normative ... They have not taken seriously enough either the ecclesiological diversity one finds in the New Testament texts or the many developments since the days of Ignatius.' Erickson asks whether the 're-creation of the Ignatian local church [can] really advance the church's mission ... today, when the context in which the church is placed has changed so dramatically'.⁶²

Nevertheless, both Anglicans and Lutherans have something to learn from the Orthodox vision of the bishop as the president of the eucharistic assembly and representative of the local church in the communion of the local churches. What is important in this vision is not that the bishop is always the eucharistic president of the local community sociologically, but that theologically the bishop is understood to be the chief pastor and president of the eucharist for the diocese or region that he/she represents. It is this which relates the bishop to the local community and enables him/her to represent the local community in the wider communion of the local churches.

'The Cameron Report [of the Church of England], *Episcopal Ministry*,⁶³ describes the bishop's ministry of unity and continuity as exercised in the 'three planes of the Church's life'. The first plane is that of the 'local church' or diocese. Here the bishop is a 'focus of the community's worship and life, and in protecting it as guardian of its faith and order, the bishop stands in a relationship to the community, which makes it possible for him to act on its behalf'. The second plane of the church's life is that of the Church catholic or universal. In keeping contact and communication with the leaders of other worshipping communities on his people's behalf, the bishop ... holds in unity the local church with every other local church with which it is in communion. The third or apostolic plane of the Church's life is the continuity of the life of the Church in time, from the apostles to the present day. The primary manifestation of apostolic succession is the fidelity of the whole Church to the apostolic teaching and mission ... Within the apostolic continuity of the whole Church and all its means of grace, the succession of bishops 'is a sign of assurance to the faithful that the Church remains in continuity with the Apostles' teaching and mission'.⁶⁴ We ought to add a fourth eschatological plane. As Erickson points out, 'ecclesial ministry has an *eschatological* dimension. By the power of the Spirit it builds up the church so as to reveal in it the space and time of this world as 'the anticipated manifestation of the final realities, the foretaste of God's kingdom'.'

Erickson argues that the most important contribution that the Orthodox have made to ecumenical dialogue in this connection is 'to

draw attention to the importance of a pneumatologically conditioned Christology for a proper understanding of ecclesiology and therefore of episcopal ministry'. Erickson points out that 'a proper understanding of the relationship of pneumatology to Christology can help to correct distortions possible in the Ignatian, Irenaeian and Cyprianic approaches to *episkope*'. The importance from this perspective of the Ignatian model is that it brings out the bishop's particular *charism* of ministry as that of discerning the diverse gifts of the Spirit in the baptised community and enabling them to flourish for the upbuilding of the community as a whole. Hence the importance of the bishop's being rooted in the local community and its eucharistic celebration as chief pastor and presider of the eucharist, even if he/she is not the presider at every Sunday celebration. With regard to the Irenaeian model, 'without a pneumatological perspective, the Irenaeian apostolic succession can too easily be reduced to the historical transmission of authority through hands on heads' rather than as the living transmission of the apostolic tradition through the continuing activity of the Spirit, with the bishop serving as sign of apostolic continuity. Similarly, 'without a pneumatological perspective, the Cyprianic emphasis on the unity of the episcopate can too easily detach the episcopate from the whole body of the faithful, placing it over and above the church rather than in its midst'.⁶⁵

In all of these models what is important is that the bishop's ministry is rooted and grounded in the life of the local community in order that the bishop can represent the local community within the communion of the local churches. In the Anglican tradition, has the bishop become too detached from the local community and become primarily an administrator of the diocese? In EMAC's vision has episcopal ministry become a superstructure 'above' the local churches rather than bishops representing their local eucharistic communities as chief pastors and presidents of the eucharist in their regions?

VI. The Reform and Renewal of Episcopacy

Anglicans are not asking Lutherans to adopt an Anglican form of episcopacy. Anglicans are asking Lutherans to embrace an episcopal ministry in the historic succession which serves apostolic continuity, the Gospel, God's mission in the world, and the visible unity of the church. The Anglican form of episcopacy also stands in need of reform in order to serve more faithfully apostolic continuity, the Gospel, God's mission in the world, and the visible unity of the church. In *CCM* 'the Episcopal Church acknowledges and seeks to receive the gifts of the Lutheran tradition which has consistently emphasised the primacy of the Word. The Episcopal Church therefore endorses the Lutheran affirmation that the historic catholic episcopate under the Word of God must always serve the gospel, and that the ultimate authority under

which bishops preach and teach is the gospel itself ... [Accordingly] the Episcopal Church agrees to establish and welcome ... structures for ... [the] review ... and ... reform [of episcopal ministry] in the service of the gospel.' (*CCM*, 17) In both our communions new models of episcopal ministry are emerging as we seek to be faithful to the Gospel and the mission of the church in new cultural contexts.

In its *Berkeley Statement* on the theology and liturgy of ordination, the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation notes that the bishop's role has been shaped by 'the historical, cultural, and social contexts in which the episcopal office has developed. In the pre-Nicene period ... the bishop was teacher and pastor and the bond of communion both within the local church and between the various local and regional churches. Bishops also exercised a ministry of prophetic witness. In the period after Constantine ... the bishop became part of the hierarchical administrative structure of the empire on the model of the imperial civil service. In the feudal period in the West the bishop was both spiritual and temporal lord. After the Reformation [and during the period of colonialism] ... the imperial and feudal models of episcopacy continued to predominate ... [but were later] modified by an increased sense of the role played by the bishop in leading the mission of the church and by a heightened emphasis on the apostolic nature of the episcopate. In the Anglican Communion today a renewed model of episcopal leadership is emerging, one that more fully reflects the servant ministry of Jesus and the baptismal calling of the whole people of God. In this style of episcopal leadership, the ministries of all the baptised are nurtured in ways which are personal, collegial, and communal.'⁶⁶

The Orthodox emphasis on the eschatological character of the church in the ecclesiology of the first three centuries of the church and the role of the bishop as sign both of apostolic continuity and of the eschatological promise means that the church in history stands under both judgment and grace. In this perspective it is the servant role of the bishop that comes to the fore rather than episcopacy as an expression of worldly power. The eschatological perspective, therefore, provides an important critique of ecclesial structures which reflect secular and historical patterns which are not consistent with the Gospel.

Erickson asks how episcopal ministry can serve the church's redemptive mission today in a global context that is radically different from the cultural and sociological context of the ancient church. 'In the context of the ancient *polis*, the eucharistic structures of the local church could and did powerfully proclaim and manifest Christ's victory over the divisions of this fallen world. But simply replicating those structures in today's 'global village' might well perpetuate and exacerbate these divisions, by identifying the church with the special interests of this or that natural, purely human community.' He argues,

therefore, that the Ignatian model ‘without a significant infusion of ‘Irenaeus’ and ‘Cyprianic’ elements ... would inevitably lead to an absence of common witness and action on broader levels (the world, the nation, the region, even the city - for surely a megalopolis like Mexico City or Athens would have to be broken up into ‘smaller dioceses’)’⁶⁷

In 1998 the Section of the Lambeth Conference concerned with mission described its vision of the missionary role of the bishop in the contemporary context:

‘The bishop is a guardian of the faith received from earlier generations and which is now to be passed on gratefully and hopefully to the bishop’s successors. Apostolic succession is not only a matter of formal historical continuity, but a responsibility to receive and transmit this gift. Thus, too, the bishop seeks to work from and with a community eager to share this news. As a public figure in many cultural and social contexts, the bishop has the opportunity of addressing large gatherings in the Church and in the wider community and of interacting with people in industry, commerce, government and education, with leaders of other religious communities and with those who form opinion in society. It is vital that these opportunities be seen in an apostolic light, as part of an intentional series of strategic actions flowing into the mission of God, not as signs of status. And in the Church, the bishop must foster the same sense of purpose and coherence, taking every opening to name the vision, articulate common goals and cultivate purposeful reflection about mission at every level in a diocese.’⁶⁸

These perspectives point a way forward for both Anglicans and Lutherans as we seek to reform and renew our episcopal structures in ways that more faithfully serve apostolic continuity, the Gospel, God’s mission in the world, and the visible unity of the church.

VII. Episcopal Ministry and Global Communion

A question that is particularly pressing in the current Anglican context is how episcopal ministry can serve global communion. The classical model in Anglicanism is one of ‘dispersed authority,’ which was clearly articulated in the 1948 Lambeth Conference. Deriving from the single source of divine revelation, this authority ‘is distributed among Scripture, Tradition, Creeds, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the witness of saints, and the *consensus fidelium*, which is the continuing experience of the Holy Spirit through His faithful people in the Church. It is thus a dispersed rather than a centralised authority having many elements which combine, interact with, and check each other ...’ Among these elements ‘the bishop ... [exercises] his authority by virtue of his divine commission and in synodical association with his clergy and laity ... in organic relation [to the other elements of

authority] ...⁶⁹ In the language of *BEM* this is a model of episcopal ministry which is exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways.

In recent years the *Virginia Report* of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission and the *Windsor Report*⁷⁰ of the Lambeth Commission have recommended strengthening the Instruments of Communion, i.e. the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Primates' Meeting, and the Anglican Consultative Council as a means of strengthening the bonds of communion among the Anglican provinces. The first three of these instruments of communion are exclusively episcopal structures. Furthermore, the Primates' Meeting and the recent meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC-13) have called for the Primates to be included *ex officio* as members of the ACC. Since this represents a constitutional change it will require the agreement of 2/3 of the Anglican Provinces. If approved, it would give the ACC a strongly episcopal character. These recommendations and developments have received a mixed reception in the various provinces of the Anglican Communion. Some welcome them as ways of strengthening the bonds of communion among the various Anglican provinces. Others view them as an over-concentration and centralisation of episcopal authority which threatens the balance between the personal, collegial, and communal dimensions of ministry and authority within the Anglican Communion. Lutheran churches are also struggling with what it means to be a global communion and what structures are needed to sustain this communion. These are questions which call for continuing dialogue between our churches as our respective episcopal structures evolve.

The House of Bishops of the Church of England has tried to address the question of episcopal collegiality in its occasional paper *Bishops in Communion*. This report acknowledges that there is no fully developed ecumenical or Anglican theology of collegiality, and that the subject is a relatively new one in Anglican ecclesiology. The report sets episcopal collegiality within the framework of a communion ecclesiology, thus exploring the issue of episcopal collegiality 'within an understanding of the Church as a communion or fellowship (*koinonia*) in which every member has a part ...' Episcopal collegiality is said to belong 'within the interdependent life of the whole people of God and relates to the various means by which that life is ordered and held together'.⁷¹ In a communion ecclesiology, the foundation of the church's communion is understood to be the communion between the persons of the Divine Trinity and the church as communion is understood as sign and foretaste in history of the eschatological fulfilment of communion in the coming reign of God. This communion is sustained by a variety of gifts: the apostolic faith, the word and sacraments, and an apostolic ministry.

The ministry of bishops has communal (or synodal or conciliar), collegial, and personal dimensions, which need to be held together in balance. 'The communal (conciliar or synodal) life of the church is grounded in the sacrament of baptism. All the baptised share a responsibility for the apostolic faith and witness of the Church. Conciliarity refers to the involvement of the whole body of the faithful - bishops, clergy and laity - in consultation, normally through representative and constitutional structures, for the sake of the well-being of the church and God's mission in the world. Its nature is fundamentally eucharistic (ARCIC, *The Gift of Authority*, para 39). It implies unity in diversity and is expressed in one heart and one mind among Christians (Philippians 2.1-2) ... This conciliarity lies behind the Anglican conviction that authority in the church is dispersed and corporate ...' This implies mutual responsibility and accountability 'between those entrusted with a personal ministry of oversight and all the baptised ...'⁷² This is expressed within Anglicanism through the synodical structures of the various provinces of the Anglican Communion.

The bishop's ministry is communal; it is also personal and collegial. 'Bishops exercise individually [personally] a ministry which is shared by them as a body ...' In this sense collegiality is understood to be 'implicit in the nature of the ministry of oversight' when exercised regionally or globally, but 'in the Anglican Communion the collegiality of bishops is always understood within the conciliarity of the whole body.'⁷³ The report recognises the reality that 'both as a divinely ordained community and as a human institution, the Christian church is necessarily involved in the exercise of power and authority ... [as] inescapable facets of all forms of community.' Theologically, however, for Christians, every form of power and authority in the church, including episcopal authority and power, must be 'shaped and moulded into conformity to Christ's death and resurrection'. It must be exercised 'under the sign of the cross,' since power and authority in the church as elsewhere is 'subject to the limitations and sinfulness of human nature'. The model for episcopal ministry, therefore, must be the model of the servant (Luke 22.24-27).⁷⁴

'Episcopal collegiality exists to ensure the church's fidelity to the apostolic teaching and mission and to maintain the local church/diocese ... in communion - with the Church' both in time and in space. 'It is a ministry with a particular care for continuity and unity.' Episcopal collegiality exercised at local, regional, and international levels entails discerning 'what should be the authentic witness to the Gospel in today's world'.⁷⁵ While 'the member churches [of the Anglican Communion] are legally autonomous, they are ... [also] interdependent, ...[which] requires the support of appropriate structures and adequate

resources.⁷⁶ This lies behind the recent recommendations in the *Virginia Report* and the *Windsor Report*.

‘A bishop is a bishop of the universal church and belongs to the universal episcopal college. Because of the divisions of the churches there is *de facto* no universal collegial exercise of oversight. However, the ecumenical movement of the twentieth century has increasingly made possible a degree of shared oversight ... [which] is being explored in a number of ecumenical conversations.’⁷⁷ These reflections, which are new for Anglicans, hold the promise of a reform and renewal of episcopal ministry in both our communions in the service of apostolic continuity, the Gospel, God’s mission in the world, and global communion.

Questions for Further Dialogue between Anglicans and Lutherans

1. Can Anglicans and Lutherans agree that episcopal ministry is a particular gift of the Spirit (*charism*) and that a charismatic, representative, relational, and symbolic understanding of the episcopal office is more adequate than a purely functional understanding?
2. Is the Lutheran understanding of a ‘region’ equivalent to the Anglican understanding of a ‘diocese’? What portion of the people of God, what community is it that the bishop relates to and represents in Anglican and Lutheran understanding? Do Lutherans and Anglicans agree that the bishop is the chief pastor for both clergy and laity in the region/diocese where he or she exercises episcopal oversight and a sign both of continuity with the apostolic tradition and of the unity between the local and universal church?
3. The present regional agreements (*Porvoo*, *CCM*, *Waterloo*) agree to bring their episcopal ministries within the historic episcopal succession for the sake of the restoration of visible unity and as a sign of apostolic continuity? Are Anglican and Lutheran churches which are not part of the present regional agreements able to embrace the historic episcopal succession?
4. Are Anglicans and Lutherans prepared to acknowledge the ecclesial authenticity of each others’ ministries before the sign of historic succession has been fully received, and under what conditions?
5. When Anglicans speak of the ‘ordination’ of bishops and Lutherans speak of the ‘installation’ of bishops, do they mean the same thing?
6. Are Anglicans and Lutherans prepared to take steps to reform both their episcopal and their synodical structures, so that they are more accountable to the Gospel?

7. What can Lutherans and Anglicans learn from each other as they seek to reform and renew their episcopal ministries in the service of the Gospel, the mission of the church, and global communion?

An appendix, summarising the *Niagara Report* and the *Regional Anglican - Lutheran Agreements* was attached to the above. This repeated the section on Lutherans in the Holy Order Paper below and therefore has not been reproduced here.

The Holy Order paper summarises multilateral, bilateral and other ecumenical documents insofar as they deal with Holy Orders, and identifies questions (at the end of the text) where there may be inconsistencies or where further theological reflection is needed.

IASCER Paper on Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues

Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry

BEM, a multilateral document, stands in the background of more recent bilateral documents, which often take it as a benchmark. *BEM* places the ordained ministry in the context of the ministry of the whole people of God. In order to fulfil its mission, the church needs persons who are publicly and continually responsible for pointing to its fundamental dependence on Jesus Christ, thereby providing within a multiplicity of gifts, a focus of its unity. The reality of an ordained ministry was present from the beginning and is constitutive for the church, but its forms have evolved historically. The churches remain divided concerning the ordination of women.

Ordained ministers fulfil their calling only in and for the community. The chief responsibility of the ordained ministry is the proclamation and teaching of the Word of God, the celebration of the sacraments, and guiding the life of the community in its worship, mission, and caring ministry. It is especially in the eucharistic celebration that the ordained ministry is the visible focus of the communion between Christ and the members of the body. The authority of the ordained ministry is rooted in the triune God, has the character of responsibility before God, and is to be exercised with the co-operation of the whole community. Authority in the church is to be modelled on the example of Christ, whose authority was exercised as service.

Ordained ministers are related, as are all Christians, both to the priesthood of Christ and to the priesthood of the church. They may be appropriately called priests because they fulfil a particular priestly service by strengthening and building up the royal and prophetic priesthood of the faithful through word and sacraments, through their prayers of intercession, and through their pastoral guidance of the

community. The priestly ministry of the ordained differs in appropriate ways from the sacrificial priesthood of the Old Testament, the priesthood of Christ, and the corporate priesthood of the people of God.

The New Testament bears witness to a variety of forms of ministry. During the second and third centuries, a threefold pattern of bishop, presbyter, and deacon became established as the pattern of ordained ministry throughout the church. These functions subsequently underwent further historical developments. Although there is no single New Testament pattern and although the Spirit has led the church to adapt its ministries to contextual needs and blessed other forms of the ordained ministry, *BEM* believes that the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon may serve today both as an expression of the unity of the church and a means for achieving it. Among the various gifts of ministry, 'a ministry of *episkope* is necessary' (*Ministry*, 23) to safeguard and express the unity of the body. The threefold pattern, however, is 'evidently in need of reform' (*Ministry*, 24). Churches which retain it need to ask themselves how it can witness most effectively, and churches which do not retain it need to ask themselves whether it does not have a 'powerful claim' (*Ministry*, 25) to be accepted by them.

The ordained ministry should be exercised in a personal, collegial, and communal way. It needs to be constitutionally and canonically ordered and exercised in the church in such a way that each of these three dimensions can find adequate expression.

Bishops preach the Word, preside at the sacraments, administer discipline, and exercise pastoral oversight, in the service of apostolic continuity and unity in the church, linking the local church with the universal church. In communion with the presbyters and deacons and the whole community, they are responsible for the orderly transfer of ministerial authority in the church. Presbyters serve as pastoral ministers of Word and sacraments in a local eucharistic community. Their functions include preaching, teaching, pastoral care, and discipline. Deacons represent to the church its calling as servant in the world and exemplify the interdependence of worship and service in the church's life.

Apostolic tradition in the church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the church of the apostles: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation and fresh interpretation of the Gospel, celebration of baptism and the eucharist, the transmission of ministerial responsibilities, and communion in prayer, love, joy, suffering, service, and unity. The primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the church as a whole. Within this apostolic tradition is an apostolic succession of the ministry which serves the continuity of Christ's mission. In the early centuries of the church this was exercised by the historic episcopate. It is increasingly

recognised by churches which have the historic episcopate that a continuity in apostolic faith, worship and mission has been preserved in churches which have not retained the historic episcopate, and that the reality and function of the episcopal ministry have been preserved in many of these churches, with or without the title 'bishop'. These considerations enable churches which have not retained the episcopate to appreciate the episcopal succession as a 'sign, though not a guarantee,' (38) of the continuity and unity of the church.

Ordination denotes an action by God and the community, which through long tradition takes place in the context of worship and especially the eucharist. The act of ordination by the laying on of hands of those appointed to do so is at one and the same time invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*), sacramental sign, and acknowledgement of gifts and commitment in the new relation which is established between this minister and the local and universal church. Ordination should never be repeated.

**Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission:
The Final Report**

In the *Canterbury Statement* (1973) and its *Elucidation* (1979) the ordained ministry is understood within the broader context of the ministry of all the baptised. All ministry in the church is christologically grounded. Christ's life and self-offering is its source and model. The purpose of Christian ministry is the building up of the church by the Holy Spirit as a community (*koinonia*) of reconciliation. This implies a communion ecclesiology. The apostolic character of Christian ministry is grounded christologically in the sending of the Son by the Father. While the original apostles had a unique foundational role, the church is apostolic both because it reflects the original witness of the apostles and because it is called to continue the apostles' commission.

Within the New Testament, ministerial functions are not precisely defined. With the growth of the church, certain functions became located in specific officers of the community. What we call ordination is the recognition and authorisation by the church of those who exercise these functions in the name of Christ. The emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon was a historical development which eventually became universal.

The goal of the ordained ministry is to serve the priesthood of all the faithful. A variety of images is used in the New Testament to describe the functions of this ministerial leadership. An essential element in the ordained ministry is its responsibility for 'oversight' (*episcopo*). Presbyters are joined with the bishop in the exercise of oversight and in the ministry of word and sacrament. They are given authority to preside at the eucharist and to pronounce absolution. Deacons are

associated with the bishop and presbyters in the ministry of word and sacrament and assist in oversight.

The priestly role of Jesus Christ is unique. While the New Testament does not use priestly language to describe ministerial leaders, because Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in its ministers, the church came to use priestly language to speak of the ordained ministry. The ordained ministry is called priestly principally because it has a particular sacramental relationship with Christ as High Priest. Ordained ministers, particularly in presiding at the eucharist, represent the whole church in the fulfilment of its priestly vocation of self-offering to God as a living sacrifice (Romans 12.1). Their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood, but 'belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit' (*Canterbury* 13).

Ordination denotes entry into this apostolic and God-given ministry, which serves and signifies the unity of the local churches in themselves and with one another. Every individual act of ordination is an expression of the continuing apostolicity and catholicity of the whole church. In ordination, which is a sacramental act, the bishop prays God to grant the gift of the Holy Spirit and lays hands on the candidate as the outward sign of the gifts bestowed. Because God's calling and gifts are irrevocable, ordination is unrepeatable.

Ordination in the apostolic succession ensures the historical continuity of the church with the apostolic church and of the bishop with the original apostolic ministry. The communion of the churches through time and space is symbolised and maintained by the bishop.

Anglican - Lutheran Relations

The Porvoo Statement, Called to Common Mission, and The Waterloo Declaration provide three different models for establishing full communion between the Anglican and Lutheran churches. The *Niagara Report*, while not always chronologically prior, provides a common background for these statements.

Niagara Report

The *Niagara Report* was the report of a consultation on the nature of *episcopate* initiated by the International Anglican - Lutheran Continuation Committee. The consultation was charged with exploring the relationship between apostolic succession, the ministry of the whole people of God, episcopacy and the historic episcopate in relation to the mission of the church today.

The context within which the question of *episcopate* is discussed is the mission of the Triune God towards the world in which the church participates. Mission is gift and all ministry is to serve the mission of the church. As part of their common confession of Christian faith, both

Anglicans and Lutherans hold that all the baptised are given gifts of ministry, and that the ordained ministry exists to serve the ministry of the whole people of God. The ordained ministry of word and sacrament is understood to be a gift of God to the church and, therefore, an office of divine institution. The nature of ministry and its authority is understood against the background of *BEM* ('Ministry', 34). A ministry of pastoral oversight (*episcopate*), exercised in personal, collegial and communal ways, is necessary to witness to and safeguard the unity and apostolicity of the church. *Episcopate* is defined as 'pastoral leadership, co-ordination and oversight' (3). By *historic episcopate* the report means 'an episcopate which traces its origins back through history to at least the end of the second century' (3). *Apostolic succession* is understood as 'the apostolicity of the Church in faith' (3).

The continuing mission of the church requires apostolic continuity. 'Apostolic succession' is characteristic of the church as a whole in its varied witness and cannot be limited to ministerial succession. Pastoral oversight (*episcopate*) is an essential strand in this witness, but the New Testament does not allow us to assert that it was exercised by a uniform structure of ministry inherited directly from or transmitted by the apostles. To recognise a church as being 'in the apostolic succession' requires not one criterion of discernment, but many. The consultation identified five principal criteria of authentic apostolic continuity: (1) Doxology, (2) Continuity, (3) Disciplined Life Together as a Community of Disciples, (4) Nurture, (5) Direction and Goal.

These requirements for the mission of the church are given in Christ, but need to be realised in history. Each of them must be focused in symbolic acts and structures. Among the symbols of apostolic continuity are the scriptures, baptism and the Lord's Supper, orthodox confession of faith, and the historical continuity of bishops and presbyters. These symbols, however, must be constantly re-interpreted and reformed in new social, historical, and cultural contexts. While no single pattern of leadership was common to the early Christian communities, there was a persisting need for faithful leadership in the mission of the church. The *Niagara Report* quotes with approval section 6 of the *Canterbury Statement* in *The Final Report* of ARCIC which recognises both the essential part which ministerial office played in the life of the early church, the considerable diversity in the structure of pastoral ministry in the New Testament, and the emergence of *episcopoi* and *presbyteroi* in some churches.

With the development of the episcopate, the bishop came to be seen as the symbolic person in whom the identity of the community was focused and represented. Paralleling the communion ecclesiology of ARCIC, the *Niagara Report* sees the office of bishop in the early church as symbolising the *koinonia* or communion of the local churches with the

universal church both in time and in space. These are enduring values in the episcopal office. However, both the episcopal and the presbyteral offices have exhibited historical variety; so it is not possible to give normative status to a particular stage in their historical development. The report concludes, therefore, that ‘what is essential to the life and mission of the church is that the connection between the universal and the local should be made, and that it should be effective’ (53). The presence of a bishop in the historical succession does not *guarantee* the preservation of *koinonia* between the local and the universal church. Neither does the absence of a bishop in the historical succession automatically entail its absence. The case is the same in relation to continuity. ‘Apostolic succession in the episcopal office does not consist primarily in an unbroken chain of those ordaining to those ordained, but in a succession in the presiding ministry of a church which stands in the continuity of apostolic faith and which is overseen by the bishop in order to keep it in the communion of the Catholic and Apostolic Church’ (Lutheran - Roman Catholic Joint Commission, *The Ministry in the Church*, 62).

It is the oversight or presiding ministry which constitutes the heart of the episcopal office, and that oversight is never to be viewed apart from the continuity of apostolic faith. Since the historical succession of the episcopate symbolises but does not guarantee apostolic continuity, it is possible for a church to be in the apostolic succession when there is a material rupture in the succession of presiding ministers for the sake of preserving the continuity of apostolic faith. The report concludes that since Anglicans and Lutherans share a common apostolic faith, neither tradition can, in good conscience, reject the apostolic nature of the other. As a consequence, the ordained ministry is no longer an issue which needs to divide the two churches. The practical application of these theological convictions is that ‘both our Churches have been given by God sufficient faithfulness to the apostolic gospel that today we can recognise each other as sister Churches’ (83) while at the same time acknowledging that the inherited expressions of *episcopate* in both churches will need reform in the context of the experience of full communion and in the light of the continuing call of the church to mission if both churches are to maintain apostolic continuity.

The Porvoo Common Statement

The *Porvoo Common Statement* builds on earlier Anglican - Lutheran agreements, especially Niagara and Meissen, and on the broader ecumenical dialogue. It intends to move beyond the existing agreements towards the goal of visible unity and attempts to resolve the issues of episcopacy and succession. Following Niagara, *Porvoo* seeks to anchor its doctrinal affirmations in the context of the church’s mission

The understanding of the nature of the church which has emerged in the broader ecumenical dialogue provides the context for a new approach to the question of the ordained ministry and of oversight (*episcopate*). The nature and unity of the church is understood in the context of God's ultimate purpose and mission in Christ, which is the restoration and renewal of all creation, the coming of the reign of God in its fullness. The purpose of the church is to proclaim the gospel of God's reconciling love through Jesus Christ. God's action in Christ brings us by grace through faith into a life of communion (*koinonia*) with the triune God and with one another in the body of Christ. The church is both a divine reality and a human institution, rooted in the love and grace of Christ but also sharing in the brokenness of human sin. The church is sign, instrument, and foretaste of the kingdom of God. The unity of the church is a joyful communion both with the triune God and among its members. Because the unity of the church is grounded in communion with the triune God, unity is a gift given in Christ which belongs to the very nature of the church and demands fuller visible embodiment. Visible unity does not mean uniformity. Unity and diversity are complementary gifts, grounded in the communion of the triune God. This unity and diversity is sustained by the bonds of communion: one baptism, a common confession of the apostolic faith, a united celebration of the eucharist, a single ministry set apart by prayer and the laying on of hands, and communion in love. This sharing in a common life is served by the apostolic ministry.

There is no proclamation of the word and sacraments without a community and its ministry. All the baptised are given a variety of gifts and ministries by the Holy Spirit in the service of both the church and the world. Within the community of the church the ordained ministry exists to serve the ministry of the whole people of God. The ordained ministry of word and sacrament is an office of divine institution and as such a gift of God to the church. Ordained ministers are related, as are all Christians, both to the priesthood of Christ and to the priesthood of the church. The threefold ministry of bishop, priest and deacon became the general pattern in the church of the early centuries and is still retained by many churches, though often in partial form. The threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon may serve today as an expression of the unity we seek and also as a means for achieving it. A ministry of pastoral oversight (*episcopate*), exercised in personal, collegial and communal ways, is necessary as witness to and safeguard of the unity and apostolicity of the church. The retention of the episcopal office is a sign of the intention, under God, to ensure the continuity of the church in apostolic life and witness. For these reasons, all the Anglican and Lutheran churches have a personally exercised episcopal office.

Historically, however, a difficulty has been created by the fact that this episcopal ministry has not in all cases been in historical succession. How then is the apostolicity of the whole church to be understood and within that the apostolic ministry, succession in the episcopal office, and the historic succession as a sign? Apostolic tradition in the church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the church of the apostles: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation and fresh interpretation of the Gospel, celebration of baptism and the eucharist, the transmission of ministerial responsibilities, communion in prayer, love, joy, suffering, service, unity, and sharing the gifts of ministry. The church is called today to remain faithful to the apostolic witness to the life, death, resurrection and exaltation of its Lord. The church receives this mission and the power to fulfil it as a gift of the risen Christ. Apostolicity is, therefore, a mark of the church as a whole. Apostolicity means continuity in the church's apostolic mission, which is rooted in the mission of the triune God. Thus the primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the church as a whole.

Within the apostolicity of the whole church there is an apostolic succession of the ministry. The ordained ministry has a particular responsibility for maintaining the continuity of the apostolic tradition through the proclamation of the word and sacraments and by guiding the life of the community in its worship, mission, and pastoral care. Ordination by prayer, invocation of the Holy Spirit, and the laying on of hands reminds the church that it receives its mission from Christ and expresses the church's intention to live in fidelity to and gratitude for that commission and gift. The different tasks of the one ministry find expression in its structuring. The threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, which became the general pattern of ordained ministry in the early church, continues to undergo historical development. *Episcope* (oversight), which is the particular responsibility of the bishop, is needed for the co-ordination of the variety of ministries in the community, for leadership in the church's teaching, worship, and mission, and for the unity and continuity of the church both in time and in space. This ministry of oversight is to be exercised personally, collegially and communally at the local, regional, and universal levels of the church's life. In most Anglican and Lutheran churches this takes synodical form. Bishops, together with other ministers and the whole community, are responsible for the orderly transfer of ministerial authority in the church.

Apostolic succession in the episcopal office is a visible and personal way of focusing the apostolicity of the whole church. Continuity in apostolic succession is signified in the ordination or consecration of the bishop by the laying on of hands with prayer. In the consecration of a bishop the sign is effective in four ways: (1) It bears witness to the faithfulness of

the triune God, (2) It bears witness to the church's intention to remain faithful to God's initiative and gift by living in continuity with the apostolic faith and tradition, (3) The participation of a group of bishops in the laying on of hands signifies the catholicity of the church, the communion of the local diocese with the universal church, (4) It transmits ministerial office and its authority in accordance with God's will and institution.

To ordain a bishop in historic succession (in intended continuity with the apostles) is also a sign. It signifies the church's care for the continuity of its apostolic life and mission as a whole. The use of the sign of the historic episcopal succession does not guarantee the fidelity of a church to every aspect of the apostolic faith, life and mission, but the retention of the sign remains a permanent challenge to fidelity and unity. Because continuity is not maintained by a single means, a church which has preserved the sign of historic episcopal succession is free to acknowledge an authentic episcopal ministry in a church which has preserved continuity in the episcopal office by an occasional priestly/presbyteral ordination at the time of the Reformation. Similarly a church which has preserved continuity through such a succession is free to enter a relationship of mutual participation in episcopal ordinations with a church which has retained the historical episcopal succession, and to embrace this sign, without denying its past apostolic continuity. The mutual acknowledgement of our churches and ministries is theologically prior to the use of the sign of the laying on of hands in the historical succession. Resumption of the use of the sign does not imply an adverse judgement on the ministries of those churches which did not previously make use of the sign. It is a means of making more visible the unity and continuity of the church both in time and in space. To the degree to which our ministries have been separated, all our churches have lacked something of the fullness that God desires for the church. In being served by a mutually recognised episcopal ministry our churches will be enabled to be more faithful to their mission.

Called to Common Mission

Following *Niagara* and *Porvoo*, the understanding of ministry in *CCM* is worked out in the context of the mission of the church on the understanding that unity and mission are organically linked in the Body of Christ. *CCM* operates with the understanding of 'full communion' defined by *Cold Ash*. Full communion is understood to be a relation between distinct churches in which each recognises the other as a catholic and apostolic church holding the essentials of the Christian faith, becoming interdependent while remaining autonomous. In *CCM* ECUSA and the ELCA agree to recognise in each other the essentials of the one catholic and apostolic faith as witnessed by each church's basic

documents and the doctrinal consensus summarised in the *Niagara Report*.

The ministry of the whole people of God forms the context for what is said about all forms of ministry. All members of the church are commissioned for ministry through baptism. *CCM* acknowledges that both Anglican and Lutheran ordained ministries have been given by God to be instruments of God's grace in the service of God's people and possess not only the inward call of the Spirit but also Christ's commission through his body, the church. Personal, collegial, and communal oversight is embodied and exercised in both churches in a diversity of forms in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles. Ordained ministers are called and set apart for the one ministry of word and sacrament, but do not thereby cease to share in the priesthood of all believers. The Anglican tradition uses the terms 'presbyter' and 'priest' and the Lutheran tradition in America characteristically uses the term 'pastor' for the same ordained ministry.

ECUSA and the ELCA agree that the one ordained ministry will be shared between the two churches in a future common pattern. The ministry of pastors/priests will be shared from the outset, some functions of deacons in both churches can be shared, and over time the churches will come to share in the ministry of bishops in an evangelical, historical succession. This succession is also manifest in the churches' use of the apostolic scriptures, the confession of the ancient creeds, and the celebration of the sacraments. ECUSA will immediately recognise existing ordained ministers within the ELCA and the ELCA agrees to receive and adapt an episcopate that will be shared. The diaconate, including its place within the threefold ministerial office and its relationship with all other ministries, needs continuing exploration. The ordination of deacons, deaconesses, or diaconal ministers is not required by *CCM*.

The New Testament describes a laying-on-of-hands to set persons apart for a variety of ministries. In the history of the church various terms have been used to describe the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. Currently the ELCA uses the term 'installation' for this rite while the Episcopal Church uses the term 'ordination'. What is involved in each case is the setting apart within the one ministry of word and sacrament of a person elected and called for the exercise of oversight (*episcopate*) wider than the local congregation in the service of the gospel.

'Historic succession' refers to a tradition which goes back to the ancient church, in which bishops already in the succession install newly elected bishops with prayer and the laying-on-of-hands. Both churches make a commitment to share an episcopal succession that is both evangelical and historic. They promise to include regularly one or more bishops of the other church to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the

ordinations/installations of their own bishops as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the unity and apostolic continuity of the whole church. With the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, such ordinations/installations will involve prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkope* as one of the ways, in the context of ordained ministries and of the whole people of God, in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolised in fidelity to the gospel through the ages. By such a liturgical statement the churches recognise that the bishop serves the diocese or synod through ties of collegiality and consultation that strengthen its links with the universal church. It is also a liturgical expression of the full communion initiated by *CCM*. When persons duly called and elected are ordained/installed in this way, they are understood to enter the historic episcopate.

While the two churches will come to share in the historic episcopate, each church is free to explore the interpretation of the ministry of bishops, whenever possible in consultation with the other. ECUSA is free to maintain that sharing in the historic catholic episcopate, while not necessary for salvation or for the recognition of another church as a church, is nonetheless necessary when Anglicans enter the relationship of full communion with another church, while the ELCA is free to maintain that the historic episcopate, although pastorally desirable when exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways, is nonetheless not necessary for the relationship of full communion (for example, such freedom is evidenced by its communion with non-episcopal churches). The two churches will acknowledge immediately the full authenticity of each other's ordained ministries (bishops, priests, and deacons in ECUSA and pastors in the ELCA). The creation of a common and fully interchangeable ministry of bishops in full communion will occur with the incorporation of all active bishops in the historic episcopal succession.

To enable full communion the Episcopal church will temporarily suspend the application of the Preface to the Ordinal requiring ordination by bishops in the historic succession. This action will permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all Lutheran pastors of the ELCA as priests or presbyters in ECUSA without any further ordination, re-ordination, or supplementary ordination. This action is taken with a view to the future implementation of the principle embodied in the Preface to the Ordinal. ECUSA recognises as gift the consistent emphasis on the primacy of the Word in the Lutheran tradition and endorses the Lutheran affirmation that the historic catholic episcopate under the Word of God must always serve the gospel, and that the ultimate authority under which bishops preach and teach is the gospel itself. Accordingly, ECUSA agrees to establish and welcome structures

for the review and reform of episcopal ministry in the service of the gospel.

The ELCA agrees that all future bishops to be installed will be installed with the intention to enter the historic episcopate. ECUSA will recognise such bishops as bishops in the historic succession even though bishops in the ELCA are installed for a term rather than for life. Any subsequent installation of bishops so installed will include a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit without the laying-on-of-hands. While freely accepting the historic episcopate, the ELCA affirms that a distinction between episcopal and pastoral ministries within the one office of word and sacrament is neither commanded nor forbidden by divine law, and that the historic episcopate is not necessary for the relationship of full communion. This allows the ELCA to continue to be in full communion with non-episcopal churches. Following the establishment of full communion, all installations of new bishops in the ELCA will be through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit with the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, at least three of whom are to be in the historic succession. Further, the ELCA agrees that a bishop shall regularly preside and participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of all clergy. Pastors shall continue to participate with the bishop in the laying-on-of-hands of all ordinations of pastors.

Interchangeability of clergy between the two churches will be subject to the canonical provisions of each church. Further, each church agrees that the other church will continue to live in full communion with all the churches with which it is presently in communion without requiring full communion of the other church with the same bodies. Each will continue to be in dialogue with other churches and traditions.

The Conference of Bishops of the ELCA in a resolution adopted at its meeting in Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999 interprets *CCM* as follows: *CCM* makes no requirement that the ELCA must eventually adopt the three-fold order of ministry. The present understanding of one ordained ministry in the ELCA, including both pastors and bishops, may continue in effect. There is no requirement that ELCA bishops be elected to serve as synodical bishops for life. They will continue to be elected and installed for six-year terms, with eligibility for re-election, subject to term limits, where applicable. The ELCA will continue to receive onto the roster of ordained ministers, without re-ordination, pastors from other traditions, some of whom will not have been ordained by a bishop in the historic episcopate. Following the adoption of *CCM*, if someone has been received onto the roster of ordained ministers of the ELCA who was not episcopally ordained and is subsequently elected and installed as a bishop, he or she will be understood to be a bishop in the historic episcopate. Lay persons may continue to be licensed by the synodical bishop in unusual circumstances to administer Baptism and Holy

Communion. In adopting *CCM*, both the ELCA and ECUSA acknowledge that this is a correct interpretation of the implications of the agreement.

Called to Full Communion: The Waterloo Declaration

The Waterloo Declaration is the culmination of earlier agreements between the Anglican Church of Canada and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada growing out of a series of meetings of the Canadian Lutheran Anglican Dialogue in the context of bilateral agreements already reached between other Anglican and Lutheran churches and the wider multilateral ecumenical dialogue. Full communion was established between the two churches in July 2001. *The Waterloo Declaration* understands full communion as a relationship between two distinct churches or communions in which each maintains its own autonomy while recognising the catholicity and apostolicity of the other, and believing the other to hold the essentials of the Christian faith. Communicant members of each church would be free to communicate at the altar of the other and ordained ministers would be free to officiate sacramentally in either church. In the Canadian context this is understood to include transferability of members, mutual recognition and interchangeability of ministries, freedom to use the liturgies of each other's churches, freedom to participate in each other's ordinations and installations of clergy, including bishops, and structures to maintain common life, witness, and service. In 1997 the House of Bishops of the Anglican Church of Canada and its Council of General Synod agreed that they were prepared to view the historic episcopate in the context of apostolicity articulated in *BEM* (29, 34-38, 51-53), *The Niagara Report* (53, 94), and *The Porvoo Common Statement* (34-57). In the same year, the National Convention of the ELCIC agreed that it was 'prepared to take the constitutional steps necessary to understand the installation of bishops as ordination'.

The official commentary on *The Waterloo Declaration* affirms that the declaration is based upon several key convictions. First, apostolicity is understood as a characteristic of the whole church. Episcopal ministry is seen as a sign and servant of the apostolicity exercised by the whole church. Second, it is understood that the substance of episcopal ministry may be present in a church even if the sign of the historic episcopal succession is not. Third, it is understood that if the substance is present, the resumption of the sign of the historic episcopal succession may come as a consequence of full communion rather than a precondition for the establishment of full communion. These convictions are based on the convergence that has emerged in the Canadian Lutheran - Anglican Dialogue, in *The Niagara Report* and in *The Porvoo Common Statement*. Within the ELCIC, the office of bishop has been established and is evolving. Because various strands of Lutheranism have come together to form the ELCIC, different

understandings of the office of bishop exist. By recognising the installation of a bishop as ordination, the ELCIC has clearly expressed its commitment to the office of bishop as the personal expression of *episcopate*. Full communion will initiate a process that will result in the ordained ministries of both churches sharing the sign of the historical episcopal succession in the service of the Gospel.

The official commentary elaborates further on the understanding of apostolicity underlying the declaration. Apostolicity means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the church of the apostles. As God's gift in Christ through the Holy Spirit, apostolicity is not confined to the historic episcopate but is a diverse reality expressed in the church's teaching, mission and ministry. Apostolic teaching is expressed not only in the scriptures and historic ecumenical creeds but also in the confessional documents of the Reformation as expositions of the scriptural witness. The apostolic mission of the church is rooted in the trinitarian action of God towards the world and in the sending of the apostles by Christ in the power of the Spirit. Within the church there are a variety of ministries conferred by the same Spirit. The ministry of *episcopate* is a ministry of leadership bearing the authority of Christ in and to the community and involves fidelity to the apostolic faith and its proclamation and transmission to future generations. *Episcopate* is pastoral oversight of the whole community, including the pastors. It is entrusted to the whole church and is exercised in the light of the Gospel.

The ministry of oversight is the particular responsibility of the bishop who serves the whole community by preaching the Word, presiding at the sacraments, and administering discipline. This ministry of pastoral oversight serves the apostolicity, catholicity and unity of the church's teaching, mission and sacramental life. The episcopal office is a visible and personal sign of the apostolicity of the whole church. Succession in the episcopal office provides continuity in the apostolic life and mission of the church through the ministry of oversight. Continuity in episcopal succession is signified in the ordination of a bishop. While the sign does not guarantee either the faithfulness of the church or the personal fidelity of the bishop, it witnesses to continuity of the proclamation of the Gospel and the mission of the church. The resumption of the sign of an ordained episcopate is not an adverse judgement on the past, but a means of making more visible the unity and continuity of the church at all times and in all places.

Episcopate is exercised personally, collegially and communally. As a personal ministry, *episcopate* points to the presence of Christ by proclaiming the Gospel and calling the community to common service. As a collegial ministry, *episcopate* means that the bishop takes counsel with the ordained to determine how best to enable the ministry and mission of the whole church in the local context. It also means the

collegiality of bishops locally with the wider church. *Episcope* is communal because ordained ministry is rooted in the life of the community and requires the community's effective participation. Through their participation in the governance of the church and in the exercise of their own ministries and witness, the laity share in the ministry of *episcope*.

Ordained ministry exists to serve the ministry of the whole people of God. The two churches acknowledge ordained ministry to be a gift of God to the church, and thus of divine institution. Ordination is an act of Christ in the church. It is regarded by both churches as essential for the church and is exercised as a public office. The oversight of pastoral ministry through the office of *episcope*, therefore, is seen as fundamental to the life, unity and mission of the church. Ordination takes place through the laying on of hands by those authorised to do so in the context of the prayer of the whole assembly. Both churches acknowledge that ordination can be received only once and is not a repeatable act.

In the declaration the Anglican Church of Canada recognises the full authenticity of the ordained ministries of bishops and pastors presently existing within the ELCIC, acknowledging its pastors as priests in the church of God and its bishops as bishops and chief pastors exercising a ministry of *episcope* over the jurisdictional areas of the ELCIC in which they preside. Likewise, the ELCIC recognises the full authenticity of the ordained ministries of bishops, priests, and deacons presently existing within the Anglican Church of Canada, acknowledging its priests as pastors in the church of God and its bishops as bishops and chief pastors exercising a ministry of *episcope* over the jurisdictional areas of the Anglican Church of Canada in which they preside. The Anglican Church of Canada and the ELCIC affirm each other's expression of episcopal ministry as a sign of continuity and unity in apostolic life. It is understood that the bishops of both churches are ordained for life service of the Gospel in the pastoral ministry of the historic episcopate, although tenure in office may be terminated by retirement, resignation or conclusion of term, subject to the constitutional provisions of each church. As a result of entering into full communion, the two churches commit themselves to invite one another's bishops to participate in the laying on of hands at the ordination of bishops as a sign of the unity and continuity of the church, and to invite pastors and priests to participate in the laying on of hands at the ordination of pastors or priests in each other's churches. They also commit themselves to work towards a common understanding of diaconal ministry.

The Diaconate as Ecumenical Opportunity: The Hanover Report of The Anglican - Lutheran International Commission

The Anglican - Lutheran International Commission (ALIC), in the light of previous agreements *Niagara Report* (1987), proposed *Concordat of Agreement* (1991, USA) and the *Porvoo Common Statement* (1992) believed that the next logical step was to undertake a fresh joint study of the diaconate. The aim was to offer a theological rationale which follows a clear line of argument: from Christ and the Spirit, through the ministry of the whole people of God (including ordained ministry) to an understanding of the diaconate, taking into account the experience of those engaged in various diaconal ministries. The report is offered as a catalyst for joint study and action and does not have the same authority as the bilateral and multilateral agreements between churches.

No ecumenical consensus has yet emerged on the nature and forms of the diaconate and diaconal ministries. Churches are making different decisions about the direction of the diaconate and fundamental questions are still debated about whether the diaconate is appropriately an ordained or lay ministry and whether those intending to be ordained priest or pastor should first be ordained to the diaconate. There is also continuing debate about the meaning of *diakonia* in the New Testament and the early church. Following the *Niagara Report*, this report seeks to place the diaconate in the context of a vision of the mission of God in the world.

Diaconal ministries are rooted in the *diakonia* of Christ who is present in the eucharistic assembly as the foundation of the church's ministry and mission. The liturgy provides the context for understanding the church's diaconal ministry. Traditionally the ministry of deacons was expressed within the liturgical celebration by the assignment of distinct roles to the deacon. In the early church the social service carried on by deacons seems to have been rooted in the liturgical celebration. The integration of worship and service remains a concern for the various diaconal ministries of the church. In some churches there has been a revival of the liturgical role of the deacon. In some churches these roles are undertaken by lay persons. The revival of the liturgical role of the deacon need not exclude the exercise of lay roles in the liturgy, but should give leadership to the diaconal dimension of the ministry of all the baptised.

The diaconate and diaconal ministries have taken highly diverse forms in both the Lutheran and Anglican churches, most often related to specific historical needs in society. In the Anglican tradition the diaconate is an ordained ministry, whether transitional or permanent. At the Reformation, the Lutheran churches did not preserve an ordained diaconate within a threefold ordering of ministry. Lutheran churches, nevertheless, have a variety of diaconal ministries which are

commissioned, set apart, or consecrated in other ways. New forms of diaconal ministry are developing in both churches in response to new needs.

Amidst this diversity certain common principles can be discerned. A general description, applicable to both lay and ordained diaconal ministries, is that diaconal ministers are called to be agents of the church in interpreting and meeting needs, hopes, and concerns within church and society. Service (*diakonia*) typically forms the central emphasis of diaconal ministry, but diaconal ministries should also reflect the dimensions of witness (*martyria*) and worship (*leitourgia*) in various forms. As a ministry of the church, diaconal ministry should also reflect the personal, collegial, and communal aspects of the church's ministries.

The contemporary renewal of the diaconate calls for consideration of the question whether diaconal ministry should be included within the ordained ministry of the church. The rationale for this depends on the meaning of ordination itself. In the case of a renewed or re-established diaconate the meaning of ordination would include (1) both an activity and an identity, (2) some kind of open-ended or life-long commitment, (3) recognition as being within the one ordained ministry of word and sacrament, and (4) a symbolic as well as a practical relationship to the whole community that provides for both the public exercise of diaconal ministry and its accountability. This understanding of the meaning of ordained ministry is an attempt to move beyond the old dichotomies of 'functional' versus 'ontological'. If such an understanding of ordained ministry is accepted which includes the diaconate, questions then arise about the relationship of this order to (1) the presbyterate, (2) those already exercising non-ordained diaconal ministries, and (3) all the baptised. Lutherans would then be challenged to consider whether an ordained diaconate would be of value in the service of the Gospel, and Anglicans would be challenged to restore the diaconate as a lifelong and distinct form of ordained ministry which would imply both a reconsideration of the transitional diaconate and the possibility of direct ordination to the priesthood of persons who have a presbyteral rather than a diaconal vocation. How is the call to the diaconate to be distinguished from the vocation of the laity? What is distinctive about the diaconate is the call to be publicly accountable servants of the church who have a responsibility to model, encourage, and co-ordinate the *diakonia* which is the ministry and mission of all the baptised.

Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church: The Lund Statement by the Lutheran World Federation, March 26, 2007

Introduction

The Lund statement is a new statement, which builds on the earlier 2002 document of the same title, but takes into consideration all the comments and proposals received from member churches of the LWF as well as ecumenical responses, including IASCEP's.

In the broad sense, in Lutheran churches, *episkope* is carried out by synodical forms of oversight, involving both lay and ordained persons, but as part of this broader *episkope*, Lutheran churches assign specific tasks of oversight to a regional ministry by bishops and similar officials with other titles, who exercise personally, collegially and communally, a supra-congregational form of ordained ministry.

Biblical and Historical Foundations

An ecumenically shared insight today is that the New Testament does not describe a single pattern of ministry, which can serve as a blueprint for later structures in the church. Rather, there is in the New Testament a variety of forms reflecting developments at different places and times.

In the history of the early church three principal images or models of the office of a bishop in the pre-Nicene period are exemplified in Ignatius, Irenaeus and Cyprian. For Ignatius of Antioch, the bishop is primarily the one who presides at the eucharist. While Irenaeus echoed the eucharistic teaching of Ignatius, he placed more emphasis on the bishop's role as teacher of the faith. For Irenaeus, the bishop is above all the one who preserves the continuity of apostolic teaching in succession from the apostles. For Cyprian of Carthage the emphasis is on the collegiality of the bishop's ministry as the bond of unity among the local churches within the universal church. These three perspectives remained important through the Middle Ages and were also important for the reformers.

From the beginning of the fourth century, the *episkopos* came to oversee, not just one eucharistic congregation, but a group of congregations headed by presbyters. The 'local church' then came to be identified with the wider community of congregations headed by the *episkopos* and not with the single eucharistic congregation. The history of the early church shows the need for personal continuity in the exercise of responsibility for the church's proclamation, sacraments and discipline in the service of the unity of the church.

At the time of the Reformation, Luther taught that all Christian believers are priests through faith alone by baptism. The Lutheran Reformation also taught that the public ministry of word and sacrament was divinely instituted and is offered in the name of Christ. According

to Reformation practice, prayer and the laying on of hands are constitutive elements in ordination. In the view of the reformers, the ministry of word and sacrament is one office. Luther relates the one office fundamentally to the local congregation which assembles for divine worship. This is very close to the position of the Church Fathers for whom the eucharistic community was the primary focus of reflection on the church. According to both the Church Fathers and the Lutheran reformers, the universal church is present in the worship of the congregation. While word and sacraments are always given locally, they are at the same time marks of the one universal church.

The reformers recognised the value of an episcopal ministry whose task is to ordain and supervise, and made a strong effort to retain the traditional episcopal polity, provided that the officeholders permitted the gospel to be preached. Where this was not possible, they taught that pastors were legitimate presiders at ordination, and some thought that in emergency situations congregations themselves could ordain pastors by prayer and laying on of hands. While 'apostolic succession,' understood as a succession of episcopal consecrations, was not regarded as essential to episcopal ministry, Luther spoke openly about the need for succession of ministers in the church. The reformers recognised and affirmed the need for the ministry of *episkope* (superintendents). The Augsburg Confession calls for obedience to bishops by divine right, *de jure divino* (CA 28), but also gives congregations a mandate to refuse obedience to bishops who do not teach according to the gospel.

Mission and Apostolicity of the Church

The ministry of *episkope*, with its special responsibility to care for the unity and growth of the church, should be set in the context of the mission of the church as the whole people of God. The handing on (*traditio*) of this mission, in which the Holy Spirit makes Christ present as the Word of God, is the primary meaning of apostolic tradition. Apostolic tradition in the church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the church of the apostles: witness to the apostolic faith, proclamation of the Gospel and faithful interpretation of the scriptures, celebration of baptism and the eucharist, the exercise and transmission of ministerial responsibilities, communion in prayer, love, joy and suffering, service to the sick and needy, unity among the local churches and sharing the gifts which the Lord has given to each. Continuity in this tradition is apostolic succession.

Every member of the church participates in the communication of the gospel through word and life and so participates in the apostolic succession of the church. For Lutherans, apostolic teaching is expressed fundamentally in the scriptures as the 'norming norm' (*norma normans*) of faith, and in the historic ecumenical creeds and the

Lutheran confessional writings as ‘normed norm’ (*norma normata*). The Holy Spirit uses a variety of means to maintain the church in the apostolic tradition. As God’s gift in Christ through the Holy Spirit, apostolicity is a many-faceted reality expressed in the church’s teaching, mission and ministry. The Reformation aimed at the renewal of the church catholic in its continuity with the evangelical mission of the apostles.

Apostolic succession has sometimes been identified with particular forms of continuity, e.g. specific forms of continuity in episcopal ministry. While at the Reformation the Lutheran churches emphasised different forms of continuity, all Lutheran churches understood themselves to have preserved the one apostolic ministry instituted by God. Recent ecumenical discussions have moved beyond limited views of apostolic succession to a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the apostolic character of the whole church.

Ordained Ministry in Service to the Apostolic Mission of the Church

Within the apostolic continuity of the whole church there is a continuity or succession in the ordained ministry, serving the church’s continuity in the apostolic tradition of faith and life.

The ordained ministry of word and sacrament belongs to God’s gifts to the church. It is a permanent part of the church, essential for the church to fulfil its mission.

There is diversity within the Lutheran churches in the understanding of how the ministries of deacons, pastors and ministers of *episkope* are related to each other within the one ordained ministry of the church. Some Lutheran churches recognise a three-fold ministry, whereas others do not see this model as appropriate for them. The ordination of deacons is an open matter in the Lutheran communion globally. Generally the Lutheran tradition does not view the diaconal ministry as a stage on the way toward pastoral ordination but as a distinct and often lifelong service, whether understood as a lay or ordained ministry.

Today the great majority of Lutheran churches ordain both women and men. This reflects a renewed understanding of the biblical witness and expresses the conviction that the mission of the church requires the gifts of both men and women in the ordained ministry. On this view, limiting the ordained ministry to men obscures the nature of the church as a sign of our reconciliation and unity in Christ through baptism across the divides of ethnicity, social status and gender (cf. Galatians 3.27-28). The LWF is committed to the ordination of women. In many member churches of the LWF today, and in the majority of the larger Lutheran churches, women are not only ordained as pastors but are also elected to the episcopal ministry. This is consistent with the Lutheran emphasis on the one office of ordained ministry.

The Exercise of Episcopal Ministry

The communion of local churches requires supervision for the sake of the faithfulness of the church. This episcopal ministry is a regional ministry that oversees several parishes or congregations. It serves the purpose of caring for the life of the whole church. Its faithful exercise in the light of the gospel is of fundamental importance to the church's life. Lutheran churches generally have a regional ministry of *episkope* within the one office of word and sacrament, even though this ministry is structured in different ways and is exercised by persons with different titles. Episcopal ministry is understood by Lutherans to be a distinct form of the one pastoral office, and not a separate office. Episcopal ministry is pastoral ministry mandated to be exercised at a regional, supra-congregational level.

Since episcopal ministry carries responsibility for larger geographic areas of the church, it is given specific tasks which are not shared by pastors at the local level. These include leadership to the church in its mission, an accountable voice in the public sphere, pastoral care of the congregations in their region, and supervision of the teaching and ministry of the ordained. Episcopal ministers have a particular responsibility for doctrine, to ensure that teaching is faithful to the gospel. They are given the authority and responsibility to ordain. Ordination is understood to be into the public ministry of the one church, not simply into the ordained ministry of a particular national church or denomination. The episcopal minister, as the presiding minister at an ordination, acts on behalf of the whole people of God, thereby serving and representing the unity of the church's ordained ministry. The particular responsibility of episcopal ministry is to care for the apostolic faithfulness and unity of the church. This unity consists in the participation by all the baptised in the communion of love between the Father and the Son in the unity of the Spirit, and is a divine gift.

Episcopal ministry is exercised personally, collegially and communally within the broader oversight exercised by the whole community. It is exercised within the communion of *charisms* of all the baptised and through synodical and collegial structures which include the participation of both lay and ordained persons. Mutual accountability binds together ordained ministers and other baptised believers.

Episcopal Ministry and Succession

The continuity of the episcopal ministry is important for the apostolic mission of the church. To serve the continuity of the church's apostolic mission is the primary purpose and meaning of 'episcopal succession'. Continuity in episcopal ministry bears witness to the church's faithfulness to its apostolic mission, but is not a guarantee of it.

Continuity with Christ and the apostles in the church's mission through time and space is the fundamental concern in the 'apostolic succession' of the church. This notion also commonly designates continuity in the ordained ministry through the successive participation in installations (consecrations) of ministers of *episkope* by other such ministers. Apostolic succession is not limited to episcopal succession, which cannot be historically proved to be an unbroken chain back to Christ and the apostles. Nevertheless, episcopal succession bears witness to the unity, catholicity and apostolicity of the church in history.

Absence of episcopal succession does not necessarily mean a loss of continuity in apostolic faith. The possibility of recognising the apostolicity of churches which have not preserved the sign of episcopal succession is of great ecumenical significance. At the same time, a church which has not preserved the sign of episcopal succession is free to enter a relationship of mutual participation in episcopal installations (consecrations) with a church which has retained it, and thereby to adopt it for itself, without denying its past apostolic continuity. The readiness of Lutheran churches to recognise the value of the sign of apostolicity in the historic succession of episcopal ministers and to adopt this sign, without requiring its necessity, is a contribution to the ecumenical movement.

Installation (consecration) of episcopal ministers in the Lutheran tradition includes laying on of hands with prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Normally at least three other episcopal ministers participate in this action. In several Lutheran churches pastors and also lay persons may in addition participate in the laying on of hands. The participation of episcopal ministers from non-Lutheran churches is a sign of the shared unity and apostolicity of the universal church. In the installation (consecration) of episcopal ministers the sign of apostolic succession is expressed by the participation of episcopal ministers (Lutheran or others) who have themselves received this sign.

The Reformation was fundamentally concerned with the apostolicity of the church in faithfulness to the gospel of God's grace in Jesus Christ, upheld by the proclamation of the word and by the sacraments, received in faith. The churches of the Lutheran Communion maintain and continue to develop forms of episcopal ministry which serve the divine mission.

International Anglican Liturgical Consultation

The liturgy and theology of ordination has been the subject of the last three sessions of the IALC. A preliminary conference was held in Jarvenpaa, Finland in 1997 on this theme. Further work was done at the meeting in Kottayam, India in 1999. This preparatory work came to

fruition in the full consultation held in Berkeley, California in August, 2001.

Already at Jarvenpaa the ecumenical implications of this work were recognised. In the group reports there is a section entitled 'Ecumenical Questions for the Future of the Church'.⁷⁸ In this section it is recognised that the variety of bilateral agreements and the reality of full communion with some churches and united churches in some provinces form part of the present ecumenical context in which Anglicans reflect on the meaning of ordination. The issues of parallel jurisdictions, 'impaired communion,' stages of communion, the relation of *episcopate* to the episcopate, the relationship of each of the three-fold orders to one another, direct ordination, and the renewal of the diaconate are some of the issues identified in this section requiring ongoing theological reflection.

It is noted that there has been significant ecumenical convergence on a variety of issues around ordination in both multilateral and bilateral agreements. These include (1) Baptism as the foundation in which a theology of the ministry of the whole people of God is rooted. (2) Apostolic faith/tradition as fundamental to the nature of the church with the recognition that a continuity of apostolic faith, worship and mission has been preserved in churches which have not retained the form of the historic episcopate. The historic episcopate is a witness to but not a guarantee of a church's succession in apostolic faith/tradition. (3) Different forms of ministry are based on different gifts (*charismata*) given by God for the mission of the church. (4) 'In order to fulfil its mission, the Church needs persons who are publicly and continually responsible for pointing to its fundamental dependence on Jesus Christ, and thereby provide, within a multiplicity of gifts, a focus of its unity. The ministry of such persons, who since very early times have been ordained, is constitutive for the life and witness of the Church' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 8). (5) Ordination is always presided over by persons in whom the church recognises the authority to transmit the ministerial commission by imposition of hands and prayer. (6) Ordination is accepted in most denominations to be for life. (7) Recognition of the true ecclesial status of other Communion precedes the mutual recognition of ministries.

In view of the foregoing, the report encourages the following methodological approach: 'Proposals for church unity will best begin with the mutual recognition of partners' sacramental baptism as set forth and practised in official liturgies. Ecumenical dialogue can then move to questions concerning recognition of the partners as churches, i.e., ecclesial bodies comprised of members sharing a common baptism. Thirdly, the dialogue can then move on from ecclesial recognition

towards mutual recognition of ordained ministries, and, when that is in view, to their consequent interchangeability.⁷⁹

A first draft of a document on the theology of ordination was produced at Kottayam. This was revised at Berkeley. The Berkeley document is entitled 'The Ordered Nature of the Church'. The calling of the people of God is placed in the context of the work of the triune God who called the whole of creation into being in love, who in Christ participates in the world's life so that we may share in the triune life of love and joy, and through the Holy Spirit baptises us into the life and ministry of Christ and forms us into the *laos*, the people of God, who as signs and agents of God's reign participate in God's mission of reconciling humanity and all creation to God. The foundation of the life and ministry of the church is, therefore, baptism. God bestows upon the church a variety of gifts to build up the body of Christ and to participate in God's mission in the world. In order that the whole people of God may fulfil their calling to be a holy priesthood, some are called to specific ministry by ordination. Although the New Testament refers to a number of different ministries, by the second century the ordering of bishops, presbyters, and deacons emerged within the wider context of the ministry of the whole church. Understanding baptism as the foundation of the life and ministry of the church (i.e., a baptismal ecclesiology) leads us to understand ordained ministers as integral members of the body of Christ called by God and discerned by the body to be signs and animators of Christ's self-giving life and ministry to which all the baptised are called. The threefold ordering of ministry will be embodied in different patterns of leadership in different cultures.

The ministry of oversight (*episcopate*) found its focus historically in the office of the bishop, who is the sign of unity and of continuity with the apostolic tradition of faith and life. The document affirms the role of the bishop as summed up in the *Virginia Report*: 'The calling of a bishop is to represent Christ and his Church, particularly as apostle, chief priest, teacher and pastor of a diocese; to guard the faith, unity and discipline of the whole Church; to proclaim the word of God; to act in Christ's name for the reconciliation of the world and the building up of the Church; and to ordain others to continue Christ's ministry' (3.17).

The bishop's role has been shaped by the historical, cultural, and social contexts in which the episcopal office has developed. In the pre-Nicene period, the bishop was teacher and pastor and the bond of communion both within the local church and between the various local and regional churches. Bishops also exercised a ministry of prophetic witness. In the post-Constantinian period the bishop became part of the hierarchical administrative structure of the empire on the model of the imperial civil service. In the feudal period in the West the bishop was both spiritual and temporal lord. The imperial and feudal models continued to exist in

the Church of England in the post-Reformation and colonial periods, but became modified by an increased sense of the role played by the bishop in leading the mission of the church and by a heightened emphasis on the apostolic nature of the episcopate. In the Anglican Communion today, a renewed model of episcopal leadership is emerging that reflects the servant ministry of Jesus and the baptismal calling of the whole people of God. In this style of episcopal leadership, the ministries of all the baptised are nurtured in ways which are personal, collegial, and communal (cf. *BEM*, 'Ministry', 26; *Virginia Report* 3.22).

The calling of presbyters is 'to share with the bishops in the overseeing of the church' (*Virginia Report* 3.18). The presbyter's distinctive ministry is expressed particularly in proclaiming the word and presiding at baptism and eucharist. 'Presbyters serve as pastoral ministers of Word and sacraments in a local eucharistic community. They are preachers and teachers of the faith, exercise pastoral care, and bear responsibility for the discipline of the congregation ...' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 30).

The New Testament uses the term *presbyteros* in reference to the 'elders' of Christian communities, and the language of priesthood to speak of Christ (Hebrews 4.14) and of the whole community of the baptised (1 Peter 2.9; Revelation 1.6). When applied to Christ, priestly language refers to the sacrificial nature of his death and to his intercession before God on behalf of all creation (Romans 8.34). When applied to all the baptised, priestly language refers to the 'living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God' (Romans 12.1) which they offer. As the ordained ministry developed, language of priesthood became increasingly applied first to the office of bishop and then derivatively to the presbyterate. At the time of the Reformation, the Anglican ordinal retained the term priest, interpreting this office as one in which the minister unites the proclamation of the word, the administration of the sacraments, and the pastoral care of the community.

In the various languages used in the Anglican Communion today, different terms are used for the office, with different connotations arising from historical, cultural, and linguistic factors. Provinces that use the term priest (or a translation) may be guided by the interpretation of the term in *BEM*: 'Ordained ministers are related, as are all Christians, both to the priesthood of Christ, and to the priesthood of the Church. But they may appropriately be called priests because they fulfil a particular priestly service by strengthening and building up the royal and prophetic priesthood of the faithful through word and sacraments, through their prayers of intercession, and through their pastoral guidance of the community' (*Ministry*, 17). Whichever term is used, ordination rites should make use of a wide range of imagery in order to bring out the multi-faceted meaning of the office. Consistent

with a baptismal ecclesiology, the ordination rite should affirm the priesthood of the baptised community and the sacramental, pastoral and teaching relationship of the presbyter to the entire community.

The diversity of understanding and practice in the Anglican Communion today with regard to the diaconate is acknowledged. While during the Middle Ages the diaconate became principally a transitional order and continued to be in the Church of England in the post-Reformation period, in some places within the Anglican Communion today the diaconate is being renewed as a distinct office directed towards the servant mission of the church in the world. The liturgical role of the deacon expresses this interface between the world and the baptismal community. Although it is sometimes asserted that the diaconate is the basis for the servant character of all three orders, it is baptism which is the basis for the servant character of all the church's ministries. The distinctive nature of the diaconate is not servant ministry in itself, but the calling of the deacon to embody and activate the Christ-like service of the whole people of God in the world. Both the missionary, world-directed aspect and the liturgical aspect of the diaconal ministry ought to find expression in the ordination rite for deacons.

Some in the Anglican Communion are calling for direct ordination to the presbyterate, in order to affirm the distinctive ministry of the diaconate. The possibility of direct ordination to the episcopate is also being raised in a few places. 'There is historical precedent for both sequential and direct ordination. In the pre-Nicene church, direct ordination was commonly practised, and sequential ordination did not become universal until the eleventh century.' (p.9) Anglicans have continued the inherited medieval pattern of sequential ordination. Provinces should be free to consider the possibility of direct ordination to the presbyterate in the case of those who are called to be presbyters and not deacons, rather than treating the diaconate as a transitional order. Where this is considered, it will be important to make provision for the testing and formation now provided during the diaconal period.

The act of ordination is the liturgical expression of the church's appointment of its ministers. *BEM* expresses the meaning of ordination in a way which is consistent with an Anglican understanding of ordination: 'Ordination denotes an action by God and the community The act of ordination by the laying on of hands of those appointed to do so is at one and the same time invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*); sacramental sign; acknowledgement of gifts and commitment. Ordination is an invocation to God that the new minister be given the power of the Holy Spirit in the new relation which is established between this minister and the local Christian community and, by intention, the Church universal... .' (*Ministry*, 41-44).

This understanding of ordination reflects a baptismal ecclesiology. It is the community as a whole, with the bishop presiding, which recognises the divine call and the gifts of ministry of those who are to be ordained. It is the community as a whole which through prayer with the laying on of hands by the bishop as the focus of the church's unity seeks from God the necessary increase of those gifts and graces for the effective exercise of the ministry. It is the community as a whole which authorises and sends forth the ordained in God's name to lead the baptised in Christ's mission and ministry. All of these dimensions of ordination ought to find expression in the rite.

The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue - 2006

V Episcopate, Episcopos, and Primacy

Introduction

These statements on ministry presuppose the Trinitarian and Christological agreements in the earlier sections. To be church is to participate in the Triune life of God. In the Anglican and Orthodox vision the primary way of ecclesial being is the local church.

Episcopate and Episcopos: Historical developments to the Fourth Century

In the New Testament the local churches never appear without *episcopate*, or oversight, but this took various forms. The Ignatian epistles provide the first unequivocal evidence of the threefold ministries of bishop, presbyter and deacon, although it cannot be assumed that this structure was yet universal. The picture is one of gradual development into a pattern of one bishop in each local church.

Anglicans and Orthodox are agreed that the Spirit had a guiding role in this development, but how this should be interpreted and how ecclesiology should draw on the past as a criterion for the present and future is an important theological issue. Historically and theologically Orthodox and Anglicans share a commitment to the scriptures and ecumenical councils as decisive elements in their ecclesiology, but neither claim that the New Testament texts provide a blueprint for subsequent church order.

The development of *episcopate* by the post-apostolic church was prompted by the need to find a way of preserving the apostolic witness to Christ. In the early centuries there was the closest possible link between local churches and *episcopate*. The local church understood itself as eschatological in character, gathered around Christ in the Spirit, with the eucharist as a crucial moment in its ecclesial life. 'Eucharist' should be understood to include pastoral oversight and proclamation of the gospel. When the local church celebrated the eucharist the

eschatological community was present in its fullness. It is most likely that this eschatological understanding of the local church, rather than a linear-historical origin, gave rise to the one bishop in Ignatius. *Episcope* and synods did not constitute an ecclesiastical structure over and above the local communities. *Episcope* was rather a ministry which enabled the local church to remain a concrete community.

Episcope and *Episcopos* from the Fourth Century

A significant change took place in the fourth century owing to the changed relationship between church and state. As dioceses grew in size, presbyters, rather than the bishop, became the normal eucharistic ministers. The bishop's eucharistic role was overshadowed by administrative and teaching functions. While the bishop remained the minister of ordination, this came to be seen as a function of the power (*potestas*) delegated to him through the apostolic succession, thus weakening the link between ordination and the local community. Presbyteral collegiality was also weakened as presbyters became individual parish priests. Bishops became a supra-local 'college' apart from the local eucharistic communities. There was thus a fading of the earlier local, eschatological, and eucharistic self-understanding of the church.

Ecclesiological Issues of *Episcope* arising from the Historical Analysis

Anglican ecclesiology has accepted *episcope*, exercised personally by a bishop, not only as a development which serves the needs of the church, but also as a mark of catholicity and unity within the apostolic church, together with the holy scriptures, the creeds and the sacraments, as witnessed by the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The Orthodox understand the bishop in an eschatological and iconic sense as representing Christ. The bishop is a constitutive element of the church around whom the local church gathers.

Apostolic succession is best regarded as a succession of communities represented by their bishops, rather than a succession of individuals with power and authority to confer grace apart from their communities. Local churches participated in wider councils through their bishop who represented them. In this way the unity of the local churches and the catholicity of the faith was maintained and preserved. Such an ecclesiology is central to the way in which both Orthodox and Anglicans understand themselves as communions of local churches.

The eschatological note in apostolic and sub-apostolic ecclesiology challenges our churches today and their temptation to align themselves with worldly power structures. If the eschatological presence of Christ in the Eucharist is indeed the centre of local church life, then eschatological judgement, as well as grace, must challenge the community and its *episcope* and their role in society.

Conciliarity and Primacy

Anglicans and Orthodox share a doctrine and practice of primacy, but this implies neither universality of jurisdiction nor the centralisation of authority, but a ministry of service and support to self-governing national or regional churches. Anglicans and Orthodox are agreed that primacy and conciliarity are inseparable. The theological argument for primacy must begin with the local church and move on to regional and global leadership. Anglicans and Orthodox agree that bishops do not form an apostolic college apart from and above the local churches. Bishops represent their local churches in wider synods. Such an understanding precludes any form of centralised universal episcopal jurisdiction standing apart from the local churches. The claim to universal primacy on the part of the Church of Rome must be understood within this perspective.

Anglicans and orthodox agree that synodality is fundamental to the being of the church. Anglican ecclesiology provides for this by giving the laity an important place in Anglican synodical structures. The Orthodox regard the bishop in synod as representing his whole community. Does this constitute a matter of legitimate diversity between our churches? Reception is another important complement to primacy. Decisions of councils and primates need to be referred back to the local churches for their acceptance. Such decisions must be received by the community in order to become authoritative. This reinforces the truth that bishops, including primates, are not independent of their local churches.

Conclusion

The eschatological, Christological, and local character of ecclesiology challenges both our churches as they face issues of unity and diversity and seek to find ways in which church structures might be re-shaped to meet contemporary needs. Because to be church is to share in the life of the Trinity, a Trinitarian perspective is of the utmost importance in developing appropriate models and structures of episcopacy and primacy.

VI Priesthood, Christ, and the Church

This section reflects on the priestly understanding of eucharistic presidency, whether of bishops or presbyters. This priesthood is rightly understood within the context both of the priesthood of Christ and of the priesthood of the church, and ultimately within the *koinonia* of the Trinity.

The Priesthood of Christ

There is one priesthood in the church, the priesthood of Christ. From the beginning Christian priesthood has been understood as a living witness to the presence of Christ and the Spirit in the church. If we are

to understand the role of priesthood within the Christian community we must emphasise its christological and pneumatological foundations. Christian priesthood is neither a function nor a status, but a ministry belonging to the entire ecclesial body.

In the New Testament, all models and titles related to ministry and priesthood are referred first to Christ himself. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus Christ is represented as the great High Priest who offered once and for all the sacrifice of himself, breaking down the barrier of sin and restoring us to full communion with God. As priest, Christ is our mediator with God. Christ's priesthood is expressed in his incarnate life and ministry, in his atoning self-offering, and in his eschatological presentation of a redeemed creation to the Father. In the life of the church, the eucharist is the focus of the church's grateful offering of herself in union with Christ, and the eschatological moment when she is drawn in worship into the life of God the Trinity.

Christian priesthood is directly related to Christ's priesthood by being ontologically incorporated into Christ's ministry and identified with it. Christian priesthood is the extension of Christ's priestly office in every period of the church's life.

Trinity and Priesthood

Priesthood is a Trinitarian reality. Christ's priestly work is not only to present the redeemed world to the Father, but to open up creation fully to the Father's will and action. This is realised through the work of the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation.

Priesthood and the Church

The church exists as communion (*koinonia*) with Christ in the Spirit. The whole church is taken into the movement of Christ's self-offering and his eternal praise of the Father. In baptism we enter into this movement and are configured to the priesthood of Christ within the ecclesial community as 'a royal priesthood'. The life of the church can be called 'eucharistic' in the fullest sense as it participates in the self-offering of the Son to the Father in the Spirit. Christians seek to be true to their sacrificial and priestly calling by becoming ministers of reconciliation and service in the world.

Ordained Priesthood

There are various functions and images associated with the ministries of bishops and presbyters. As church life developed, the term priest, used in the New Testament of Christ and the church, was applied first to bishops, and subsequently to presbyters.

Ordination is an ecclesial act. It also implies a relationship with a specific community. The canonical tradition of the church prohibits

absolute ordinations. Ordination is not performed by the bishop (or bishops) alone, but by the bishop together with the clergy and the congregation. The assent proclaimed by the entire community in Anglican and Orthodox ordination rites is a responsible expression of ecclesial approval. The bishop is the person who has the sacramental authority to ordain within the Christian community and together with it. The bishop is the person charismatically appointed to safeguard the unity of the church, who connects past, present, and future by what we call apostolic succession. The participation of at least three bishops in the ordination of a bishop is of fundamental ecclesiological significance. Every bishop who takes part in the ordination of a new bishop does so as the representative of his entire community.

The fact that every ordination takes place within the context of the eucharistic assembly affirms that priesthood exists for the community. The eucharist is the action of a community; it is celebrated by priest and people together. Ultimately the celebrant of the eucharist is Christ himself, acting through the presiding bishop or presbyter and the community to build up the body of Christ. Priesthood is intrinsically related to the eucharistic offering. The priestly president of the eucharistic assembly 'has a twofold ministry: as an icon of Christ, acting in the name of Christ towards the community and also as a representative of the community expressing the priesthood of the faithful' (*Dublin Agreed Statement*, 56).

Through the *epiclesis* and the coming of the Holy Spirit in ordination, the newly-ordained participate in Christ's own priesthood. The priestly ministry is a charismatic gift, enabling those who receive it to serve and build up the body of the church. We are not aware that the theory of an indelible mark conferred by ordination can be found in patristic teaching. On the contrary, the canonical data leave no doubt that, once the church decided to depose a bishop or presbyter, they returned to the rank of layman. Those deposed or excommunicated were in no way considered to retain their priesthood. The fact that the ministerial rehabilitation and restoration of such persons did not, according to the canons, involve re-ordination, does not imply any recognition that they were bishops or priests during the period of such punishment. It meant only that the church recognised what had been sacramentally performed. The grace of ecclesiastical ministry was restored upon his assignment to an ecclesial community with no other sacramental sign or rite. The failings of ordained persons do not invalidate their sacramental ministries.

The distinction between a priest and a lay person is not one of legal status but of distribution of the gifts of the Spirit. In debates about the nature of ordained priesthood the distinction has often been drawn between 'ontological' and 'functional' definitions, where 'ontological'

has meant a quality given to the individual priestly soul. It is more promising to consider priesthood on the basis of an ontology of relation. Priesthood should be considered as a relational reality, seen in its eucharistic context and in its connection with ecclesial communion.

VII Women and Men, Ministries and the Church

Introduction

Christian ministry is rooted in the ministry of Jesus Christ. The pastoral, prophetic and priestly ministry of the church reflects and continues the saving work of Christ. The whole ministry of the church, ordained and lay, is situated within the context of baptism and the eucharist. If the church is Christ extended into history and reflecting his eschatological glory, equally Christian ministry is Christ's ministry realised in every historic period of the life of the church.

Agreement between Orthodox and Anglicans on the ministry of women in the presbyterate and episcopate has not been achieved, but we believe that this issue should be considered in the wider context of the ministries of women and men within the laity and the diaconate. It may be possible for us to agree on the wider ministry of lay women and the ministry of women in the diaconate.

Lay Ministries

The church's ministry is wider than priestly ministry. All Christian ministries presuppose the grace of the sacraments of Christian initiation. They do not derive from ordained ministries. Anglicans and Orthodox together acknowledge the many gifts of the Spirit given to lay men and women for building up the body of Christ. e.g. various liturgical, evangelistic, educational, and monastic ministries, and ministries of spiritual direction.

The Diaconate

Anglicans and Orthodox maintain the diaconate as a distinctive ministry in its own right, but in both churches the great majority of those ordained to the diaconate are subsequently ordained as presbyters. The canonical tradition of sequential ordination, the *cursus honorum*, goes back to the fourth century. There is, however, some criticism among both Anglican and Orthodox theologians of the practice of conferring a lower order as the prerequisite for ordination to a higher. Our two traditions would do well to recognise the diaconate as a distinctive order, embodying the ministry of service (*diakonia*) given to the whole body of Christ.

There have been women deacons or deaconesses in both the Anglican and Orthodox traditions, though with very different histories. The diaconate of women was known in some New Testament communities,

and is attested in the East from the third century, and in the West from the fifth. The Orthodox Church never formally abolished the order of deaconesses, but their demise in the Byzantine tradition dates from the eleventh century. Recently there have been calls for the restoration of the diaconate for women in the Orthodox tradition at both the Inter-Orthodox Consultation at Rhodes in 1988 and the conference of Orthodox women at Damascus in 1996. This call for the restoration of the order of women deacons was recognised by the Ecumenical Patriarch at a meeting in Istanbul in 1997.

The Anglican churches restored the order of deaconess in the mid-nineteenth century. Towards the end of the twentieth century women began to be ordained to the diaconate alongside men. The Anglican history of women's ordination to the presbyterate and the episcopate must be seen against this background. Anglican and Orthodox members of our dialogue do not disagree with regard to the ordination of women as deacons or deaconesses.

Women, Men and the Ordained Priesthood

Anglicans and Orthodox together acknowledge the ministries of women and men among the laity and as deaconesses and deacons, but diverge from one another in both theology and practice regarding the place of women in the priestly ministries of bishop and presbyter, which involve eucharistic presidency. Each tradition believes that its respective decisions with respect to the ordination of women to the presbyterate and the episcopate have been made in fidelity to Scripture and Tradition, and in response to the leading of the Holy Spirit. Anglicans and Orthodox are convinced that the Spirit is calling us to search for the truth with openness and a readiness to question our own certainty. Our present aim is to understand each other's theological position on the place of women and men in the presbyterate and episcopate, to ask whether our differences point to a deeper theological division, and whether our differences in theology and practice are sufficiently serious to divide us as churches.

We approach the question of the ordination of women as presbyters and bishops within the context of lay and diaconal ministries and in the broader theological context of the earlier sections of this agreed statement on trinitarian ecclesiology, christology and pneumatology, theological anthropology, and the relationship of the Gospel to culture.

We wish to affirm that while canonical and pastoral distinctions can be made between the ordination of women to the presbyterate and their ordination to the episcopate, the theological arguments for and against the inclusion of women in the presbyterate and episcopate are identical. Both ministries are priestly ministries of eucharistic presidency, and are configured in the same way to the priesthood of Christ.

The argument of those in favour of the ordination of both women and men to the presbyterate and episcopate begins with the affirmation that the priest is a guarantor of the Church's identity in Christ, in whom there is neither Greek nor Jew, slave nor free, male nor female. Christ's priesthood, in which baptised women and men, as well as presbyters and bishops, participate, is integral to his humanity, which is male. Yet we have agreed that while Christ is the perfect male person, his saving work extends equally to male and female. To use the maleness of the incarnate *Logos* as an argument against the ordination of women to the priesthood would run counter to the ways in which the Bible and the Fathers speak of the Incarnation. Although Christ was born as a particular man at a particular time, Scripture and Tradition are clear that he stands for all and assumes the fate of all, so that all may be saved. All patristic teaching on this question may be summed up in the phrase of Gregory Nazianzus: 'For that which he has not assumed he has not healed; but that which is united to his Godhead is also saved' (*Epistle* 101. PG 37.181D). What is significant in Christ's humanity, and what is symbolised by the humanity of the ordained priest, is the human condition which the Son assumes in order to save.

Christ's risen body is already eschatologically transformed, transfigured, and glorified, and by his resurrection our humanity is transformed and restored to wholeness. Some of the Fathers, in particular St Gregory of Nyssa and St Maximus the Confessor affirm that, in the risen life in Christ, the distinction between male and female is radically transformed. This new transformed humanity is associated with baptism and the eucharist because there the Spirit is at work opening humanity to the future and to a new quality of human relationship. In the eucharist the baptised people of God are renewed in their identity as the eschatological community. The eucharist is both the memorial (*anamnesis*) of the cross and resurrection and the anticipation of the future reign of God. In the light of the eschatological transformation of gender, many Anglicans hold that there are compelling theological grounds for ordaining women as well as men to the priestly and presidential ministries of presbyter and bishop, or at the very least that there are no compelling reasons against doing so.

While the Orthodox subscribe fully to the biblical and patristic teaching that the salvation Christ offers to humanity through the incarnation is extended equally to male and female, they distinguish this from the ministerial, and especially the eucharistic service of the church. They see no reason to deviate from the consistent tradition of the church, which has reserved the ministry of eucharistic presidency to men. Their objection to the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate is based on the following grounds:

- i. The eucharistic president acts *in persona Christi*. Although the Christ in whose person the eucharistic president acts is the eschatological Christ, we are not allowed to conclude from this, without deeper examination, that maleness is not his specific human nature, and thus part of his identity. Paul's affirmation that 'in Christ there is neither male nor female' is in the context of baptism, not ordination. and while Maximus the Confessor speaks of the overcoming of the division and conflict between the sexes he does not affirm the ultimate elimination of their difference. The Orthodox feel that these matters ought to have been taken into deeper consideration before any decision to ordain women was taken and acted upon, particularly in the context of ecumenical dialogue.
- ii. Sociological considerations are not in themselves sufficient to justify innovations pertaining to the ministry of the church, particularly in its eucharistic form. Theological and ecclesiological considerations are more decisive. The Orthodox do not feel that they are doing injustice to women by not ordaining them, since ordination does not involve the exercise of some kind of power (*potestas*), but is a specific service to the community. The lay ministries of women are in no way inferior to that of the ordained ministry.
- iii. Given the risk of schism or the perpetuation of division, the Orthodox feel that the question of the ordination of women requires more profound theological examination in ecumenical dialogue.

Questions to Anglicans, addressing possible inconsistencies or the need for further theological reflection, identified within the IASCER Paper on Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues:

1. 'The primary manifestation of apostolic succession is to be found in the apostolic tradition of the Church as a whole. The succession is an expression of the permanence and, therefore, of the continuity of Christ's own mission in which the Church participates' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 35). What is the place of the apostolic succession of the episcopal office within the apostolic succession of the church as a whole?
2. What is the relationship between the three orders of ministry? Lutherans understand the ordained ministry as one order of word and sacrament. Pastors and episcopal ministers exercise different functions within this one order of ministry. Some Lutherans speak of diaconal ministers as lay ministers; others speak of the diaconate as an ordained ministry. Anglicans, on the other hand, speak of three orders of ministry within a single ordained ministry (cf. Ignatius of Antioch, Hippolytus of Rome).

3. What is the relationship between the priesthood of bishops and presbyters, and the royal priesthood of the baptised? What does ARCIC mean by saying that the priesthood of eucharistic presidents 'belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit'?
4. Do Anglicans understand the Lutheran use of the language of 'installation' of bishops as having the same meaning as the Anglican understandings of 'ordination' and 'consecration'?
5. How could Anglicans encourage those Lutheran churches which are not part of the present regional agreements (*Porvoo*, *CCM*, *Waterloo*) to bring their episcopal ministries within the historic episcopal succession, where necessary, as a sign of apostolic continuity, for the sake of the restoration of visible unity?
6. What is the significance of the laying on of hands in episcopal ordinations by at least three bishops in accordance with Canon 4 of the Council of Nicaea? Should this be a normative requirement in agreements of full communion with other churches?
7. Are the provisions in the Lutheran - Anglican agreed statements sufficient to allow Anglican provinces to live with the temporary anomaly of accepting Lutheran ministries before the sign of historic succession has been fully received?
8. What direction ought the renewal of the diaconate to take? How ought the question of ordained and non-ordained diaconal ministries to be resolved? If the diaconate is understood as a distinctive vocation, what are the arguments for and against direct ordination to the priesthood?
9. In what ways is the apparent challenge to the concept of indelibility of orders in the Cyprus Agreed Statement of the Anglican - Orthodox Dialogue (VI.22) consistent with other Anglican ecumenical agreements on the theology of holy orders, particularly the teaching of ARCIC?
10. To what extent can the differences between Anglicans and Orthodox on the ordination of women be contained within Christian communion (*koinonia*)?
11. What further theological considerations and other questions (for example, culture) need to be taken into account to clarify or resolve the differences between Anglicans and Orthodox on the question of the ordination of women?
12. What theological work around human sexuality and its relationship to ordained ministry is needed in future ecumenical dialogues?

6. Reception

The final section of *Called to Be One* from the bishops at the 1998 Lambeth Conference addressed 'Response and Reception'. They recorded the mixed experiences across the Anglican Communion of familiarity with ecumenical advances, and of the ability to draw on these in the local life of churches. Even *BEM*, the most widely circulated of ecumenical texts, was little known in some places, and bishops admitted they often had scant awareness either of previous Lambeth Conference reports and resolutions on the unity of the Church or of major Anglican bilateral achievements, such as the work of ARCIC:

When the Lambeth Conference has articulated the mind of the Provinces that an agreed statement is consonant with the faith of Anglicans, these agreements need to be received into the life of the church. Reception into the life of the church would assist Anglican cohesiveness and help us to grow in communion with our ecumenical partners. For example, the incorporation of the convergences on the eucharist in *BEM* into liturgical revision would assist the Provinces and give them assurance that with increasing liturgical inculturation they still retain the classical elements of the Christian eucharist. *BEM* recommends that the churches test their liturgies in the light of ecumenical eucharistic agreement. This would be an excellent example of reception of ecumenical agreement into the life of the Church.

Thus, weaknesses in reception detrimentally affect the life of the Communion, not only in our relations with other churches at every level, but in relations between Anglicans and in the vital yet challenging task of appropriate inculturation of ministry and mission, including in liturgy (see the fourth point of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral). Therefore monitoring and encouraging the process of response, decision and reception were listed as a particular task within IASCER's mandate. In addressing this, improving communication, not only about particular agreements, but also in understanding of ecumenical method and process, has been a priority for IASCER (as noted in Chapter 2), though more still needs to be done.

The growth of the internet and its increasing availability during the lifetime of IASCER have greatly assisted the dissemination of ecumenical information. All IASCER's resolutions and texts are to be found on the Anglican Communion's website, as are the communiqués of dialogues, and a wealth of other ecumenical material. Key documents may be sent out in verbatim or summary form through the Anglican Communion News Service. Documents published by, or in conjunction with the Anglican Communion

Office, are sent to all Primates and Moderators, and to the Ecumenical Officer in each Province. Details are published on the website, and, increasingly, texts are available for download. Ideally, there would be far wider mailings, for example to theological colleges, but this remains beyond the Office's resources, and sales of printed versions are generally necessary to recoup publishing costs. Attention is also drawn to particular ecumenical issues in correspondence between the Anglican Communion Office and member churches, sometimes at IASCER's instigation.

However, reception requires more than mere awareness of or even familiarity with ecumenical documents and developments. Reports and proposals produced by dialogues are generally offered by the working group or commission responsible to the parent bodies for their formal response. They are not of themselves authoritative until such endorsement is given. The polity of some partners provides for a fairly straightforward process by which such agreement (or otherwise) can be given – but in contrast, as indicated in the discussions on communion in Chapter 3, the juridical autonomy of Anglican Provinces, and the lack of legal authority of the Instruments of Communion, means that formal response or reception has become a slow and complex matter (for example, see the comments and resolutions in Chapter 8, in relation to the reception of documents produced in dialogues with the Roman Catholic Church).

This can be disappointing and even confusing to our partners. Careful explanation is required on our part to clarify why it is that resolutions from either a Lambeth Conference or the ACC that welcome some ecumenical development do not technically constitute an 'official' Anglican position. IASCER has had to conclude that it is unclear whether it is possible to produce such a position other than through individual affirmations of each and every member church. The possibility of any comprehensive 'agreement with the Anglican Communion' as a whole, not only on the contents of a statement, but also in terms of entering into a new relationship, remains one for further work by IASCUFO, while recognising that progress on an Anglican Covenant may also be pertinent.

Beneath the structural complexities of response and reception lie practical issues that should be noted. There is a great disparity in the level of resources that Provinces are able to devote to ecumenical affairs. Some have departments with full time staff. For others, ecumenism is just one part of a far wider portfolio held by an individual whose most pressing commitments may lie elsewhere. Broader ecumenical questions may not be deemed pressing on congested agendas which have more urgent matters before them. Even where there is agreement in principle, formal progress can be slow.

For example, IASCER was aware of only a very limited response to Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolution IV.8 inviting endorsement by Christmas 2000 of WCC proposals for a common date for Easter; while the 1988 recommendation, in Resolution 6, that in future liturgical revisions the Nicene creed be printed without the *filioque* clause, has still not fully been implemented across the Communion.

Furthermore, the internal structures for debate and formal agreement also differ greatly between Provinces, as does the time required to take such steps. For the most significant agreements, the complete process of ratification, such as may be required for a formal agreement with another ecclesial body, may take a number of years to complete.

All this has been a matter of continuing concern for IASCER, which, in 2003 requested advice and clarification from the JSC on how statements from bilateral commissions might be received in the Anglican Communion. The JSC in response requested further reflection from IASCER. These reflections are carried in the wide-ranging paper 'Reception in the Anglican Communion: Responding Responsibly to Ecumenical and Inter-Anglican Developments' that is carried below, and is offered to ACC-14 for consideration, and to IASCUFO. The accompanying Resolution 2.08 also highlights IASCER's concerns that the format of the 2008 Lambeth Conference resulted in limited ability to respond to recent ecumenical developments (this is discussed further in Chapter 13).

Of course, as reflected in the IASCER paper, reception goes far beyond questions of decision-making and authority within the Anglican Communion. Fundamentally, this addresses our ability to discern the leading of God in the proposals and possibilities that come before us. This has been a task for IASCER and for all those engaged in the ecumenical activities which we have been asked to consider, as well as being a responsibility for Provinces and the Instruments of Communion in weighing what is offered to them as a result of our engagement with Christians of other traditions.

In his Foreword, IASCER Chairman Archbishop Drexel Gomez has described the Commission's commitment 'to be faithful to the strictures of the Vincentian canon, that as Anglicans we believe that which has been believed everywhere, always and by all in the Christian revelation'. IASCER also bore in mind, as Vincent himself insisted, that in the processes of history, the truth of Scripture may be more fully explicated and so doctrine in this respect could be susceptible to development. In addition to sharing internal informal papers by members that ranged from historic reflections to review of the resources offered by the philosophy of religion, IASCER has been

helped by the consideration of reception within the Windsor Report. Most recently, *The Church of the Triune God*, of the Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue, devotes its final chapter to Reception in Communion. IASCER wholeheartedly commends this for further study and reflection.

**Resolution 2.08:
Reception of Ecumenical Documents**

IASCER

- regrets the fact that the nature of the programme at the 2008 Lambeth Conference prevented sustained attention being given to significant ecumenical agreed texts, such as *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (the Report of the International Anglican – Roman Catholic Commission on Communion and Mission), *The Church of the Triune God* (the Report of ICAOTD), and ‘Called to be the One Church’ (the Ecclesiological Statement of the Porto Alegre Assembly of the World Council of Churches)
- encourages ACC-14 to consider how the Anglican Communion might respond officially to these texts as a contribution to their potential reception in the life of the Church
- commends the text ‘Reception in the Anglican Communion: Responding responsibly to ecumenical and inter-Anglican developments’ prepared by IASCER to assist in their deliberations.

Reception in The Anglican Communion: Responding Responsibly to Ecumenical and Inter-Anglican Developments

1. The 1998 Lambeth Conference called for the setting up of an Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations. IASCER’s role has been to scrutinise ecumenical developments involving the Provinces of the Communion in terms of their mutual consistency and their coherence with Anglican doctrine, and to provide advice to Provinces and to the Instruments of the Communion. There is clearly a need for the Churches of the Communion to consult together, through qualified representatives, in order to reach a common view about ecumenical developments and reports that involve or concern Anglicans – whether these are regional or global, bilateral or multilateral – and to evaluate them. The workload and output of IASCER appear to vindicate the decision of Lambeth 1998.
2. The *Windsor Report* (2004) called the Churches or Provinces of the Anglican Communion to greater mutual accountability and in particular to consult more fully about emerging developments that

- could prove controversial both within the Communion and ecumenically. In the proposed Anglican Covenant the Provinces are likely to be asked to commit themselves to certain protocols that are designed to facilitate reception, mutual accountability, consultation and restraint for the common good.
3. IASCER believes that these two tasks are twin aspects of a single process of reception and that a common set of principles should be applied to them.
 4. The evaluation of developments in the life of the Christian Church and of ecumenical texts belongs within the broad process of 'reception', which is a spiritual process, one requiring the gifts of empathy and critical discernment. Reception is primarily about 'receiving one another as God in Christ has received you' (Romans 15.7). This mutual reception of Christians by one another has implications for the mutual reception of Christian traditions and churches. Receptive ecumenism is a key to ecumenical progress, especially in theological dialogue. Reception of developments in the Church's life belongs within the Church's life of word and sacrament and needs to be practised in communion.
 5. The concept of reception refers primarily to a process and does not contain any presumption that the development or text will prove acceptable. The use of the term 'reception' itself does not imply a value judgement, either positive or negative, which is why it is sometimes referred to as 'an open process of reception'.
 6. Within the overall, ongoing, diffused process of reception, a guided process of formal reception and discernment is sometimes required. This is needed particularly when developments or texts demand to be critically evaluated for the well-being of the Church.
 7. A guided process of formal reception will have regard to several complementary criteria: the coherence or consonance of texts or developments with Scripture, the tradition of the Church, and existing ecumenical agreements that have been endorsed to some degree by the Communion. It will also be mindful that the faith that we have received needs to be expressed in fresh ways in each generation, within a diversity of cultures, and applied to changing circumstances. How should this task be carried out on behalf of the Communion and by whom?
 8. IASCUFO has been set up in order to (among other tasks) 'advise the Provinces and the Instruments of Communion on all questions of ecumenical engagement, proposals for national, regional or international ecumenical agreement or schemes of co-operation and unity, as well as on questions touching Anglican Faith and Order ... with the intention to promote common understanding and

convergence both in Anglican Communion affairs, and in ecumenical engagement' (*from the mandate*).

9. However, IASCUFO, as an advisory body, needs to offer its advice to others who have the authority and responsibility to speak to and for the Communion. In what follows we make some suggestions as to which these persons and bodies are.
10. In the light of the two related tasks of reception, described in 1-6, IASCIER strongly supports the intention that not only ecumenical texts and draft agreements but also developments within the life of the Communion that need careful examination should be referred to its successor body (IASCUFO) for study, comment and (where appropriate) response.
11. Any Province which wishes to propose a possible development is encouraged to consult with the Communion through IASCUFO. Any Anglican Primate who becomes aware of a potential development in any Province of the Communion that they believe should be tested, would be at liberty to draw it to the attention of IASCUFO, together with supporting documentation. Any of the Instruments of Communion can also bring a matter to IASCUFO. A steering group of the Commission would filter and prioritise items for its agenda. Where appropriate, IASCUFO will engage in dialogue with the Province where the development in question originated.
12. Ecumenical reports and draft agreements that involve or concern Anglicans should be referred to the Commission before they have reached their final form in order to enable IASCUFO to scrutinise the documents and to prepare advice on them.
13. In the case both of internal Anglican and ecumenical developments and texts that it believes to be of major significance for the Communion, the Commission will prepare advice for the relevant Instrument of Communion. IASCUFO will also facilitate any process of consultation, that may be needed, within the Communion and evaluate the results, reporting to the Instruments of Communion.
14. IASCIER believes that greater clarity is needed about the respective roles and responsibilities of the Instruments in these respects. To this end, IASCIER offers some reflections arising from recent experience of addressing the ecumenical agenda:

In practice, it has often been the case that whichever conciliar Instrument is meeting next is the one that takes note of ecumenical matters and/or sends out ecumenical texts.

The Lambeth Conference

Over the years, it became the custom for the Lambeth Conference to consider ecumenical affairs at its meetings and develop resolutions that helped to evaluate ecumenical developments, send messages to its ecumenical partners, and set the ecumenical agenda for the period of time before its next meeting. This was for the most part a very helpful way of managing the ecumenical work of the Communion, especially when the Conference was designed in such a way that bishops who had particular ecumenical formation and experience were able to contribute to the report and resolutions. It was not always the case, however, that all the bishops had the ability and experience to contribute meaningfully; sometimes the language of ecumenical texts is technical, and it was rarely the case that they were translated into many other languages of the Communion. In some cases, bishops had not been sent critical texts in time for them to be read by the bishops, let alone by anyone in their dioceses.

The response to *The Final Report* of ARCIC is instructive as to how reception can best be advanced through the Lambeth Conference. The ACC sent *The Final Report* to the Provinces for response. The Anglican Communion Office collated those responses and brought them to the Lambeth Conference of 1988, which then produced a resolution that affirmed many parts of the report but also offered some critique, based on the Provincial responses and the bishops' own considerations.

The Lambeth Conference of 2008 was designed differently. While this made it possible for all bishops to have a greater say on all the issues on the agenda of the Conference, there was not sufficient time for ecumenical matters to be addressed in depth. Thus, for example, three important ecumenical texts - *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (International Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission), *The Church of the Triune God* (International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue) and 'Called to Be the One Church' (Statement of the Porto Alegre Assembly of the World Council of Churches) - which were already in a process of reception within the Communion, were not able to be addressed in any adequate way at the Conference. In the future, care must be taken to provide means for serious engagement with ecumenical matters at the Conference.

The Primates' Meeting

The enhanced role of the Primates' Meeting called for by the Lambeth Conference has been accompanied by pressure around particular matters and it has not been possible for the Primates adequately to address ecumenical issues that were referred to them. Some on IASCEP have concern about this enhanced role, not least because there is a great deal of difference among the Primates in terms of their own

authority and jurisdiction. It is certainly helpful to have a small body that meets more regularly to which ecumenical issues can be referred for advice as to next steps. Might the Joint Standing Committee of the ACC and the Primates of the Anglican Communion be developed in such a way as to enable it to handle such matters effectively and competently?

Anglican Consultative Council

The ACC is the body that often refers ecumenical texts to the Provinces for comment and reception. Through its staff it co-ordinates with ecumenical partners the questions that are asked of the churches, and collates responses.

Debates on ecumenical issues at ACC face the same challenges as the other Instruments already named. There are questions of time, expertise and language.

The ACC is the only conciliar Instrument that includes, in addition to bishops, representatives from clergy and laity. Many voices throughout the Communion, though, believe that the ACC needs considerable reform before it can become a truly synodical body – and probably more resources than it will be able to muster. Accountability and expertise are two qualities needed for its members.

Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of Canterbury, because of his particular role as *primus inter pares* of the bishops of the Anglican Communion and focus of unity, is a key person in the building and deepening of ecumenical relationships. Personal contact with leading ecumenical figures often leads to the warming of those relationships, even to breakthroughs. The involvement of ecumenical participants in the Lambeth Conference of 2008 was particularly significant because of the Archbishop of Canterbury's deep ecumenical commitment and his willingness both to encourage them to speak, and to listen to them.

In his role as president at the Lambeth Conference 2008, the Archbishop of Canterbury modelled a way of exercising primatial ministry and demonstrated that primacy can shape the work of the other Instruments of Communion.

15. In the light of the considerations in the previous section (13), IASCER envisages that the advice of IASCUFO, on all of the matters referred to it, whether ecumenical or Anglican, might be considered by any or all of the Instruments, depending on the topic in question and the timeliness of meetings. As far as doctrinal matters are concerned IASCER sees a special role for the Lambeth Conference.

16. From its early days the Lambeth Conference has taken ecumenical initiatives and given guidance on ecumenical texts. Its teachings over a century and a half on a wide range of doctrinal matters, especially on the nature and mission of the Church, comprise an extensive and valuable body of Anglican doctrine. As a conference of bishops, who are charged at their ordination to the episcopate with particular responsibility for safeguarding and teaching the faith and for banishing error, the Lambeth Conference is the body within the Communion to which the task of articulating Anglican teaching on questions of faith and order most appropriately belongs. The Conference commends its guidance to the Provinces, which then consider whether to adopt it formally. Although the Conference does not have binding authority for the Provinces of the Communion, it has considerable moral and pastoral authority as a gathering of the 'chief pastors' of the Anglican Communion, the bishops.

PART THREE

Dialogues

7. Churches in Communion

The Anglican Communion enjoys a number of relationships of ‘full communion’, the most longstanding being that through the 1931 Bonn Agreement with the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht. There are more recent relationships with the ancient Mar Thoma Syrian Church of India, and the Philippine Independent Church (Iglesia Filipina Independiente, IFI). Anglicans have accorded these relationships a particular significance in our ecumenical life.

Since the late 1990s, Anglicans around the world have embarked on various national and regional agreements of communion (such as *The Porvoo Agreement*, and *Called to Common Mission*, between Anglicans in Europe and the USA respectively). As explored in Chapter 3, this has given rise to the anomaly of churches being in communion with some Provinces of the Anglican Communion while not with others, an issue on which the Lambeth Conference of 1998 asked IASCER to reflect (Resolution IV.6). Yet the development of the juridical autonomy of our churches means that each must decide for itself on entering into relationships of communion. To be in communion with the entire Anglican Communion it is no longer sufficient to be in communion with the See of Canterbury, as was historically the case.

The question of whether and how a church might come into communion with the whole Anglican Communion, other than through separate agreements with each Province, remains on the table for consideration by IASCUFO. It is also possible that the development of an Anglican Covenant may affect the path ahead. But for the moment these three churches (and the Anglican Communion as a whole) enjoy a unique relationship, and we continue to seek ways to develop and deepen the common life we share. One means of acknowledging both our closeness and our desire for its enhancement was the invitation to churches in communion to send an observer to participate in IASCER meetings. The Revd Karackattil George Pothen of the Mar Thoma Church came to the meetings in 2002 and 2003, the Rt Revd Dr Fritz-René Müller represented The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht in 2005, as did the Revd Professor Harald Rein in 2006.

Looking to the future, Anglicans must also consider the implications of our understanding of the goal of ecumenism for relationships of communion. The Bonn Agreement was essentially static in providing for ‘inter-communion’ but foresaw no development beyond this. Today we understand that parallel jurisdictions of reconciled ministries can only be a staging post on the longer journey to the full visible unity to which we are called. How that continuing rapprochement will take place with our partners in ‘full communion’ is a

question that we must still consider. The *Indaba Reflections*, 78 records the commitment of the bishops at the 2008 Lambeth Conference to sustain and nourish these relationships.

The four United Churches of Southern Asia, fully members of the Anglican Communion, offer us a model that is both challenge and hope. Their example has many implications for our ecumenical life, and so they are also considered in this chapter.

Finally, in complete contrast, there are those groups that may be considered in some way as ‘Continuing Anglican Churches’. They are the subject of the final section of this chapter.

United Churches

The presence within the Anglican Communion of the four United Churches – of Bangladesh, North India, Pakistan and South India – are a living reminder in our midst of what it is to work towards the full unity of the Church of God. They enrich our common life with the experience they share with us of an authentic breadth of diversity, demonstrating too how we can share what we value in Anglicanism with others while also receiving from them.

The United Churches offer us more than a signpost to a route ahead. They are a vibrant icon of a stage on the journey of reconciling unity in their honesty over the long and sometimes difficult path they have trodden. In what they have achieved they are an encouragement to us that we should be more open to anomalies along the way. What was found by some for a time to be unbearable passed smoothly – not least because the ultimate goals and the means of reaching them were so clearly in place as they took their first steps.

They bring us other ecumenical challenges, for they lie not only within the Anglican family of Churches, but simultaneously belong to one or more other world communions. Whether in our internal arrangements (such as in the current working towards a possible Anglican Covenant) or in our relationships with other churches (for example, with the Roman Catholic Church in the proposals of IARCCUM), we need to be sensitive to the commitments we are asking these brothers and sisters of ours to make in relation to those other legitimate ties they have elsewhere. This is an area where questions of transitivity can bite hardest.

The Mar Thoma Syrian Church of India

The Mar Thoma Syrian Church of India has long-standing links particularly with Anglicans in South India, which pre-date the founding of the United Church of South India. There is close co-operation elsewhere around the world where Mar Thoma congregations are found. Some receive formal oversight from Anglican bishops, and share buildings or clergy.

The Church of South India, Church of North India and the Mar Thoma Church participate in the recently established Communion of Churches in India (welcomed by the ACC in Resolution 13.21) and co-operate in other ways. In the longer term, though it is not a live concern at the moment, the question remains open as to whether the Mar Thoma Church might at some point join the United Churches of North and South India.

The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht

The Anglican Communion signed the Bonn Agreement with the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht in 1931. It is one of the oldest (and briefest) ecumenical agreements:

1. Each Communion recognises 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.

Even so, it took some time to be fully incorporated into the life of the Anglican Communion, with the 1958 Lambeth Conference noting ‘with satisfaction’ that the Bonn Agreement had by that point been adopted by ‘nearly all’ the Provinces of the Anglican Communion (Resolution 46).

This agreement of ‘inter-Communion’ has formed the basis for an ongoing relationship through subsequent decades. Old Catholic bishops have participated in Lambeth Conferences, and have also for many years been invited to take part in consecrations of Anglican bishops of the British Isles (and beyond), and Anglicans have similarly participated in the consecration of Old Catholic bishops.

The Anglican – Old Catholic International Co-ordinating Council (AOCICC) was established to seek to deepen the reality of this shared life. This was welcomed by the bishops at the 1998 Lambeth Conference, who in Resolution IV.6.c recommended that ‘consideration be given to ways of deepening our communion with the Old Catholic Churches beyond the Bonn Agreement, including means of taking counsel and making decisions together; the anomaly of overlapping jurisdictions; the implications of wider ecumenical relationships, particularly with the Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Lutheran Churches; and the importance of work together on issues of mission and common witness.’

Its first phase ran from 2000 to 2004, and a second phase was launched in 2005 to take this work further. The new mandate asked AOCICC to:

- assist the Council of Anglican Bishops in continental Europe and the International Bishops’ Conference to develop a common definition and understanding of shared mission for their work in Europe, and to advise on the establishment of appropriate mechanisms to carry forward that mission
- promote the drafting of a common statement of ecclesiological understanding to assist in exploring the shape of the future relationship between the Churches of Anglican Communion and the Union of Utrecht, and to advise the ACC and the International Bishops’ Conference on the future development of that relationship
- review the nature and content of ecumenical agreements by the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Union of Utrecht with regard to their impact on ecumenical progress
- explore concrete proposals for joint initiatives in mission work in continental Europe.

These are complex and challenging issues, that place our stated commitments to the pursuit of full visible unity in the crucible of reality. The implications of what we say we believe and aspire to can in practice pose demanding, and even at times quite threatening, challenges to current long-standing situations and relationships on the ground. The communiqués of the meetings are available on the Anglican Communion website.

The year 2006 saw the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Bonn Agreement. This was celebrated in a number of ways, including a joint theological conference held in the United Kingdom, a shared pilgrimage to the Shrine of St Willibrord, and celebrations at the Old Catholic Congress of 2006 during which the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of

Utrecht shared a lecture platform. Anglican appreciation of the anniversary, and of our common life, was expressed in ACC resolutions 12.27 and 13.18, as well as in IASCER Resolution 4.03, below.

**Resolution 4.03:
Anglican - Old Catholic Relations**

IASCER:

- reaffirms its support for an international celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Bonn Agreement in the year 2006, to be held either in continental Europe or in England, or both, to consist of a major theological conference and of a major liturgical celebration held either together or separately
- further suggests that the theological conference be held in conjunction with the regular conference of Old Catholic theologians and either immediately before or after the next regular meeting of AOCICC, and that Prebendary Paul Avis serve as the liaison of IASCER for this purpose
- also recommends that the major liturgical celebration of the Bonn Agreement be timed to coincide with a meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion in the same year, and that consideration be given to holding such a meeting in an appropriate location on continental Europe.

***Iglesia Filipina Independiente
(The Philippine Independent Church)***

The Iglesia Filipina Independiente (IFI) has had close connections with Anglicans, particularly in the USA, since its founding in 1902. In 1948 bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America (subsequently ECUSA then TEC) consecrated three bishops for the church, a move warmly welcomed by the Lambeth Conference of 1958 (Resolution 53). Since the 1961 Concordat of Full Communion it has been in full communion with the Episcopal Church of the United States (extended subsequently to other Anglican Provinces) and, since 1965, also with Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht. It also has a relationship with the Church in Sweden. In 1997 the Concordat was reaffirmed by a Common Declaration between the IFI and the Philippine Episcopal Church, which has previously been a mission district of TEC.

There was a strong Anglican presence at the IFI's centennial celebrations in Manila in 2002, and a European celebration of the Centennial was held with Old Catholics in Utrecht, also attended by Anglicans.

Both Philippine Churches are now committed to discussions about the establishment of a single non-overlapping jurisdiction, manifesting the unity established in the historic agreement. With encouragement from IASCER in 2003 (Resolution 5.03), TEC and the IFI reconfigured their co-ordinating council, which now meets annually. Within the USA the two Churches enjoy a warm relationship, with extensive mutual mission and ministry, though the IFI and TEC tend to minister to different sectors of the population. The IFI has congregations elsewhere around the world, among Filipino diaspora communities.

A three-year theological consultation between representatives of TEC, the IFI, and the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht, joined by an observer from the Church of Sweden, recently completed its work, and issued the Bishop Ramento Statement on 'A Eucharistic Vision for a Globalized World', which makes a number of recommendations for joint worship, joint witness and joint service. This is available at www.episcopalchurch.org/documents/Bishop_Ramento_statement_final.doc. Anglicans and Episcopalians joined with the IFI in mourning Bishop Ramento, following his murder in 2006.

**Resolution 5.03:
Iglesia Filipina Independiente**

IASCER

- encourages the Episcopal Church in the United States of America to resume negotiations with its full communion partner, Iglesia Filipina Independiente, to establish a formal body to co-ordinate ECUSA - IFI relations and to report on its progress at the 2004 meeting of IASCER.

Continuing Churches

As *Called to Be One* noted, in the last 150 years various small groups have separated themselves from the Church of England and other Churches of the Anglican Communion, for reasons of matters of faith and order (including developments in liturgy), among which in recent years the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate has been a particular issue. Many of these churches claim the title 'Continuing Anglican Churches' and assert that they are in continuing fidelity to authentic Anglican heritage, though they are

not in communion with the See of Canterbury, nor are they members of the Anglican Communion. Some are served by former Anglican bishops and priests.

As the bishops at Lambeth in 1998 recorded, 'although overall numbers of people involved in these groups are relatively small, this fragmentation is a cause of great sadness.' They urged Provinces where congregations of such churches are present, to try to open dialogue with a view to reconciliation, though they recognised that restoration of communion was likely to be hard to achieve. They also noted that wider consultation between Anglicans on matters of faith and order might be necessitated as a result of such dialogues. The small size of the majority of these groups also raises questions of ecclesial density.

In Resolution IV.11 the Conference requested the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates' Meeting 'to consider best how to initiate and maintain dialogue with such groups with a view to the reconciliation of all who own the Anglican tradition.' The Primates proposed a small working group, on which two members of IASCER were delegated to serve. In the event, the working group did not meet, as energies and resources were diverted into the Windsor process. Meanwhile, there has been some progress at provincial level, with studies and conversations in the USA and England.

This remains on the ecumenical agenda for the Anglican Communion.

8. *Bilateral Dialogues*

The Anglican Communion has a long history of bilateral engagement with other Christian bodies. In 1878 the second Lambeth Conference referred the question of relations with the Moravians to a committee and reaffirmed this ten years later (Resolution 16 of 1888). The third Lambeth Conference also passed resolutions calling for ‘earnest efforts ... to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches (Resolution 15); and expressing ‘its hope that the barriers to fuller communion’ with the Eastern Orthodox Churches might be ‘in course of time, removed by further intercourse and extended enlightenment’ (Resolution 17).

The number and depth of dialogues has increased steadily ever since. The 1998 Lambeth Conference report, *Called to Be One*, recognised their importance within the wider ecumenical movement, and noted how moral, ethical and social justice issues have come to be increasingly important alongside questions of faith and order. National and regional bilateral relationships have also developed. The report went on to note that:

...all dialogues, however, continue to seek a balance and harmony between the fundamentals of Christ’s revelation and the social and cultural context in which we find ourselves. It is here that a dynamic, pneumatological perspective is so important. The Spirit is given to teach and to bring to remembrance all that is of Christ (John 14.26). It is the Spirit also who will lead us into all truth (John 16.13). Our ecumenical dialogues are not only concerned with the past, with the historical and theological causes of our unhappy divisions; they are equally concerned with a faithful vision of the configuration of Christ’s future Church: one, holy, catholic and apostolic.

This vision continued to guide the dialogues in the subsequent decade. While some, particularly those with older roots, have had a greater emphasis on theological questions, others have had a wider focus. Some have been largely exploratory, as much a ‘conversation’ as a dialogue. Others have pursued agreed statements, or worked towards making mutual commitments and taking concrete steps to bring one another into closer and deeper relationship. Yet in all of these, many of the key issues have remained the same, even if approached from different vantage points, and with different emphases. IASCEC’s thematic work, often stimulated by such questions, sought to ensure consistency and coherence across dialogues, and that insights and advances in one area might resource and encourage exchanges elsewhere.

This chapter reviews the specific relationships that Anglicans enjoy with Baptists, the Eastern Orthodox Churches, Lutherans, Methodists, Moravians, the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Reformed, and the Roman Catholic Church. This is not to say that these are the only families with whom we speak, but we, as well as our partners, have limited resources and cannot engage on all fronts at once. The Conference of Secretaries of the Christian World Communions (CS/CWCs) has been an increasingly useful forum for maintaining contact with those with whom there has been no active dialogue, and provided an important means of keeping abreast of the dialogues in progress between others. So, for example, we are appreciative of the work that has been done between the Mennonites (with whom we have close relations in some regions) and the Roman Catholic Church in North America on the healing of memories, and have been glad to send a representative to the Mennonite World Conference.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference called for the Anglican Communion to pay greater attention to Pentecostals, New Churches and Independent Church Groups (Resolutions IV.21 and IV.25). No formal bilateral dialogues have been established, but contacts have thickened in various ways. Many of these churches have taken significant steps towards greater involvement in ecumenism (particularly through their engagement within the Global Christian Forum, the Pentecostal World Federation (PWF) and World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) – see Chapter 10). There are longstanding and substantial dialogues between the Pentecostals and the Roman Catholic Church, and with other world Communions. Both the PWF and the WEA are represented at the CS/CWCs. And of course, many Anglicans consider themselves evangelical or charismatic, and numerous Anglican individuals and congregations participate in the WEA and the PWF.

The increasing engagement in ecumenism of the African Instituted Churches (which have grown considerably in recent decades) is an even more recent, and very welcome, development. They too now participate in the Global Christian Forum, are engaging the CWCs in dialogue, and developing relationships with the WCC.

There is some overlap between the contents of this Chapter and Chapter 9, Schemes of Union and Regional Developments, with some regional developments being included in this, rather than the next chapter, because of the way they inform our international relations. See also Chapter 10 for consideration of the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogues held in Breklum, Germany in March 2008, which addressed a number of issues raised by the conduct and methodology of bilateral dialogues.

Baptists

The Lambeth Conference of 1988 (Resolution 10) concluded that in the light of the growing reception of the WCC statement *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, agreed in 1992, that the time was ripe for a dialogue between the Anglican Communion and the Baptist World Alliance, and requested the ACC to take this proposal forward. In the event, resource constraints meant little progress had been made by the time of the 1998 Conference, which (in Resolution IV.15) recommended that as a priority, co-ordinated regional and local discussions should be held in partnership with the Baptist World Alliance, which might lead to the establishment of a continuing forum between Anglicans and Baptists at the world level.

Rather than embarking on a formal theological dialogue, in the sense that such dialogues are often oriented towards the goal of full, visible unity, a series of ‘conversations’ were duly held between 2000 and 2005, with the intention of exploring how Anglicans and Baptists relate in their understanding of the Christian faith, and of mapping the ways in which Anglicans and Baptists share in common witness to Jesus Christ across the globe. The conversations had six regional phases - Europe (Norwich, UK), Asia (Yangon, Myanmar), Africa (Nairobi, Kenya), the Southern Cone (Santiago, Chile), the Caribbean (Nassau, the Bahamas) and North America (Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada). A ‘continuing committee’ of three Anglicans and three Baptists attended each regional meeting to provide a measure of continuity, and to ensure that a rolling account was made of all the discussions, from which all the threads could be brought together and overarching analysis made in the final report.

We recognised that many areas of the organisation of our communities of faith differed quite markedly. For this reason the goals of the conversations were modest, though still significant. They included mutual learning, sharing understandings of apostolic faith, identifying areas of doctrine and church life which needed fuller exploration, looking for ways to co-operate in mission and increase fellowship and common witness. Regional meetings considered papers on particular themes that were pertinent to their own situations. Often areas of greater or lesser shared understanding were markedly different between regions, and were shaped by such factors as diverse experiences of the historic development of Christianity – for example, the conversations discovered that there was a great deal of common ground in the ways both Anglicans and Baptists in Africa had inculturated theology and praxis.

A report *Conversations around the World 2000-2005* was published (and is available from the Anglican Communion Office, or from the Ecumenical

Affairs pages of the Anglican Communion website). This offers a careful digest of the main topics of conversation on a wide range of theological concerns for both Communion, exploring the major subjects of Christian faith as they are lived out by the two traditions. Structured around the eight themes that emerged during the conversations, each section poses questions to Anglicans, Baptists, or both, to provoke debate and stimulate further thought.

ACC-13 (Resolution 13.14) welcomed the publication and commended it 'to the parishes, dioceses and Provinces of the Anglican Communion as a resource for study and reflection on the nature of mission and of the way in which Baptists and Anglicans can co-operate'. It encouraged 'Anglicans to meet with Baptists at the appropriate level and locality and reflect on this report and on their common mission to bear witness to the salvation found in Christ'. This has begun to happen in some areas of the world (for example, England). They also requested the Director of Ecumenical Affairs to explore ways in which the conversation at international level may be developed – this remains a task for the future.

IASCER judges the conversations to have been a significant development in ecumenical methodology, setting a useful precedent which can be drawn on in relating to those with whom we do not yet share a vision of visible or organisational unity. The format allowed an open exploration that, first, gave rise to a description of convergences in faith, discipleship and mission, and second, allowed for a benchmarking of degrees of ecumenical co-operation, which range from joint participation in ecumenical diaconal agencies through to the united church situation of the Church of North India. Though the report offered reflection on the way that Anglicans and Baptists around the globe can confess their shared faith more effectively together and can engage in a greater sharing of mission, there was no pressure to make the extent of these a measure of the 'success' of the encounters. Furthermore, story-telling and the sharing of experience, rather than solely a more technical debate around differences in ecclesiological and doctrinal issues, allowed a broader engagement. To some degree this bridged the gap that can at times emerge between the professionalised ecumenism of faith and order experts, and the life of the local church. It is a model to be commended.

Eastern Orthodox Churches

Formal dialogue between Anglicans and the Eastern Orthodox family of churches began in 1973, when the Anglican – Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions (A/OJDD) held its first meeting in Oxford. The first phase of the dialogue was concluded by the publication of *The Moscow Agreed Statement*

in 1976. The publication of *The Dublin Agreed Statement* in 1984 brought its second phase to a conclusion. Both statements recorded a measure of agreement on a range of specific topics, while acknowledging continuing divergence on others.

The third phase of the dialogue began in 1989, when A/OJDD was re-constituted as the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue (ICAOTD). Its task was to consider the doctrine of the Church in the light of the doctrine of the Trinity, and to examine the doctrine of the ordained ministry of the Church within the wider context of conversations oriented towards full visible communion.

Three interim reports were produced before the Lambeth Conference of 1998 (*The Trinity and the Church; Christ, the Spirit and the Church; Christ, Humanity and the Church*), which the Conference (in Resolution IV.20) welcomed and invited bishops to study. The Conference repeated the request of ten years previously, that the 1984 *Dublin Agreed Statement* be circulated (again) to Provinces for response. This is one illustration of the difficulties of receiving the fruit of ecumenical work within the life of the Communion.

This phase of the dialogue culminated with the publication of *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement* (available from the Anglican Communion website). The statement begins with first principles – what we believe about the Trinity, and thus about the Church, about ministry in the Church, and, from there, how the Church receives or rejects new expressions of Tradition. It sets out significant material on the life of the Church which is timely and pertinent to many of the current debates within Anglicanism.

IASCER highlighted currently relevant aspects of the Statement in its Resolution 5.06, and in Resolution 7.08 offered questions designed to assist Anglicans in studying the statement. It was provided as a resource to bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 2008 (see Chapter 13).

Alexy II, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia died as IASCER met for the final time. In Resolution 20.08 the Commission expressed its appreciation for his life and his commitment to the full visible unity of the Church. (Resolution 5.06 similarly gave thanks for the life of Bishop Henry Hill.)

Though the family of Orthodox Churches has reacted variously to the developments in North America and the way these have impacted on the wider Communion, international Anglican – Orthodox relations have remained generally warm.

A new phase of bilateral dialogue is planned for 2009. The likely focus will be questions of theological anthropology; in other words, considering the

Christian understanding of the human being as 'image and likeness of God' and its implications for church life and ethical issues.

**Resolution 5.06:
Anglican – Eastern Orthodox Dialogue**

IASCER

1. warmly welcomes the substantial *Agreed Statement* of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue (ICAOTD)
2. commends the trinitarian and christological grounding of ecclesiology as the appropriate context for the consideration of issues of theological anthropology, episcopacy, primacy, priesthood and the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate
3. believes the *Agreed Statement* to be of particular importance for consideration by the Anglican - Oriental Orthodox dialogue and by the next phase of Anglican - Roman Catholic dialogue
4. believes also that the *Agreed Statement* provides a substantial resource for all addressing the questions of Anglican ecclesiology arising from the current Windsor process and commends it to them
5. gives thanks for the major contribution of Bishop Henry Hill (1921-2006) to this Dialogue, and to Anglican – Orthodox and Anglican – Oriental Orthodox relations, and commends him to God.

**Resolution 7.08:
The Church of the Triune God**

IASCER asks the Provinces to engage with the Report of ICAOTD by considering and responding to the questions below.

Questions for The Church of the Triune God

Section I (Trinity and the Church; Christ the Spirit and the Church; Humanity, Christ and the Church)

1. In what ways might these chapters enrich the faith of Anglicans?
2. In what ways does the faith of Anglicans challenge these chapters?
3. To what extent can your church recognise in these chapters the faith of the church through the ages?

Section II (Episcopacy, Episcopate, Primacy and the Church; Priesthood, Christ and the Church; Women and Men, Ministry of the Church)

1. In what ways might these chapters enrich the Anglican exercise and understanding of ministry in the widest sense, with particular attention to the ministries of bishops and presbyters, and the ministries of women and men?
2. In what ways does the Anglican exercise and understanding of ministry challenge these chapters?
3. To what extent can your church recognise in these chapters the faith of the church through the ages?

Section III (Women and Men, Ministry and the Church; Heresy, Schism and the Church; Reception in the Church)

1. In what ways might these chapters offer insights to current Anglican processes to deal with disagreement, change and division in the Church?
2. In what ways do these chapters assess critically the ways in which Anglicans deal with controversy?
3. To what extent are these chapters consonant with Anglican instruments of reception and decision-making?

Resolution 20.08:

In memoriam Patriarch Alexy II of Moscow and All Russia

IASCER

- receiving with sadness in the course of their meeting the news of the death of His Holiness Alexy II, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, assure the faithful of the Russian Orthodox Church of their heartfelt condolences and prayers, giving thanks to God for the ministry of the Patriarch, and his commitment to the search for the unity of the Church
- affirms the commitment of the Anglican Communion to the search for the full visible unity of the Church, and particularly in this context to the continuation of the work of reconciliation between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Lutherans

Anglicans and Lutherans have been involved in close dialogue since their distinctive traditions emerged at the time of the Reformation. Modern theological dialogue began at the global level in 1972 and has sought to build on the success of regional co-operation evidenced by *The Helsinki Report* 1982 (Europe), *The Meissen Common Statement* 1988 (England and Germany), *The Porvoo Common Statement* 1992 (the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches), *The Reuilly Common Statement* 1999 (the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the French Lutheran and Reformed Churches), *Called to Common Mission* 1998 (USA), *The Waterloo Declaration* 2001 (Canada), *Common Ground* 2001 (Australia), and *The All Africa Report* 2001. Alongside these, the Anglican – Lutheran International Conversations (subsequently Commission) also published *The Pullach Report* in 1972, *The Niagara Report*, on episcopate, in 1987, and *The Hanover Report* on the diaconate in 1996. The 2008 Lambeth Conference *Indaba Reflections*, 78 welcomed this growth and renewal of relationships between Anglicans and Lutherans. (*Anglican - Lutheran Agreements: Regional and International Agreements 1972-2002*, is a comprehensive volume containing the texts of all the major Anglican - Lutheran ecumenical agreements between 1972 and 2002. It can be purchased from the Anglican Communion Office. The Anglican Communion website, www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical, carries all the individual reports.)

As the bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 1998 noted in *Called to Be One*, to a considerable extent Anglicans and Lutherans are ‘coming to share in a common vision and a common concern for the mission of the Church, which has proved to be their motivation and their strength ... The dialogues have been further strengthened by the fact that Lutherans and Anglicans are re-discovering substantial doctrinal agreement and, sometimes with surprise, a similarity in worship, mission and ministry. We have a familial likeness.’ The familial closeness is reflected in invitations to participate in a number of each other’s bodies and consultations. So, for example, an Anglican representative is invited to the meetings of the LWF Council and Assembly, the LWF General Secretary participated in the Windsor Report Reception Group, and LWF representatives take part in ACC meetings and Lambeth Conferences. The ACC and LWF hold joint staff meetings at regular intervals.

Yet alongside growing closeness there has been considerable diversity in the scope, content, goals, and language of the various regional agreements and statements. Some of this has been reflective of the wider diversity among

Lutheran churches around the world, particularly in respect of ordained ministry. Comparing and contrasting these documents, and considering issues of consistency from language through to intent and the way that common life under the agreements has evolved in practice, has been a significant task for IASCER, as well as ensuring a wider ranging coherence that embraces our dialogues with other partners. Several of the resolutions that follow address such concerns.

These concerns also formed the focus of the Anglican – Lutheran International Working Group’s report, *Growth in Communion*, published following the conclusion of its work in 2002. Receiving its mandate from the 1997 Assembly of the LWF and the 1998 Lambeth Conference, the Working Group’s tasks included monitoring regional developments and encouraging steps towards the goal of visible unity, while at the same time reviewing these dialogues for consistency and coherence, paying particular attention to concepts of unity, and to the understanding of apostolicity and episcopal ministry.

Each global communion separately has had to deal with these same issues across the range of its other ecumenical relationships. While expressing deep appreciation for *Growth in Communion*, IASCER (in Resolution 1.02) saw the need for further study, particularly in areas of transitivity and the interchangeability of ministries. The work arising out of this is recorded in the IASCER Paper on ‘Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues’, in Chapter 5 above. This surveys the ordained ministry across the range of ecumenical contacts, and attempts to identify where there may be inconsistencies or where further theological reflection is needed. Meanwhile, a broadly similar exercise was conducted by the LWF, leading to the report ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ (also known as The Lund Statement; available at www.lutheranworld.org). The report was shared with the Anglican Communion in an early form, giving IASCER the opportunity to feed a substantial response into the drafting process. This is carried in Chapter 5. IASCER commended the final report to Anglicans (in Resolution 7.06) as a resource for addressing issues of Anglican ecclesiology as part of the Windsor process.

While transitivity between various Anglican - Lutheran agreements was a particular issue of concern in *Growth in Communion*, a rather different question of transitivity was posed by the agreement between the LWF and the Roman Catholic Church in the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (as noted in Chapter 3). Should the Anglican Communion also consider signing the declaration? IASCER Decision 7.01 (reaffirmed in 2002) records our conclusion that we had covered similar ground in

discussing the doctrine of justification with both Lutherans and Roman Catholics in our bilateral dialogues, and this did not require restating in this particular way. But, more importantly, we recognised that this agreement arose out of a specific theological history and context in which we had not shared – and we had similarly not shared (or needed to share) in the necessary journey which the parties had taken together to be able to make this *Joint Declaration*. Sometimes true ecumenism means walking the walk, as well as talking the talk, and healing of memories along the way is an important element in learning to go forward together.

In 2006 a third phase of the Anglican - Lutheran International Commission began, which is considering ways to build on existing relationships with the aim of bringing all the churches of the Anglican Communion and the LWF into fuller communion. Its mandate, proposed in *Growth in Communion* (para 170) and affirmed by the ACC (Resolution 12.29) is to:

1. provide guidance regarding the evaluation and implementation of the Report of the Anglican – Lutheran Working Group (1999-2002), *Growth in Communion*, with a view to co-ordinated decisions by the governing bodies of both communions, in co-operation with their member churches
2. continue to monitor and advise upon the development of Anglican – Lutheran relations around the world, having regard to their consistency with each other and with the self-understanding of the two communions, give attention to the impact of different ecumenical methodologies, and to clarify questions of transitivity (i.e. the consequences that an agreement reached in one ecumenical relationship may be seen to have for other relationships)
3. explore the possibility of common actions and statements, and, in particular, seek ways to promote joint study projects of issues relevant to Anglican – Lutheran relations
4. consider ways to engage with and promote the wider ecumenical movement, and, in particular, give consideration to the ecumenical role and contribution of Christian World Communions
5. report to the relevant bodies on both sides on the progress of work, and to ensure consultation on emerging developments in regional Anglican – Lutheran relations.

The communiqués of its meetings can be found on the Anglican Communion website. Meanwhile, in line with ACC resolution 13.16, the All Africa Anglican – Lutheran Commission (AAALC) resumed its work in 2007.

Decision 7.01:

Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification

IASCER rejoices at the achievement of agreement between the LWF and the Roman Catholic Church in the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. Anglicans have addressed the doctrine of justification and related issues both within our own Communion and in our ecumenical dialogues with Lutherans and Roman Catholics. The Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) in its 1986 statement *Salvation and the Church* affirmed that our two Communions 'are agreed on the essential aspects of the doctrine of salvation and on the Church's role within it'. *The Niagara Report* (1987) of the Anglican - Lutheran International Continuation Committee cites among the truths shared by Anglicans and Lutherans 'a common understanding of God's justifying grace'. Therefore, it would not be necessary or appropriate for the Anglican Communion to adhere formally to this bilateral agreement which arises out of a particular theological history and context.

Decision 7.01 above was reaffirmed in 2002.

Resolution 1.02:

Growth in Communion

IASCER

1. expresses its deep appreciation for the quality of this report, not only as to the range and detail of the data presented about Anglican - Lutheran dialogues around the globe, but also as to the synthesis of the issues raised
2. acknowledges the report as a significant contribution to the deepening of relationships between the member churches of the Anglican Communion and of the Lutheran World Federation
3. encourages responses to the report, especially from regions of the Communion where renewed Anglican - Lutheran relationships have been inaugurated or are proposed;
4. notes that Recommendation 7 has already been endorsed by the ACC 12 meeting in Hong Kong, and recommends to the ACC Ecumenical Office that such a Commission be established
5. endorses Recommendation 1, noting that the necessary administrative support implied may not be present in parts of the Anglican Communion

6. in relation to Recommendation 2, notes that ‘the appropriate bodies of the Anglican Communion’ include IASCER, which, while unable to give unqualified endorsement to the Report’s evaluation of the theological consistency of the various agreements, commits itself to further study and response
7. endorses Recommendation 3 warmly
8. advises a cautious approach to Recommendation 4, calls for a further exploration within the Anglican Communion of ‘transitivity’ (see paragraphs 157-159) and the implications of ‘extending interchangeability’, and refers this Recommendation both to the new Anglican – Lutheran International Commission and to those Anglican Provinces which have reached agreements with Lutheran churches, asking them to make responses to IASCER
9. advises some caution regarding Recommendation 5, noting that sacramental hospitality in relation to lay persons already exists, and while affirming the positive intention of the Recommendation for churches working towards an agreement, IASCER believes that extending ministerial functions to individual ordained ministers raises fundamental matters which can only be rightly considered in the context of a particular ecclesial agreement
10. endorses Recommendation 6 warmly, noting that resources for theological education (both prior to and following ordination) have been developed in seminaries of ECUSA, which IASCER encourages to be made available more widely, possibly using the Anglican Communion web-site
11. recommends that the report be published, whether separately or together with the proposed collection of all Anglican - Lutheran documents, but in either case only if this Resolution and the attached comments from IASCER (and any made by the Lutheran World Federation) are included.

Resolution 6.03:

All Africa Anglican – Lutheran Commission

IASCER

- having noted with regret the lack of recent progress by AAALC, encourages Anglican churches in Africa to advance their relations with their Lutheran counterparts, acknowledging that it must be for the Anglican and Lutheran churches involved to determine the most

appropriate regional contexts for such ecumenical initiatives. IASCER looks forward to receiving reports on progress at their meeting in 2004.

**Resolution 3.04:
Anglican – Lutheran Relations in Australia**

IASCER

- welcomes the resolution of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia 2004 concerning the Anglican/Lutheran Dialogue and notes the Report of their Doctrine Commission which ‘states that *Common Ground*, as supplemented by the Second Report of the Dialogue, is in conformity with Anglican doctrine and other agreed ecumenical statements’
- while celebrating the adoption of a covenant between the Anglican Church of Australia and the Lutheran Church of Australia, urges greater clarity in the use of the terms ‘recognition’ of ministry (as a basis for eucharistic hospitality between the two churches), and ‘reconciliation’ of ministries (on the way to full communion).

**Resolution 6.06:
Anglican – Lutheran Dialogue**

IASCER

1. welcomes the establishment of the - Anglican Lutheran International Commission (ALIC) and commends the priorities for work established at its initial meeting (January 2006, Tanzania)
2. commends for future consideration proposals for a meeting of senior leaders of the Anglican Communion and of the Lutheran World Federation, or of the Anglican Consultative Council with the Council of the LWF, at an appropriate point in the development of the work of ALIC and of the relationship between the communions
3. looks forward to the appointment of a new Anglican Co-Chair for AAALC, and encourages the further development of Anglican – Lutheran relationships in Africa toward regional bilateral agreements of communion, particularly in southern Africa and in Tanzania

4. welcomes the local agreements developed by the Anglican and Lutheran churches in Australia and Japan, and looks forward to seeing these as they develop
5. encourages ALIC to monitor and promote any emerging consensus on the diaconate and *diakonia*, noting especially the work of the Porvoo churches, the Joint Anglican Lutheran Commission in Canada, and the Lutheran Episcopal Co-ordinating Committee in the USA
6. welcomes the initiative of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land with the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem to develop an agreement of full communion, and requests that this work be shared with the Province of Jerusalem and the Middle East, and with IASCER as it develops
7. thanks Dr Bill Crockett for his work in co-ordinating and producing ‘An Anglican Response by IASCER to The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ produced for the Lutheran World Federation, and considers it a clear and helpful presentation of Anglican views of the episcopal ministry for use in ecumenical dialogues.

Resolution 7.06:

Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church

IASCER

- commends the Anglican response to the Lutheran Statement 2002 ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ as a resource for addressing issues of Anglican ecclesiology as part of the Windsor process.

Methodists

The international dialogue between Anglicans and Methodists had its beginning in the Lambeth Conference of 1988. The invitation by the Anglican bishops to begin formal conversations was enthusiastically accepted by the World Methodist Council. This first phase of dialogue culminated in the 1996 report *Sharing in the Apostolic Communion*. This was greeted with appreciation by the Lambeth Conference of 1998 (Resolution IV.17) which invited Provinces to study it and where appropriate develop local agreements acknowledging areas of common faith, witness and ecclesial life.

Attempts to move toward a new phase of the dialogue were delayed for a number of reasons, including general congestion in ecumenical and other commitments on both sides. In 2007 an Anglican – Methodist International Consultation made recommendations for the establishment of an Anglican – Methodist International Commission for Unity in Mission (AMICUM), which were subsequently endorsed by the Anglican Communion’s Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the ACC, and the Standing Committee on Ecumenics and Dialogue of the World Methodist Council.

The first meeting of AMICUM took place in January 2009. The scope of its primary tasks, and proposals for a detailed work programme, were carried in the Consultation report, which is available on the Anglican Communion website. AMICUM’s principal work focuses on monitoring and resourcing Anglican – Methodist dialogues and relationships around the world, and proposing ways toward the full visible unity of Anglicans and Methodists.

Since the publication of *Sharing in the Apostolic Communion*, there have been considerable development in Anglican – Methodist relations at regional levels, including the signing of covenants of varying sorts between the Church of England and the Methodist Church in Great Britain (the subject of IASCER Resolution 5.02); between the Church of Ireland and the Methodist Church in Ireland, and the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia and the Methodist Church of New Zealand; and an agreement for interim eucharistic sharing between The Episcopal Church and the United Methodist Church.

**Resolution 5.02:
Anglican – Methodist Relations**

IASCER

- welcomes the report ‘An Anglican - Methodist Covenant: Common Statement of the Formal Conversations between the Methodist Church of Great Britain and the Church of England’ and commends the members of the formal conversations for this report, particularly for its fine sections on the history of the relationship and the healing of memories necessary along the way toward unity
- acknowledges the importance of this dialogue, finds it consistent with the Anglican Communion’s ecumenical agreements at similar stages, and awaits with interest the decisions to be taken by the Methodist Conference and the General Synod of the Church of England

- reiterates its endorsement of the establishment of an international working group with the World Methodist Council and hopes to receive a report of progress next year
- noted with approval the beginning of a new bilateral dialogue between the United Methodist Church and the Episcopal Church of the United States of America.

Resolution 1.07:

Anglican – Methodist relations

IASCER

1. welcomes the report of the Anglican – Methodist International Consultation which took place in London at the end of October 2007
2. affirms the establishment of an Anglican – Methodist Commission for Unity in Mission proposed in that report
3. commends the programme of work set out in that report as a fruitful agenda for the work of the Commission, and
4. encourages the appropriate Instruments of Communion to take the necessary steps to enable the commission to begin its work.

Moravians

Though the question of relations with Moravians (Unitas Fratrum) was on the agenda of the Lambeth Conference as early as 1888 and, indeed, dialogue between bishops took place in the 1740s, during the life of IASCER there has been no international bilateral dialogue. However, relations have continued through bodies such as the Conference of Secretaries of Christian World Communions, as well as at regional level. The 1998 Lambeth Conference welcomed *The Fetter Lane Agreement* between the Church of England and the Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland, and subsequently adopted by the Church of Ireland, and commended the *Common Statement* for study as a possible basis for similar agreement in Anglican Provinces which overlap with Moravian Provinces. These include North America, South Africa, Tanzania and the West Indies.

Dialogue between The Episcopal Church and the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in North America is moving towards a proposal for ‘full communion’. ‘Finding our Delight in the Lord: A Proposal for Full Communion’ was welcomed by IASCER in Resolution 9.08, though with some hesitation because of differences in understandings of the

diaconate, and the potential implication of these for interchangeability of ministries and the celebration of the Eucharist. (See Chapters 4 and 5 for fuller consideration of the underlying issues at stake.)

**Resolution 9.08:
'Finding our Delight in the Lord'**

IASCER

- warmly welcomes the new proposal for full communion between The Episcopal Church and the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in North America entitled 'Finding Our Delight in the Lord'
- notes that different understandings of the diaconate will preclude exchangeability of deacons between the two churches, yet the document appears to accept the Moravian practice of diaconal presidency at the Eucharist without question
- expresses its view that it would be inappropriate to encourage Episcopalians to participate in Moravian celebrations of the Eucharist where there is diaconal presidency given the difference of teaching between the two traditions, and believes this detracts from the agreement
- believes that the realisation of full communion would be enhanced by Moravian assurance that this practice will, in due course, be phased out.

Oriental Orthodox Churches

The Anglican - Oriental Orthodox Commission (AOOIC) was established in 2001 and began its work by addressing questions of christology. Building on the dialogues between the Oriental Churches and the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, the Commission quickly produced a draft 'Agreement on Christology' (available through the website www.anglicancommunion.org). This was commended to the Primates and to Provinces for study and response, by IASCER in Resolution 3.02 (and again in Resolution 4.04) and by the ACC in Resolution 13.19, in the expectation that it might be endorsed by the 2008 Lambeth Conference. In the event, the format of the 2008 Lambeth Conference meant that it was not formally tabled for a resolution.

The draft 'Agreement on Christology' is highly significant since, taken together with the work of the Oriental Orthodox family of Churches with the

Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, it heals the schism between the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the churches which accepted the Christological Definition of the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451. It therefore represents a huge step forward in ecumenical relations. The healing of a division which has afflicted the Christian household of faith for over fifteen hundred years in no small matter, even in parts of the world where direct contact between Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox is limited. Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, the Anglican Co-Chair produced a Note, reproduced below, which gives fuller background to the draft Agreement, and underlines the centrality of christology for all ecumenical work and for the life of the whole Church of God. The draft Agreement also opens up the possibilities for renewed discussions between Anglicans and the Assyrian Church of the East (the subject of Lambeth Conference Resolution IV.14).

Unfortunately, Anglican – Oriental Orthodox dialogue was suspended at the request of our partners, following the Consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson in 2003. (Pope Shenouda III raised his concerns directly with members of IASCER during an audience with him in Cairo, during the course of the 2007 meeting.)

Echoing and enlarging on the concerns of IASCER at the suspension of the dialogue and the need for the Windsor process to be fully understood (in Resolution 4.04), the ACC (in Resolution 13.19), also expressed its regret. The ACC asked the Director of Ecumenical Affairs ‘to advise the representatives of the Oriental Orthodox churches that the Primates have now twice reaffirmed the 1998 Resolution of the Lambeth Conference 1.10 as “the standard of Christian teaching on matters of human sexuality ..., which should command respect as the position overwhelmingly adopted by the bishops of the Anglican Communion” together with the affirmation of this Council, presently meeting in Nottingham, and trusts that this will provide a sufficient basis for the resumption of the work of the AOOIC.’

A visit by the Archbishop of Canterbury to Holy Etchmiadzin, the seat of the Catholicos of All Armenia, and to other Middle Eastern Oriental Orthodox patriarchs in September 2007 also did much to move the situation forward, and guests from a number of Oriental Orthodox Churches attended the Lambeth Conference. Conversations continue regarding the possibility of resuming the work of the Commission. The ACC has suggested that the Commission ‘might examine the relationship between universal and local churches, and the processes of decision making in the life of the churches’. (IASCER’s resolution 4.04 had earlier expressed the hope that reflection together on aspects of life within the Church might be of particular value: for example, the experience of the Oriental Orthodox of living together as a

family of churches could be particularly illuminating to current Anglican debate on the nature of our own Communion.)

Resolution 3.02:

Anglican – Oriental Orthodox International Commission

IASCER

thanks AOOIC for its important work on the ‘Christological Agreement’ to be submitted to the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches and:

- draws the attention of the Primates’ Meeting to this significant development;
- requests the Provinces of the Anglican Communion to submit the text of the Agreement together with a Note from the Anglican Co-Chair of AOOIC for study by those who have responsibility for monitoring faith and order issues in their Provinces requesting them to offer any comments they may have to IASCER by 30 October 2003.
- intends to give further consideration to the *Agreement* at a future meeting in the light of comments received from the Communion.

[A Note provided by Bishop Geoffrey Rowell was appended – see below]

Resolution 4.04:

Anglican – Oriental Orthodox Dialogue

IASCER

- welcomes the responses that have been received, following the request of IASCER in 2002, to the ‘Agreed Statement on Christology’ produced by the International Dialogue between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches until now divided over the Christological Definition of the Council of Chalcedon in 451
- in the light of the full and positive responses from the Provinces of Canada, Ireland and North India, and the need for the Lambeth Conference 2008 to consider ‘The Agreed Statement on Christology’, urges those Provinces that have not so far responded, or that have not regarded such a response as a matter that concerns them, to respond to this agreement touching the central theological

question of our understanding of the Lord Jesus Christ, and encourages such responses to be made by Easter 2006

- notes the response of the Standing Committee of the Oriental Orthodox Churches of the Middle East regarding the *Windsor Report* and the postponed dialogue; and encourages a response to be sought from the whole family of Oriental Orthodox Churches. In seeking such a response IASCER recognises that there is a need to explain carefully to the Oriental Orthodox Churches the processes by which the Provinces of the Anglican Communion are responding to the *Windsor Report*, and also to address some of their expressed concerns by drawing their attention to the Statement of the Primates' Meeting in October, 2003
- hopes that a resumption of the dialogue may be possible, with a consideration of *The life of the Holy Spirit in the Church* and *Living together as a family of churches*, in which the understanding and experience of Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox may be reflected on together.

A Note from the Co-Chair of the Anglican - Oriental Orthodox International Commission, The Rt Revd Dr Geoffrey Rowell, Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (see Resolution 3.02)

At the beginning of November 2002 bishops and theologians of the Anglican Communion and of the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the ancient Christian churches of Egypt, Armenia, Syria, Ethiopia and the Malabar coast of India met in Armenia. Anglicans have had long and close relations with these churches, which have now spread beyond their ancient heartlands to a diaspora in the Western world. Our meeting was the first of an official dialogue to work towards a deeper unity and even closer relations.

The separate development of these ancient churches was bound up with some of the earliest Christian divisions. Political and cultural factors not surprisingly played a part, for these were all Christian communities on the fringe of, or beyond, the Eastern Roman Empire. The Council of Chalcedon in 451, which spoke of two natures in Christ, was not accepted by these churches, whose understanding was shaped by the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria, who taught that in Christ there was 'one nature of the incarnate Word of God'. For these churches the language of two natures, divinity and humanity, seemed to come dangerously close to a schizoid Christ, keeping God at a distance. In recent decades ecumenical conversations have gone a long way to resolving this ancient difference of understanding, and we rejoiced that in our own

meeting Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox were able to agree a common statement on our understanding of Christ, and reach out to heal what is one of the most ancient Christian divisions.

Such theological divisions and arguments can easily seem remote and distant from our contemporary world. They can be mocked, as the historian Gibbon mocked the dispute over different terms of Christ in the Arian controversy, when, noting the different terms used, he said that Christendom was split over an iota. But in that controversy it was an important iota. What was at issue was whether Christ was a supernatural being but not fully God, or, as the Nicene Creed was to confess, he was fully and completely God. The ancient debates about the person of Christ have something of the same character, the point at issue being the unity of the person of Christ, the reality of his human nature and, centrally, the affirmation that God gave himself fully and completely into our human condition. In a world in which Platonist philosophy spoke of a God remote from the flux and change of history, the Christian affirmation of the incarnation, of God taking human nature, was bound to be offensive. The struggles of the early Church with the nature of Christ are in the end struggles to say that the God with whom we have to do is a God who does not stand aside from his creation, but, in the words of the fourteenth century English mystic, the Lady Julian of Norwich, is a God who ‘comes down to the very lowest part of our need’. In Christ God freely chooses to know our humanity from the inside. In Jesus we encounter no less than God incarnate. That is the radical, wonderful and challenging reality that is at the heart of the Christian faith.

This is not just a theological dispute of long ago. The remote, distant and uninvolved God, repudiated in the theological battles of the early Church, is always in danger of creeping back. The deists of the eighteenth century, who turned God into the abstraction of a first cause, setting the universe going and then remaining all but absent from it, is one instance of this. It is often such a God who is denied by atheists and tilted at by critics. But that is not the Christian God, who is uniquely revealed in Christ.

This agreed statement, as the Commission notes, builds on much ecumenical work to heal this ancient Christian division, Anglicans along with Christians from the Reformed, Roman Catholic and Orthodox traditions, have seen agreement on who Christ is as at the very heart of Christian faith and mission, as we note in § 8 of the agreed statement. Our citation of words of Richard Hooker show that what we have said is rooted in our Anglican theological tradition. We recognise that what we attempt to express is a saving mystery, the person of Jesus Christ to whom in the end our response is one of worship and adoration not the technicalities of theological statement. Our creed is part of our worship,

and words fail us in the face of the love of God who gives himself to us in Christ (§4).

In §7 we speak of the will of Christ. In him there is a perfect union of divine and human will. Every time we pray ‘Your will be done in earth as it is in heaven’ we are praying for that to be true in our own lives which was found perfectly in Christ. What we see in him, his grace makes possible for us also.

The Oriental Orthodox Churches have been often and wrongly represented as teaching a ‘monophysite’ christology. They point out that monos means isolated and alone; Saint Cyril spoke of *mia* meaning united, and therefore they should be referred to as holding a ‘miaphysite’ understanding of Christ.

In §9 there is reference to the discussion in the early twentieth century between Anglicans and the Assyrian Church of the East, originating in East Syrian Christianity associated with the name of Nestorius. In 1911, referring to the text of the Agreement, the Patriarch of the Church of the East replied to our Anglican request for a statement of their faith in relation to Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary by writing to Archbishop Randall Davidson in the following terms:

Some time ago, brother, you asked us two questions, namely concerning whether we accept the Creed of [Mar] Athanasius, and concerning [Mart] Mariam the bearer of Christ our Lord. And on these questions of yours we answer as follows. We believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ Son of God, is God and man, God of the same substance of his Father, born before the worlds, and man of the same substance of his mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man, of a rational soul and body united; equal to his Father in respect of deity, and less than his Father in respect of humanity. Being thus God and man, he is not two but one Christ: [one,] not by the change of deity into flesh but by taking humanity into God: one completely, not by the mixture of substance but by the union of person (*parsopa*). For just as a rational soul and body are one man, so God and man are one Christ, for ever.

Then, about the Blessed [Mart] Mariam: we confess that she is Bearer of Jesus Christ our Lord and our God: him with whom, at the beginning of the formation of our Lord’s manhood (*barnasha*), God the Word the second person of the Holy Trinity, was united and became one Christ, one Son, in one person (*parsopa*) for ever and ever.

And this faith, after enquiry and examination we have found to resemble and be at one with the faith of our Eastern Chaldean Church; and there is nothing in it opposed to the teaching of our fathers and to the faith of our Church. And therefore we accept and

confirm it, because we too believe and confess according to the orthodox teaching handed down to us by our fathers, the holy teachers; and for this we honour them and commemorate their names.

Anglicans have long had cordial relations with the Church of the East. It is in this spirit that we have asked that the regional discussions with the Assyrian Church of the East commended by Lambeth 1998, should take place in the light of this Agreed Statement and with reference to the concerns expressed by the Oriental Orthodox.

6 December 2002

Reformed Churches

In 1984, the Anglican – Reformed International Commission produced a substantial report, *God's Reign and Our Unity*, which has provided a significant resource for developing regional relationships between Anglicans and Reformed churches (not least *The Meissen Agreement* between British and Irish Anglican churches and the Evangelical Church in Germany, which includes Reformed, Lutheran and United churches). In 1995 an exploratory committee considered the possibility of a new body to monitor relations, sponsor joint studies and encourage co-operation, as a means of developing greater mutual understanding, which it recommended to the Lambeth Conference of 1998. Though the Conference particularly endorsed the possibility of a study of the exercise of personal episcopacy within the Reformed tradition, and case studies of local examples of sharing in mission, justice issues and congregational life (Resolution IV.22), in the event there was at the beginning of the decade no shared urgency to consider these questions, and no formal bilateral dialogue was pursued during the life-time of IASCER.

Meanwhile, Anglicans followed with interest the debates concerning closer relationships between the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) and the Lutheran World Federation (noting that some churches are members of both), particularly given the potential for implications for Lutheran - Anglican agreements. More recently WARC and the Reformed Ecumenical Council have agreed to form a new organisation, called the World Communion of Reformed Churches. Its first Uniting General Council is to be held in June 2010. In informal discussion, IASCER members expressed the hope that this union might open the door to a new phase of dialogue and breathe new life where necessary into regional relationships.

Anglican and Reformed Churches were also partners in the failed wider unity initiatives in Wales and Scotland, which are addressed in Chapter 9.

Roman Catholic Church

Formal dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics has a long history. The Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) was established by Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey and Pope Paul VI in 1967. Its terms of reference were established by *The Malta Report* in the following year. Over the last forty years it has been the principal instrument through which the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church have engaged in theological dialogue. In a context shaped by prayer, mutual respect, friendship and a shared profound desire for reconciliation, Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians have gathered annually to engage in rigorous dialogue – grounded in the Scriptures and ancient common traditions – to address the communion-dividing issues which prevent us from entering into full visible unity.

ARCIC has worked in two phases: 1970-1981 and 1983-2005. The first phase of work was completed with the publication of *The Final Report* in 1981, dealing with three topics: The Eucharist; Ministry; Authority. The second phase covered a more diverse range of topics including: *Salvation and the Church*, 1986; *The Church as Communion*, 1991; *Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church*, 1993; *The Gift of Authority*, 1999, and culminating in the publication of *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ* in 2005. (All of these documents are available through the Anglican Communion website.)

Throughout its life, IASCER undertook extensive work and passed a number of resolutions designed to promote and encourage the incorporation of these reports into the life of the Anglican Communion and its Churches. This has often taken the form of letters to Provinces, and the commissioning or provision of questions to assist in reflection and discussion. (Not all the relevant resolutions are carried here, some being no more than a sentence expressing such intent.)

Perhaps in this, more than in any other dialogue, the difficulties around providing a formal, Communion-wide response and endorsement have been most evident. Official responses were made by the two Communion (through Resolution 8 of the 1988 Lambeth Conference on the Anglican side) to the work of ARCIC I, pointing to areas of convergence or agreement in understanding, and to outstanding areas of difference (giving rise to various ‘Clarifications’ from an ARCIC sub-commission). While no comparable official response to the agreed statements of ARCIC II has been sought, IASCER has encouraged Anglican leaders and churches, through various means, to indicate their support for the continuing work of ARCIC.

Roman Catholics have taken opportunities to do the same. The Lambeth Conference of 1998 (Resolution IV.23) and ACC meetings (Resolutions 11.15 and 13.15) have similarly urged provincial responses to ARCIC's work.

One especially significant and steady expression of that support has been found in the Common Declarations of successive Popes and Archbishops of Canterbury since the inception of the dialogue, the most recent being that between Archbishop Rowan Williams and Pope Benedict XVI of November 2007 (all the Declarations are available on the Anglican Communion website). Archbishops and Popes have also met more informally fairly frequently, such as the visit of the newly enthroned Archbishop of Canterbury to meet Pope John Paul II, and his subsequent attendance at the Inauguration of the Ministry of Pope Benedict XVI.

Preparatory meetings and conversations are now underway for a third phase of ARCIC. Consideration is being given to the working methods of this next phase, given in particular the broadening of the bilateral relationship beyond theological dialogue since the Mississauga meeting of Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops in 2000, and the subsequent establishment of the International Anglican – Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission (IARCCUM). This dialogue has sought to find practical expressions of common life and witness arising out of the degree of theological agreement perceived between us. Its remit deliberately runs far wider than theology alone, and aims to build on the strengths of the 'spiritual ecumenism' that the bishops enjoyed at Mississauga through sharing in worship and Bible study, and discussion of their experiences of the Christian life, as well as broadening areas of concrete working together in all aspects of ministry and mission.

IARCCUM issued an Agreed Statement, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission (GTUM)*, in 2007. This is not an authoritative declaration by the Roman Catholic Church and Anglican Communion, but rather a report written by bishops for bishops, and 'is intended to foster discussion and reflection...and a call for action, based upon an honest appraisal of what has been achieved in our dialogue'. Thus it sets out a digest of both theological convergence to date and the work that remains outstanding and then explores ways of practical co-operation which might give effect to the degree of convergence in faith perceived. *GTUM* was provided as a resource to bishops at the 2008 Lambeth Conference (see Chapter 13). Together with two accompanying commentaries, it can be downloaded from the Anglican Communion website.

The importance of the Agreed Statement was underlined by IASCER in Resolutions 9.06, 2.07 and 8.08, which particularly commended it for study by joint meetings of Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops. The last of these resolutions provided questions to assist reflection and discussion, and commended an agreed Covenant between bishops in Newcastle, Australia as a model for practical initiatives in line with the recommendations of *GTUM*. The full text of this Covenant is given below, as an addendum to Resolution 8.08.

There have been other advances in various forms of bilateral dialogue and co-operation around the world, as recorded in Resolutions 8.06 and 3.07 below, and in Chapter 9, where other partners are involved. A particularly wide-ranging Covenant, printed there in full, was agreed between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in Papua New Guinea in 2003. This was warmly welcomed by IASCER in Resolution 7.03. (See also the section on Lutherans above, for comment on the Anglican response to the Lutheran – Roman Catholic *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*.) More generally, during IASCER's lifetime, the breadth and depth of Anglican – Roman Catholic contacts has developed considerably, with a growing number of 'ARC' meetings at diocesan and provincial level. Even so, it must be acknowledged that in some areas of the world, longstanding tensions and suspicions may still persist, though we have come a long way from the highly critical sentiments expressed in the earliest Lambeth Conferences.

Looking ahead, there needs to be clarification between the work of ARCIC and the IARCCUM statement *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (2007), not least as it is not yet clear what role *GTUM* will play in the reception of the work of ARCIC. As Provinces make their responses to the agreements articulated in the first section of *GTUM* (or to any of the agreed statements of ARCIC II) these may point to further areas where theological work needs to continue. One possible theme proposed for the work of ARCIC III is 'the Local and Universal Church'. Among other issues, this might allow for addressing a concern raised at times within IASCER that, because of our different polities, there has sometimes been a temptation to contrast the clarity of the provisions of Roman Catholic teaching on the life of the Church with the less precise experience of Anglicans.

It must be said that preparations for a third phase, though mindful of the close relations lived out by Anglicans and Roman Catholics in some regions of the world and of what has been achieved by the ARCIC dialogue thus far, have been affected by the various challenges and obstacles which complicate relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion.

Cardinal Kasper spoke frankly about these at the 2008 Lambeth Conference (see Chapter 13).

Furthermore, complications for Anglicans have come from the Roman Catholic side. In July 2007 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued *Responses to some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine of the Church* (the *Responsa*), apparently in response to debate within the Roman Catholic Church on the interpretation of documents of the Second Vatican Council, and particularly the assertion that ‘the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church’, in the face of both maximum and minimum interpretations. The *Responsa* seems to have been developed with limited consultation with the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (PCPCU), and suggests little awareness of the ecumenical implications that they inevitably raised. The JSC requested advice from IASCER, which provided a detailed background and consideration, and suggested that ARCIC III in due course be mandated to address the questions raised by the *Responsa*. The full text of IASCER’s paper is given below.

On a sadder note, during the course of IASCER’s lifetime, three significant figures in Anglican – Roman Catholic relations died, and resolutions were passed thanking God for the lives of Fr Jean-Marie Tillard (27.00), the Revd Professor Henry Chadwick (18.08) and Bishop David Beutge, the serving IARCCUM Anglican Co-Chair (19.08), and commending them to God’s everlasting love.

**Decision 27.00:
Jean-Marie Tillard**

The following resolution was passed and it was agreed to communicate the same to the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and to the Dominican Mother House in Ottawa:

Be it resolved, that this the first meeting of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations

- a. hereby notes with great sadness the passing from this life of the great Roman Catholic ecumenist Father Jean-Marie Roger Tillard
- b. records hereby its heartfelt appreciation for the many and deep contributions he has selflessly and tirelessly made toward the restoration of full visible communion, especially between the Roman Catholic Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and

- c. recognises hereby that God's gift of *koinonia* in Christ is more clearly seen as the result of his efforts throughout the course of his earthly life.

Decision 7.01:

Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification

[Text carried in full above. See Lutherans.]

Resolution 8.06:

Anglican – Roman Catholic Dialogue

IASCER

1. commends as examples of fruitful co-operation between our two communions, the following recent developments:
 - (a) the visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope Benedict XVI, and their Common Declaration in which they renewed Anglican and Roman Catholic commitment to pursue the path towards full visible communion and acknowledged the call to closer co-operation in many areas of the Church's mission and service
 - (b) the first joint meeting in Leeds, England, in November 2006, between the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales and the House of Bishops of the Church of England, together with an episcopal representative of the Church in Wales, in which the bishops met in a spirit of warm fellowship, recognising a shared vision and responsibility for the mission of the Church in today's society
 - (c) the established pattern of annual meetings in Canada between Anglican, Roman Catholic and Eastern Rite Catholic bishops, in which the bishops have recently studied together the Agreed Statement, *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*, and discussed pastoral responses to gay and lesbian people and reaffirmed the Churches' traditional teaching on marriage
 - (d) the Pastoral Letter on Marriage and Family Life from the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches of Papua New Guinea, as a fruit of the 2003 covenant between these two churches.
2. welcomes the news of the establishment of a Preparatory Commission for the Third Phase of ARCIC, and looks forward to following progress in the theological dialogue.

Resolution 9.06:

IARCCUM

IASCER

1. gratefully receives the work of IARCCUM embodied in the Agreed Statement, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*, together with the Anglican Commentary prepared by Bishop Paul Richardson
2. believes that this statement is of profound importance in offering a summary of the achievements of the theological dialogue undertaken by ARCIC and in encouraging practical co-operation in Anglican – Roman Catholic relations
3. therefore requests the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Joint Standing Committee to refer the document to the bishops and people of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion for study and response, particularly within the context of joint meetings of Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops
4. further requests the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lambeth Conference Design Group to consider ways in which the statement may be received by the Lambeth Conference 2008 and used by them as an educative resource in the course of the Conference
5. requests the Director of Ecumenical Affairs to consider further the means by which the Statement may be received in the life of the Communion, and appropriate responses solicited from the Provinces.

Resolution 2.07:

IARCCUM – *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*

IASCER

1. welcomes the Agreed Statement of IARCCUM with its record of the achievements of the Anglican – Roman Catholic theological dialogue
2. commends the recommendations in Part Two of the Agreed Statement for further collaboration in unity and mission to the bishops of the Anglican Communion, in the hope that ‘bishops will in turn engage clergy and laity in responding to the challenges set out in the text’ (the Preface of *Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Building on 40 years of Anglican – Roman Catholic Dialogue*).

3. hopes that, despite recent setbacks, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* may be a positive step towards the preparation of *The Joint Declaration of Agreement*, which would set out 'our shared goal of visible unity; an acknowledgement of the consensus of faith that we have reached, and a fresh commitment to share together in common life and witness' as envisaged by the meeting of Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops at Mississauga in May 2000 (Communion in Mission: Statement from Mississauga Meeting, May 2000)
4. welcomes the commentaries by Bishop Paul Richardson and Bishop Bernard Longley, officially commissioned by the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church respectively, noting that although officially commissioned these commentaries do not share the authority of the Agreed Statement.

Resolution 3.07:

Nippon Sei Ko Kai

IASCER

1. acknowledges with gratitude the work of the dialogue of the Nippon Sei Ko Kai and the Roman Catholic Church in Japan in preparing a Japanese translation of *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ*, and
2. requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to send greetings to the churches as they celebrate the publication of this text in Tokyo on 2 February 2008.

Resolution 8.08:

IARCCUM

IASCER

- notes that the IARCCUM report *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* has been referred by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Provinces, and to the Roman Catholic Conferences of Bishops by the President of the PCPCU, together with the request that the report be studied by Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops, if possible together
- requests the Provinces of the Anglican Communion to consider the attached questions (addendum 1), and to report their responses to the Anglican Communion Office by 31 December 2011

- welcomes the news of the *Covenant* between the Diocese of Newcastle in the Anglican Church of Australia and the Catholic Dioceses of Maitland-Newcastle and Broken Bay (addendum 2), and commends this covenant as a model for adopting practical initiatives in unity and mission in line with the recommendations of the IARCCUM Report.

Addenda

1. The Questions

Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Building on 40 years of Anglican – Roman Catholic Dialogue, an Agreed Statement of the International Anglican – Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission (IARCCUM)

The Agreed Statement *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* aims to stimulate local co-operation and ecumenical development among Anglicans and Roman Catholics. The Statement is set out in two parts, which:

- offer an honest assessment of the degree of convergence in faith discerned in the ARCIC dialogue, and
- translate that into practical ecumenical co-operation.

The Provinces of the Anglican Communion are therefore asked, if possible in co-operation with the local Roman Catholic hierarchy or their representatives, to respond to the following questions:

1. Is the degree of convergence in faith described in the document - as well as the areas noted for further discussion in the document - accurately described from your perspectives?
2. Are the possibilities for co-operation set out in the document appropriate and/or workable and/or practised in your region?

2. The Text of a Covenant between the Anglican Diocese of Newcastle, the Catholic Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle and the Catholic Diocese of Broken Bay

In the spirit of the mutual recognition of what unites us as expressed in the documents of the Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission and the recent agreed statement of the International Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission, and in the light of the tradition of collaboration and mutual respect which

already exists between us, the Anglican Diocese of Newcastle, the Catholic Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle, and the Catholic Diocese of Broken Bay hereby enter a covenant relationship in which we commit ourselves to:

- an annual Episcopal Dialogue in the both Hunter-Manning and Central Coast areas between the respective Anglican and Catholic Bishops
- an annual Ecumenical Service of Worship in both the Hunter-Manning and Central Coast areas
- an annual Joint Clergy Day for the clergy of the three Dioceses to come together to reflect on pastoral, social or theological issues which we face together
- an annual Service of Reconciliation to focus on the restoration and growth of relationships between the Roman Catholic and Anglican Communions
- an annual exchange of pulpits by the respective Anglican and Catholic Bishops in both the Hunter-Manning and Central Coast areas
- a twice-yearly meeting of the Ecumenical Commissions and Bishops of the three Dioceses
- an annual dinner to be shared by the Bishops of the three Dioceses to foster their friendship and communion
- the exploration of possibilities for the sharing of church plant
- an annual review and reaffirmation of the Covenant.

Resolution 18.08:

In memoriam Henry Chadwick

IASCER notes with sadness the passing of the Revd Professor Henry Chadwick, whose outstanding scholarship informed his unique and impressive contribution to the understanding of the roots of Christian division and the search for Christian unity. The work of this devoted and scholarly priest was deeply appreciated by both Anglicans and Roman Catholics in the ARCIC conversations, as well as by Christians of the Orthodox and many other Christian traditions. We give thanks to God for his life and works and we pray that he may rest in peace and rise in glory.

**Resolution 19.08:
In memoriam David Beetge**

IASCER

- receives with sadness the news of the recent death of Bishop David Beetge, sometime Anglican Co-Chair of IARCCUM
- gives thanks to God for the work of this outstanding bishop who gave himself unstintingly to both diocese and the wider Church, working in the service of the unity of the Church, both within his own Communion, and in our ecumenical relationship with the Roman Catholic Church
- commends him into the hands of God, praying that the ministry of unity which he undertook as a servant of the Anglican Communion may, by the providence of God, be brought to completion.

IASCER on Responses to some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church

1. Advice, as requested, to JSC, *inter alia* proposing work on a document by Anglicans to Anglicans
2. Referral to ARCIC III

1. Advice to JSC

The JSC has referred the document *Responses to some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church* to IASCER, with a request 'to make a report which can be made available to the Churches of the Anglican Communion to assist them in assessing their own reaction and feed into discernment on Anglican - Roman Catholic relations'.

Background

The document *Responses to some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church* was issued, with a Commentary, by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in July 2007, apparently in response to debate within the Roman Catholic Church on the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council's *Lumen Gentium* and *Unitatis Redintegratio*, in particular the assertion that 'the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church,' in the face of both maximal and minimal construals. Jared Wicks, a Roman Catholic theologian, has documented how the *Responsa* is critical of both narrower and more liberal interpretations of the phrase. It seems to have been developed with only limited consultation with the Pontifical Council for Promoting

Christian Unity (PCPCU), and with little awareness of the ecumenical implications that would inevitably be drawn from it. Cardinal Kasper, President of PCPCU, has been quick, if defensive, in offering interpretations to ecumenical partners.⁸⁰

Though it may be argued that there is nothing formally new in this restatement of the Roman Catholic position, it contains perplexing nuances which have raised questions for the Roman Catholic Church's ecumenical relations, and led to concerns across the Christian spectrum, in both East and West.

The Second Vatican Council, in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, spoke of the relationship between the one Church of Jesus Christ and the Church in Communion with the Bishop of Rome, and described this relationship in terms of the subsistence of the former in the latter.⁸¹ It may be that the *Responsa* is an attempt to narrow any conceptual gap that may have been left by such language, coupled with a concern that the Church of Christ cannot be visibly divided.

This intention may be evident in the wording of the Response to Question 3, which says that the expression 'subsists in' 'indicates *the full identity* of the Church of Christ with the Catholic Church' [our emphasis]. This appears to be new terminology,⁸² and may also be the first explicit statement that the Roman Catholic Church believes that the Church of Christ subsists in the Roman Catholic Church alone (Question 2), and not in the Churches of the East, though they 'merit the title of 'particular or local churches'' (Question 4), which is a variation, and arguably downgrading, of the language of *Unitatis Redintegratio*.⁸³ Their 'lack' lies in their relationship with the Bishop of Rome, whose headship is described as being an internally constitutive principle of all true particular Churches.

However, it should also be noted that the *Responsa* excludes any opinion that there is no salvation outside of the Church of Rome, since 'the Church of Christ is present and operative in the churches and ecclesial Communities not yet fully in communion with the Catholic Church, on account of the elements of sanctification and truth that are present in them' (Question 2).

As Anglicans, we understand ourselves as standing in visible continuity with the Church of the West, reaching back to the Scriptures, the Apostles, and the ancient common traditions of the Church of the Fathers of East and West, retaining both the priestly ministry of bishops and presbyters in apostolic succession, and the catholic sacraments, including 'the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic Mystery'. Therefore we do not recognise ourselves within the *Responsa*, and certainly not as one of the 'Christian Communities born out of the Reformation of the sixteenth century' (Question 5), though we would

accept that we, in common with all Western Churches, were shaped by the reforming movement of those times.

Advice

The *Responsa*, being an internal document addressing diverse trends within the Roman Catholic Church on the interpretation of conciliar documents on the Church, does not request a formal response as such.

Nevertheless, it is a public document, which refers to the ecumenical relations of the Roman Catholic Church and, as such, prompts our reflection and comment upon its claims, not least because it purports to adjudicate on the reality of other churches as expressions of the One Church of Jesus Christ. It is worth noting that official Roman Catholic circles have acknowledged that its publication, and in particular the way that it would be received by churches to which it referred, were not given adequate thought.

Though the *Responsa* has a lesser status than the relevant conciliar documents, it is a significant text with surprising nuances, which appear to modify, even retrench, Roman Catholic conciliar teaching on the subject.

IASCER therefore considers that the *Responsa* warrants careful consideration from the Anglican perspective, with particular attention being given to our self understanding in the light of the nature and mission of the Church of Christ. IASCER therefore welcomes the JSC's invitation to pursue work which addresses the questions to which the *Responsa* gives rise. IASCER considers that a rather broader consideration of questions on the nature of the church might usefully be circulated widely within the Communion (including to all bishops). This might be from the ecumenical perspective, but also include a restatement of the identity of Anglican churches as particular churches in the true sense. IASCER intends to offer such a report to the JSC in due course.

2. Referral to ARCIC

IASCER recommends that ARCIC III be mandated to address questions raised by the *Responsa*, and Cardinal Kasper's subsequent comments, on the extent to which we share common understandings on the nature of the Church, not least within its consideration of the relationship of the local and the universal Church.

IASCER also recommends that ARCIC III be mandated to consider the nature of the relationship of the Church of Rome as 'mother' church, with other churches, including with the wider Roman Catholic Church.

9. Schemes of Union and Regional Agreements

Ecumenical encounter occurs at every level of church and Christian life, from the global Communion to regions, Provinces, dioceses, parishes and even within families. Recognising one another as fellow-members of the Body of Christ can bring a new momentum to relationships, while divisions can be a source of pain and sadness. Welcoming local ecumenical initiatives, the 1998 Lambeth Conference (in Resolution IV.4) invited IASCER to study proposals already underway in Wales and Southern Africa, and in its mandate listed the monitoring and enabling of Anglican ecumenical engagement at regional as well as international levels, noting particular concerns for consistency and coherence, and for promoting the 'bearability' of anomalies encountered on the journey towards visible unity. IASCER was also asked to look at ways that agreements in one part of the world might be adopted elsewhere (on which, see also Chapter 8, and the sections on relations with Lutherans and with the Roman Catholic Church).

IASCER's work was assisted by the presence of members from both Wales and Southern Africa. Other regional matters were also brought to the Commission's attention in various ways, sometimes through Provinces seeking advice on particular issues or sharing draft proposals for comment. IASCER has also received details of agreements already made, where consultation would have been preferred at an earlier stage, in order better to uphold Anglican coherence and consistency. Questions raised by regional dialogues and proposals were among those that brought into sharpest relief the issues addressed in IASCER's thematic work. The need to be able to earth thematic work within the specific contexts of relationships around the world also helped ensure that these sometimes more theoretical considerations remained properly grounded in the 'lived life' of the Communion.

Sometimes plans do not bear fruit, and there are lessons to be learned here. For example, neither the Welsh proposal for an ecumenical bishop nor the Scottish Church Initiative for Union was agreed, and in both cases it was the largest, and historically dominant churches concerned (in Wales the Anglicans, in Scotland the Reformed) which balked at going forward, while the far smaller partners had been ready to proceed. Internationally too, IASCER found that disparities in size between dialogue partners bring added complications, which needed some sensitivity.

For the most part, however it has been a joy to join in celebrating the many examples of growing closeness between brothers and sisters in Christ around the world. Recorded in this chapter is the tip that has been visible to IASCER

of the far larger iceberg of developing relationships across the world in every sphere of Christian life and mission.

(Where regional relationships relate more directly to international bilateral dialogues, or where references to them fall within IASCER resolutions that embrace a number of issues, these are recorded in Chapter 8. The Anglican - Methodist Covenant in England is one such agreement; another is the Covenant between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in Newcastle, Australia, which was prompted by the work of ARCIC and IARCCUM.)

Brazil

In November 2007, an ‘Act of Mutual Recognition of the Administration of Baptism’ was signed between the members of CONIC, the national council of churches in Brazil, and this was warmly welcomed by IASCER the following year.

Many such agreements exist around the world. These are to be wholeheartedly encouraged. Mutual recognition of Baptism (affirmed in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral as an essential element in our ecumenical endeavours, alongside the Eucharist, as the sacraments ordained by Christ himself), provides a clear positive commitment by all parties to living and growing together within the Body of Christ. (See also the section on Baptism in Chapter 4.)

**Resolution 10.08:
The Mutual Recognition of Baptism
by the Churches of CONIC, Brazil**

IASCER

- welcomes the November 2007 document of mutual recognition of Baptism, signed by the member churches of the Conselho Nacional de Igrejas Cristãs do Brasil (CONIC): the Roman Catholic Church, the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Brazil; the United Presbyterian Church of Brazil and the Syrian Orthodox Church
- commends the positive commitment to the journey of ecumenism made explicit in the section ‘Implications of the mutual recognition of the sacrament of Baptism to the life of the churches’.

England

Some Provinces are able to devote greater resources than others to the pursuit of ecumenism. The Church of England, through its Council for Christian Unity, has the capacity to be active in many national and regional dialogues and initiatives, on which IASCER received regular updates. (More detail of these is available through the Church of England website at www.cofe.anglican.org/info/ccu. See also references and resolutions in Chapter 8, in the sections on international bilateral dialogues with Baptists, Lutherans, Methodists and Roman Catholics.) As is illustrated by Decision 15.01, on the Church of England's trilateral conversations with the Methodist Church in the UK and the United Reformed Church (UK), its engagement with ecumenical partners is accompanied by thorough reflection on pertinent questions of faith and order, that often provide useful resources on which other parts of the Communion can profitably draw.

Decision 15.01:

Church of England Trilateral *Conversations on the Way to Unity*

IASCER

- welcomes the report *Conversations on the Way to Unity* and commends the Church of England for this important work, and affirms the importance of (a) seeking unity by stages, with theological agreement accompanying each step, while recognising that ecumenical progress is not always sequentially linear, and (b) the avoidance of short-cuts in ecumenical dialogue.

Papua New Guinea

Local circumstances often provide contexts which encourage churches to work closely together. In 2003 in Papua New Guinea (PNG), Anglicans and Roman Catholics agreed a Covenant, in which they promised to work toward full unity in faith and to 'do together whatever does not have to be done separately'. One area where they committed themselves to work together was in seeking ways to strengthen family life, and to rediscover and develop a deeper appreciation of the ways in which the values of marriage and family were lived in traditional Melanesian society. This resulted in the issuing of a joint Pastoral Letter on Marriage and Family Life in 2006. The two Churches, together with Lutherans, have also signed an Agreed Statement on Baptism. The texts of the Covenant and Agreed Statement are carried below.

IASCER, in Resolution 8.06(d) (see Chapter 8, within the section on relations with the Roman Catholic Church) affirmed these as notable ecumenical advances, as has also the ACC (in Resolution 13.21).

**Resolution 7.03:
Papua New Guinea**

IASCER

- welcomes the *Covenant* between the Anglican Church in Papua New Guinea and the Roman Catholic Church in New Guinea, and the *Agreed Statement on Baptism* between the Anglican, the Evangelical Lutheran and the Catholic Churches in Papua New Guinea, and regards both as notable ecumenical advances
- in welcoming both developments, expresses the hope that the Anglican Communion Office might be given the earliest possible notice of similar proposed developments in order that IASCER and the other competent bodies of the Anglican Communion might give due consideration to such proposals.

A Covenant between the Anglican Church of Papua New Guinea and the Roman Catholic Church in Papua New Guinea

In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Believing in the will of God that all Christians are called to be one so that the world will believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, recognising our common baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity, encouraged by many years of dialogue, co-operation and friendship between our communities, wishing to respond to the pastoral needs of our people and be an effective evangelistic witness to the nation, we the bishops of the Anglican Church of PNG and the Catholic Bishops Conference, in the name of our clergy and people, enter into this covenant.

We affirm:

1. that the source of true ecclesial unity in Christ is the unity of the Triune God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit
2. that Jesus Christ, the living centre of our faith, is the Saviour and Lord of the world
3. that the desire of Christ is that the Church be one people brought together from all races, languages and cultures

4. that the life of grace is nourished by the Word of God we receive through the Scripture, Sacraments and the action of the Holy Spirit within the Church
5. that the Holy Spirit, having revealed a rich diversity of gifts in the Anglican and Roman Catholic communions while never ceasing to draw these communions into the fullness of ecclesial unity in Christ, and having enabled us internationally through ARCIC to achieve substantial agreement on the Eucharist, Ministry and Authority, now prompts us to overcome the separation which exists in doctrine and ecclesial life, in order to achieve that full visible unity which Christ wills for his Church.

We resolve:

1. to strengthen our unity in Christ and maintain our commitment to eventual full communion by:
 - pursuing theological dialogue on matters that still separate us: for example, authority and freedom, unity and pluriformity, setting limits and respecting differences, inter-communion and the validity of Anglican Orders, married priests and women's ordinations
 - having standing invitations for the attendance of one episcopal representative of the sister-Church at the yearly meeting of the Catholic Bishops' Conference and the Anglican Bishops' Meeting
 - holding an annual ARC-PNG meeting of the Ecumenical Commission of the two Churches; and
 - making an act of re-dedication to the goal of unity each Pentecost.
2. to do together whatever does not have to be done separately:
 - working together on matters of social concern and undertaking joint programmes to strengthen family life and other Christian relationships; and
 - giving mutual support in educational ministries in seminaries such as through an exchange of staff and students in specific areas of study, mutual visits, encouragement of research papers relating to Anglican/Roman Catholic issues and occasional shared prayer.
3. to give witness to our growing unity by:
 - responding to the appropriate openings of closer relationships which emerge naturally between religious orders of the two Churches, such as participation in workshops together (Xavier

Institute, the National Formators Workshop), sharing in common outreach programmes (Aitape), co-operation in various ministries (Family Life, Word Publishing, the Melanesian Institute) and an exchange of retreat and workshop directors

- working together to strengthen wider ecumenical activity, particularly through the PNG Council of Churches
- encouraging prayer for a wider unity, especially through the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity from Ascension to Pentecost; and
- making joint witness to the claims of Christ to the lapsed and to those in particular spiritual need.

19 July 2003, St Martin's Church, East Boroko, Port Moresby

(Signed) For the Anglican Church: Archbishop James Ayong

(Signed) For the Roman Catholic Church: Bishop John Ribat

An Agreed Statement on Baptism between the Anglican Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Roman Catholic Church in Papua New Guinea

We confess together that in the sacrament of baptism the Holy Spirit truly incorporates us into Christ and into his Church, justifies and truly renews us, hence we are reborn to a sharing of divine life.

We confess together that baptism is the effective sign of our participation in the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord whereby the baptised receives adoption by the Father and becomes a child of God, receives the gift of the Holy Spirit, obtains the forgiveness of sins, shares in Christ's eternal priesthood, participates in his messianic mission in the world, and becomes an inheritor of God's Kingdom.

Therefore together we recognise the necessity of baptism and affirming our common doctrine and practice in respect to this sacrament, do declare:

1. that we mutually recognise and respect each other's rite of baptism as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, the Lutheran Book of Worship and the Roman Catholic rite of Baptism
2. that the rite of baptism performed by our churches is valid and therefore not to be repeated even conditionally
3. that although our churches have always recognised the sacrament of baptism administered according to the New Testament, this

present declaration constitutes an act whereby our churches mutually give guarantee of the validity of the baptism administered by their respective ministers

4. that our churches accept the baptism of infants where the faith of the parents and of the ecclesial community supplies for the child's inability to profess a personal faith and represents a commitment to raise the child in the Christian faith
5. that baptism administered by our respective ministers are to be duly recorded in the proper registry books, and certificates of baptism delivered to all who are baptised. The presentation of the said certificate of baptism shall be deemed sufficient evidence of the fact and validity of baptism. We agree, in cases of real doubt to consult each other in these matters
6. that we commit ourselves to earnest continual prayer, consultation and working together so that we may come to the fullness of our unity in Christ of which baptism is the foundation, the impetus and the pledge.

In testimony thereof, we affix our signatures this 19th day of July in the year of our Lord 2003 at St Mary's Cathedral, Port Moresby.

(Signed) For the Anglican Church in PNG: Archbishop James Ayong

(Signed) For the Evangelical Lutheran Church of PNG: Assistant Bishop
Kiage Mоторо

(Signed) For the Roman Catholic Church in PNG: Bishop John Ribat

Scotland

The referral to IASCER of the Scottish Church Initiative for Union (SCIFU) illustrates the way that the Commission was ready to work with Provinces to provide assistance and advice in support of their pursuit of ecumenical developments. In its Resolution 13.01, IASCER flagged up potentially sensitive areas, but underlined the wider context of an openness to consider innovative proposals. Though conscious of the need to be true to Anglican self-understanding, IASCER had no desire to impose a static interpretation of what this might mean. The Commission was fully aware of the vocation of Anglicans to work creatively towards full visible unity within the Church of God – which might mean exploring new territory and setting new precedents in hearkening to Jesus' call to 'follow me'.

**Decision 13.01:
Scottish Church Initiative for Union (SCIFU)**

IASCER, meeting in Cape Town 1 - 7 December 2001, studied the documentation we had received to date regarding the Scottish Church Initiative for Union (SCIFU) consisting of the Second Interim Report with Appendices I and III (Revised). It was noted that a third and final report is still to be prepared which will incorporate contributions from the ongoing study of this initiative by the Scottish Churches.

IASCER is keenly interested to follow this initiative closely. We note that the material available to us is largely theological background for the structures of union being proposed and that a plan of union containing specific details of the steps and stages leading to union is yet to appear, including the way that the Churches involved might move from mutual recognition to eventual reconciliation of ministries. There are hints of proposals to come which for Anglicans would be innovative in terms of our understanding of Holy Orders, including the consideration of the participation of elders and lay people in the laying on of hands in ordination.

IASCER wishes to convey to the authorities of the Scottish Episcopal Church the willingness of this Commission to be of assistance as SCIFU takes shape, including offering an assessment of how such proposals are consistent with the Anglican Communion's international ecumenical agreements and how, if at all, such proposals would affect the life of the Anglican Communion as a whole.

Southern Africa

The Anglican Church of Southern Africa (ACSA, previously the Church of the Province of Southern Africa, CPSA) referred two areas of ecumenical to IASCER. The related to dialogue begun in the 1960s between Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists in Southern Africa which resulted in 1968 with agreement to form a Church Unity Commission (CUC), through which in 1974 members pledged in a joint declaration of intent to seek union. (A number of other churches have since become observers to the CUC, though without making the same commitment to pursuing unity.) In subsequent years, while more ambitious proposals towards unity did not bear fruit, various steps forward were made, including a Covenant Agreement on Mutual Recognition of Ministers. The 1998 Lambeth Conference noted this with interest (Resolution IV.4) and referred the continuing work of the CUC to IASCER.

In the early years of IASCER, the CUC was pursuing work on the nature of *episcopate* and on the different understandings among partner churches. Consideration was also being given to producing a common ordinal. Discussion at IASCER provided resources for its Southern African members to draw on within CUC discussions. More recently, it has been evident that the momentum towards full visible unity has weakened, and instead there has been growing work in other areas of co-operation, such as the development and sharing of liturgical resources appropriate to the circumstances and cultures of Southern Africa.

As with the Welsh Covenant experience (see below), this is an example of how early enthusiasm for unity cannot always be translated into the necessary radical action as readily as might have been anticipated. Within the Southern African context it is possible too that political developments have lessened the sense of urgency previously present.

Returning to the question in 2008, IASCER suggested that where it is not possible for all parties to agree to move forward in unison, it may be possible for two or more to explore whether, within the wider context, they might be able to make some of the hoped for advances, in the hope that others might come to participate at a later date. This could be understood as one way of proceeding ‘by stages’ as a means of ecumenical progress (see Chapter 2, The Processes of Ecumenism).

**Resolution 12.08:
The Church Unity Commission in South Africa**

IASCER

- gratefully receives the documentation from the Church Unity Commission in Southern Africa having followed with interest the progress of the Commission over the years
- notes the pace of development in this scheme and the obstacles to visible unity that remain to be overcome
- is aware of the considerable challenges of a multi-lateral approach to church unity schemes and suggests consideration of alternative approaches to the dialogue such as bilateral initiatives within the overall multi-lateral framework
- further suggests that the goal of ‘full visible communion’ between those Churches that are already closer to one another in their ecclesiology and polity might be investigated.

A second relationship on which advice was sought from IASCER was that between the Anglican Church of Southern Africa and the Ethiopian Episcopal Church (EEC). The latter has its roots not in the first century North African church, but in the reference to 'Ethiopia' in Psalm 68.31, on which various African churches drew from the late nineteenth century in their aspirations to pursue a legitimately incultured expression of Christianity. Such a group contacted the CPSA, seeking a means by which it might receive valid orders within the historic ministry, and in 1900 through a Compact became incorporated as the 'Order of Ethiopia' within the CPSA. The relationship between Church and Order has a long and complex history, within which agreement was reached in 1979 that the Order should have its own bishop. Siggibo Dwane was duly consecrated in 1983. The Order subsequently requested that the Canon providing for the Order be rescinded. This happened in 1999, following which the now independent Order reconstituted itself as the Ethiopian Episcopal Church.

The question then arose of the nature of the new relationship between the EEC and both the CPSA (subsequently ACSA) and the wider Anglican Communion (it should be noted that Bishop Dwane had at one point been a member of the Anglican - Orthodox dialogue). IASCER followed developments closely, making clear that it looked to ACSA to take the lead in the development of a new basis of relating. A succinct covenant of 'full communion' was agreed between the two churches in 2003, which was welcomed by the ACC (in Resolution 13.21) which 'looked forward to the time when CPSA may be able to recommend that EEC become a church in communion with the wider Anglican Communion'.

However, as explored in Chapter 3, the question of how a church enters into communion with the Anglican Communion as a whole is by no means simple. In this case, the church in question is small and only found within one of the Communion's Provinces. IASCER continued to offer comment to ACSA on this question, and remained ready to engage further, as the nature of ACSA's evolving relationship with its new partner, and the implications of this for the wider Communion, become more clear. It is likely that this question will come before IASCUFO.

Sri Lanka

Though earlier discussions in Ceylon (at the time of parallel initiatives elsewhere in South Asia) did not result in the formation of a united church, a fresh initiative was taken in 2007 by the National Council of Churches of Sri Lanka to launch a Confederation of Christian Churches in Sri Lanka in 2008. The initiative has an ambitious timetable for working and growing together

and amalgamating various activities and structures, including the mutual recognition of ministries by means of a shared liturgical act by the end of 2009.

IASCER warmly welcomed this initiative, giving its full support. The Commission's concern was that the time-frame envisaged might be insufficient to allow adequate consideration – whether within Sri Lanka, or in conjunction with partners such as the global Anglican Communion through IASCER – of the various aspects of church life that these steps might raise. When such circumstances arose, IASCER would often, as here, nominate from among its members a contact group to assist the Director of Ecumenical Affairs on any urgent questions that may arise between its meetings (or, as in this case, between the ending of IASCER's mandate and the first meeting of IASCUFO).

Resolution 11.08:

The Confederation of Christian Churches in Sri Lanka

IASCER

- welcomes the ecumenical initiative of the Confederation of Christian Churches in Sri Lanka and hopes that it will result in a significant step towards full, visible unity
- expresses a concern that the proposed timetable does not allow sufficient time for deliberation and consultation given the complexity of some of the issues involved. The nature of the mutual recognition of ministries and the liturgical act intended to bring this about need further elucidation and IASCER has nominated a small group to assist the Director of Ecumenical Affairs in advising on this matter when these further elucidations are to hand.

United States of America

The Episcopal Church is another Anglican Province which is able to devote considerable resources devoted to ecumenical work, and so is able to pursue a rich and varied range of relationships, both within the USA and beyond, through its Office of Ecumenical and Inter-religious Relations. (More details are available on the website, www.episcopalchurch.org/eir.htm, and see Chapter 8, the introductory comments, and the sections on relations with the Methodists and Moravians.)

Among the many areas in which TEC is engaged has been the Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC) initiative, which was encouraged by IASCER in

2003, though with certain reservations, as spelled out in Resolution 9.03. In the event, progress was not as swift as anticipated, and it was reported in 2008 that various partners were exploring what advances might be made bilaterally, though still under the CUIC umbrella, with the expectation that this might be the most fruitful avenue ahead at this point (there are parallels with Southern Africa and the Church Unity Commission, above).

**Resolution 9.03:
Churches Uniting in Christ (United States of America)**

IASCER

- is generally encouraged by recent progress within CUIC on the reconciliation of ministries
- is, however, concerned about the extensive use of functional, as opposed to sacramental, language for ministry
- advises that the tendency to use ‘ministry’ as a synonym for Christian life and discipleship should be avoided
- points out that the sufficiency of ‘servant’ language to describe the diaconate is being widely reconsidered in the light of fresh New Testament scholarship
- expresses the hope that some of this material may be recast to reflect a theology of ministry and holy order that is more clearly focussed on the nature and purpose of the Church.

Wales

In 1975, Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Reformed Churches in Wales adopted a Covenant (known as *Enfys*, meaning rainbow, and subsequently joined by certain Baptist congregations) to work towards ‘visible unity’. A 1986 comprehensive scheme for union, ‘Ministry in a Uniting Church’, did not go forward, failing to find the necessary support within the Church in Wales, and so a rather less ambitious proposal was put forward to begin with the consecration of an ‘ecumenical bishop’ to exercise oversight particularly in relation to local ecumenical projects in a distinct area of Cardiff shared between Anglicans, Methodists and the United Reformed Church. The 1998 Lambeth Conference referred the proposal to IASCER for study (Resolution IV.4.b). In the event, the scheme failed to receive the necessary majority at the Church in Wales’ Governing Body meeting in 2002, and was dropped, though the commitment of the covenanting churches still remains that of working for visible unity.

IASCER gave thorough consideration to the scheme, and raised a number of detailed questions (though recognising that the timing of processes within Provinces did not always sit easily with IASCER's calendar). These related to the consistency of the scheme with Anglican understandings of ordination and episcopal ministry, and the extent to which any anomalies arising could be seen as being on a clear trajectory towards more comprehensive visible unity, and therefore bearable. These questions were among those informing IASCER's thematic work on Communion (including on anomalies, Chapter 3) and Holy Orders (Chapter 5).

Decision 12.01:

Wales

IASCER, following on the Resolution IV.4(b) of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, has received updates on the proposal for an Ecumenical Bishop for Wales along with some supporting documentation. The Commission welcomes, and desires to offer constructive support to, the intention of the Church in Wales to explore, along with the Methodist Church in Wales and the United Reformed Church (UK), how shared episcopal oversight might be provided for the Local Ecumenical Partnerships and other participating congregations in the region proposed.

IASCER is aware that Primates and officials in other Provinces of the Communion may seek its advice on the proposal. We regret that, due to the timing of the Welsh Governing Body procedures, more detail was not available to the Commission which would enable a responsible and careful study of the complex issues involved in this pioneering scheme. It was not possible, therefore, to assess fully whether the plan is consistent with our Anglican ecumenical dialogues or how the relations of communion between Wales and other Provinces might be affected. Some questions that IASCER has, at this preliminary stage of review, include:

- What are the implications of *per saltum* ordination to the episcopate for wider acceptance of the ecumenical bishop within the Anglican Communion?
- Are the three bishops mentioned in the ordination rite understood to be three bishops in historic succession? Are lay persons among those groups which might lay on hands in the ordination?
- What is the relationship of the ecumenical bishop to the structures of oversight of all the participating Churches?

- How does this proposal relate to more a more comprehensive move towards visible unity as envisaged in the Welsh Covenant?
- What next steps would follow, including the way that the Church in Wales might move from mutual recognition to eventual reconciliation of ministries of the other covenanting Churches, if the review of this experiment were found favourable?
- The Commission would be grateful to receive further documentation when that is available so that a more detailed study can be made, in parallel with the timing of the Welsh Governing Body procedures, in order to assist both the Church in Wales and other Anglican Provinces.

10. Multilateral Relations

Alongside the wealth of bilateral and regional dialogues and other contacts with our ecumenical partners, Anglicans pursue their ecumenical vocation through various multilateral fora.

Chief among these is the World Council of Churches (WCC), of which most Anglican Provinces are members. Within the WCC, Anglicans have always given priority to the work of the Faith and Order Commission, which has a specific responsibility for studying questions related to Christian division.

Two other multilateral ecumenical fora have grown in significance during the life-time of IASCER, and are also considered here. The first is the Conference of Secretaries of Christian World Communions, an informal body through which General Secretaries and their equivalents, can meet to exchange information and co-ordinate their work. The Global Christian Forum is an exciting new development, which aims to bring together the widest possible range of Christians. Rather than focussing on questions of faith and order, its meetings begin with personal encounter through sharing faith journeys and exploring the shared challenges faced by Christians. Thus relationships can be built and deepened through hearing how God has been perceived to work in the lives of each of the participants, and recognition of a relationship with Christ thus forms a foundation for conversation and dialogue among partners who might previously have had little or no mutual engagement. As underlined in Chapter 2, the Anglican Communion actively supports this ‘affective’ or ‘spiritual’ ecumenism, as a means of complementing and strengthening more traditional ecumenical approaches.

Christian World Communions

The Conference of Secretaries of Christian World Communions (CS/CWCs) is an informal body, which brings together the General Secretaries of all those Christian bodies which can claim a global presence in an annual meeting to exchange information and co-ordinate the work undertaken by their various offices. The Conference has neither constitution nor membership as such, but allows for fellowship, co-operation and mutual understanding across the world communions.

The effectiveness of this body has grown during the last decade, and IASCER saw it as potentially playing a more significant role within global ecumenism in the future. With participation by the World Evangelical Alliance, the Pentecostal World Fellowship and the Organisation of African Instituted Churches, the CS/CWCs spans almost the entire Christian family. As

mentioned in Chapter 8, it also provides valuable opportunities for maintaining a relationship with those partners with whom the Anglican Communion does not have a formal dialogue, and allows for the broader exchange of information and insights from bilateral ecumenical advances.

**Resolution 5.04:
Christian World Communions**

IASCER

- welcomes the general direction of the draft resolutions of the meeting of Secretaries of Christian World Communions, in the spirit of the Lund principle that Churches should do together all those things that deep differences of conviction do not compel them to do separately
- encourages the Secretaries of the CWCs to consult each other prior to advising their communions on any proposed communion-wide initiatives and to take ecumenical considerations into account at an early stage
- wishes to see the CWCs taking a more prominent role in the ecumenical movement generally and in the WCC in particular.

Faith and Order

The Faith and Order Commission of the WCC has as its aim ‘to proclaim the oneness of the Church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship’. The chief means of achieving this goal is through study programmes dealing with theological questions that divide the churches. Its membership includes the Roman Catholic Church and others who are not members of the WCC. Anglicans serve Faith and Order in various capacities, including on its standing commission, and have always given its work priority (this was underlined within the Message to the WCC of IASCER Resolution 6.04, contained in the section on the WCC below). Since January 2008 the post of Director of the Commission on Faith and Order has been held by Canon Professor John Gibaut, a member of IASCER from 2004.

The Faith and Order Commission has produced a number of significant ecumenical texts, of which the Lima Document of 1982, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, has particular importance and remains a vital ecumenical resource for today. More recent studies include ‘A Treasure in Earthen Vessels: An Instrument for an Ecumenical Reflection on Hermeneutics’;

‘Called to be One Church’; and ‘The Nature and Mission of the Church’. The latter two were referred to the WCC’s member churches following the Ninth Assembly at Porto Alegre in 2006 (of which ‘Called to be One Church’ is formally a document, although produced by Faith and Order). IASCER, in Resolution 4.06, commended both to Provinces and, providing a brief explanatory commentary, encouraged a timely response to the WCC.

In 2008, the Faith and Order Commission hosted the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogues. In Resolution 14.08, IASCER warmly commended the recommendations in the statement from the meeting to provincial ecumenical officers and all involved in bilateral dialogues. The text is available at www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p2/breklum-statement.pdf.

Later in 2008 the Faith and Order Commission, in partnership with the Monastery of Bose in Italy, held a consultation on ‘The Cloud of Witnesses’. This discussed how particular figures commemorated in churches’ calendars and traditions may at times be controversial and contribute to division. Ways were considered that allow shared celebration of the communion of the saints to serve the goals of greater unity. IASCER gave its full support for this initiative in Resolution 6.08.

**Resolution 4.06:
WCC Ecclesiological Texts**

IASCER

1. notes the referral by the WCC to member churches of two ecclesiological texts following the 9th Assembly at Porto Alegre in 2006. One is Faith and Order Paper 198 ‘The Nature and Mission of the Church’; the other, the Assembly’s own statement ‘Called to be the One Church’. Churches are asked to reflect on both texts and their associated questions
2. encourages Provinces of the Anglican Communion to respond to the WCC not later than January 2010, bearing in mind the different purposes of the two texts, and should be grateful if such responses are copied to the Anglican Communion Office.

‘Called to be the One Church’ stands in the line of previous Assembly statements on unity (New Delhi, Uppsala, Nairobi, Vancouver, Canberra) and encourages the churches to offer their commitment to the goal of full visible unity. As part of the Anglican response, IASCER particularly hopes that this statement may be considered by parish and local ecumenical groups.

'The Nature and Mission of the Church' is part of a longer-term project designed ultimately 'to give expression to what the churches can now say together about the nature and mission of the Church and, within that agreement, to explore the extent to which the remaining church-dividing issues may be overcome'. IASCER acknowledges both the ultimate goal and the interim nature of the present text. It therefore commends the document to the member churches of the Communion, encouraging them to engage with the issues raised in the text, drawing on their best theological, academic, ecumenical and pastoral resources as they do so.

**Resolution 6.08:
The 'Cloud of Witnesses'**

IASCER, recognising both that the communion of saints and martyrs is a pledge (*arrabon*) of the unity and holiness in Christ that the Church on earth is called to manifest and proclaim, and that conversely their witness (and in certain circumstances their deaths, especially at the hands of fellow Christians) can be a church-dividing issue and obstacle to unity,

- welcomes the joint initiative of the Monastery of Bose and the WCC Faith and Order Commission - and specifically the communiqué of the recent symposium at Bose - to promote the call (first made at the Commission meeting in Bangalore in 1978) for the ecumenical commemoration of the 'cloud of witnesses' (*Hebrews* 12.2)
- encourages
 - a. the WCC Faith and Order Commission to produce a short text on the communion of saints
 - b. all Provinces of the Anglican Communion to collaborate with the WCC Faith and Order Commission in carrying this project forward with the goal of discerning a common ecumenical martyrology, and
 - c. all Christians, especially those involved in bilateral and multilateral ecumenical dialogue, to find ways of giving expression to a shared confession and commemoration of the communion of saints, thus making more visible the degree of communion that already exists
- draws attention to Resolutions 77-80 of the Lambeth Conference 1958, and Resolution 21 of ACC-9 which address these topics.

**Resolution 14.08:
The Ninth Bilateral Forum**

IASCER

- welcomes the Statement of the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogues (held at Breklum, Germany, 10-15 March 2008)
- commends its recommendations to those concerned with Anglican bilateral dialogues and to provincial ecumenical officers.

Global Christian Forum

Towards the end of the 1990s, the then Secretary General of the WCC, Dr Konrad Reiser, realised that though in many ways the WCC was a privileged instrument within the ecumenical world, it was unlikely ever to embrace the full breadth of the Christian family. Because of differences in institutional structure, the Roman Catholic Church, though enjoying a close relationship, has remained outside the WCC; and it was also unlikely that Independent Evangelical and Pentecostal bodies would come into membership (indeed, contacts between these and the historic churches were often slender at best).

At Dr Raiser's initiative, the Global Christian Forum (GCF) began in 1998 as a series of conversations among diverse faith traditions representing a wider range of churches than are members of the WCC. From this an independent 'continuation committee' was set up, which facilitated a series of regional encounters held around the globe, at which a wide range of Christians were able to explore common ground, share personal testimony and discuss possibilities for fellowship. These culminated in the gathering of some 250 Christians at a fully international Global Forum meeting near Nairobi in 2007. There representatives from every strand of the Christian *oikumene*, including many of the leading figures in the Pentecostal movement, gathered together in a spirit of encounter and co-operation. An Anglican delegation of eleven attended the global event, marking our strong support for this initiative. Canon David Hamid, Director of Ecumenical Affairs, participated in the earliest conversations and served on the continuation committee, where he was succeeded by Sarah Rowland Jones, who continues to represent the Anglican Communion as the GCF moves into a new phase of operation.

The methodology of the GCF is distinctive in that it does not seek doctrinal or institutional engagement, but operates on an affective level. Participants begin listening and sharing their understanding of how God has been at work in their lives, so that they are enabled to 'recognise Christ in one another'. In this way Christians who were not previously in contact have been brought

into relationships of growing trust. This has led to opportunities to explore differences and deal with issues of suspicion or historic legacies of difference, particularly between parts of the Roman Catholic Church and some Pentecostal and Evangelical groups. As mentioned in Chapter 8, the Forum has provided a valuable context also for developing Anglican relationships in this area, which were commended by the 1998 Lambeth Conference in Resolutions IV.21 and IV.25.

The ACC affirmed the work of the GCF in Resolution 13.22, and commended its listening-based methodology. In Resolution 5.07, IASCER expressed its enthusiasm for the Global Forum meeting of 2007, and in this, and Resolution 13.08, endorsed proposals for developing the work of the Forum. The 2008 Lambeth Conference also endorsed the Forum's work (*Indaba Reflections*, 78).

The Forum's 'Message to Brothers and Sisters in Christ throughout the World, and its Proposals for the Future', along with other information, is available through the website, www.globalchristianforum.org.

**Resolution 5.07:
The Global Christian Forum**

IASCER

1. rejoices at the culmination of the Global Christian Forum process with the meeting in Limuru, Kenya, in November 2007, of an 'unprecedentedly broad gathering' of Christian leaders under the theme of 'Our Journey with Jesus Christ the Reconciler', and the issuing of their 'Message to Brothers and Sisters in Christ throughout the World'
2. congratulates the Continuation Committee on the success of their work, and thanks the Revd Sarah Rowland Jones for the significant contribution she has made to this
3. endorses the 'Proposals for the Future of the Global Christian Forum' produced by the Limuru Meeting for evaluating and continuing the work of the Forum, particularly at the regional level
4. affirms the Anglican Communion's continuing support for the role of the Forum process in extending, strengthening and supplementing existing encounters between Christian communities, and in bringing affective and spiritual dimensions more fully alongside cognitive approaches to ecumenism

5. encourages Anglicans to engage with future expressions of the Forum process
6. commends the method of the Global Christian Forum which places at its heart the sharing of individuals' accounts of their journeys of faith as a means of deepening our understanding of one another, 'our ability to recognise how God is graciously at work among us', and our fellowship in the gospel.

**Resolution 13.08:
The Global Christian Forum**

IASCER

- welcomes the proposals for the further development of the Global Christian Forum for the period 2009-2011, noting the distinctive nature of this forum, and commending its unique vision and vocation at different levels of its engagement.

World Council of Churches

The WCC has 349 member churches, denominations and church fellowships, which span more than 110 countries and territories throughout the world, representing over 560 million Christians. Most Anglican Provinces are members. Its primary aim is to deepen the fellowship of Christian churches and communities so they may see in one another authentic expressions of the 'one holy, catholic and apostolic church'. This then becomes the basis for joining in a common confession of the apostolic faith, co-operating in mission and human service endeavours and, where possible, sharing in the sacraments. Established in 1948, its work has been a significant resource for Anglican ecumenical engagement (for example, in the two passages from Assemblies cited in the Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism in Chapter 2, or through the Lima document on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* quoted in Chapters 4 and 5, or the Lund Principle quoted in Resolution 5.04 above, and reaffirmed by the 2008 Lambeth Conference in *Indaba Reflections*, 73).

The WCC held its Ninth Assembly at Porto Alegre in February 2006, at which Anglicans had a significant presence, and in 2008 celebrated the 60th anniversary of its founding. At this it successfully introduced a 'consensus model' which it had been developing for debate. IASCER in Resolution 2.06 welcomed this and committed itself to consider its wider use within the Anglican Communion, also commending it to the Design Group for the 2008 Lambeth Conference.

The WCC launched an important evaluation of its own work within the context of wider developments in ecumenism. This has become known as Reconfiguring the Ecumenical Movement. The genesis of this lay in discussion of how to carry the ecumenical movement into the 21st century. The 20th century had been a century of sea change with respect to the quest for unity among Christians, but as the churches moved into the new millennium questions needed to be asked about the adequacy of the instruments which carried ecumenism forward (some of these concerns, for example, over the fuller participation of the Orthodox families of churches and of the Roman Catholic Church, were raised at the 1998 Lambeth Conference in Resolution IV.7). The WCC has been an active and willing participant in this wider debate, and in the Reconfiguring initiative is asking searching questions about its own role and how best to serve Christ's Body. IASCER's Resolutions 10.03 and 6.04 addressed these issues, and a longer Message (endorsed by the ACC in Resolution 13.22) was sent to the WCC, the text of which is carried below.

The WCC has been exploring the idea of an 'expanded space' around its next General Assembly in 2013, where other Christian World Communions might have the opportunity to meet in some form. IASCER addressed this question in Resolution 3.06, expressing caution about the nature of the space envisaged. Debate over what the space might entail continues at various levels, including through the meetings of the CS/CWCs.

Another important area of work by the WCC is the pursuit of a common date for Easter. The 1998 Lambeth Conference (in Resolution IV.8) commended the WCC's proposals to Provinces. It will be for IASCUFO to monitor progress towards this goal.

**Resolution 10.03:
Reconfiguration of the Ecumenical Movement**

IASCER

- reaffirms Resolution IV.7 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference that called for the reform reaffirms Resolution IV.7 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference that called for the reform of the WCC in such wise that the Orthodox Churches would wish to remain within the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church would wish to participate more fully in its work
- believes that rediscovering the founding vision of the WCC as a 'fellowship of churches' is the key to a viable future for the WCC

- welcomes the recommendations of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the WCC
- questions the wisdom of planning a full Global Christian Forum event in 2007 without considering its relationship to the next Assembly of the WCC in 2006
- believes that the reform of the WCC, including a degree of devolution to global regions and national councils of churches, could make the idea of a global forum largely redundant.

**Resolution 6.04:
The World Council of Churches**

IASCER

- adopts the message to the World Council of Churches (*see below*) and requests the Director of Ecumenical Affairs to forward it to the Secretary General of the World Council
- requests the Deputy Secretary General of the Anglican Communion to establish an electronic meeting that would enable Anglican delegates and advisers to the World Council of Churches in Porto Alegre, Brazil in February 2006 to exchange information and Anglican perspectives as part of their preparation for that meeting
- requests the member churches of the Anglican Communion to send contact information about their participants in the Assembly to the Anglican Communion Office as soon as possible.

**Resolution 2.06:
WCC Consensus Model**

IASCER

1. notes with interest the World Council of Churches' use of a consensus model of discernment in its Ninth Assembly meeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in February 2006
2. commits itself to further investigation as to the appropriateness of this tool for spiritual discernment in ecumenical dialogue, and in IASCER's own work, and
3. commends a similar process of investigation to the Lambeth Design Group.

**Resolution 3.06:
World Council of Churches Joint Assembly**

IASCER

1. welcomes the resolve of the World Council to work more closely with the Christian World Communions, and, in particular, the proposal to set up a Joint Working Party between the World Council and the Christian World Communions
2. welcomes the proposal to find enlarged space for the Christian World Communions at future Assemblies of the World Council of Churches
3. nevertheless expresses profound caution with respect to the proposal of the General Secretary of the World Council for a Joint Assembly
4. trusts that representatives of the Anglican Communion will be able to participate fully in any discussions or Working Party that is established as a result of the initiatives adopted at the 9th Assembly of the World Council in this respect.

Message to the World Council of Churches (see Resolution 6.04)

Members of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER), meeting in Jamaica December 5-10, 2004, received reports of the Kuala Lumpur meeting of the Faith and Order Plenary Commission of the World Council of Churches, and of the Geneva meeting on Reconfiguring the Ecumenical Movement.

IASCER wishes to express some concern about the present situation of the World Council of Churches. We recognise that there has been a steady diminution of money and staff over the past decade. This situation should lead to a serious scrutiny of the Council's activity, with a view to discontinuing any work that is more appropriately done regionally or locally. Without such scrutiny, undertaken in consultation with member churches, we fear that the Council will continue some programmes because of their history rather than because of their necessity in the present moment and for the future.

IASCER also has a concern that meetings of the WCC do not always make the most of the opportunities for the work or the ecumenical movement when representatives of member churches come together. There is sometimes not enough attention paid to questions of process design that would facilitate every participant making their best contribution and meeting with people from other traditions in a way that promotes ecumenical friendship and furthers understanding.

Despite the warm hospitality of local hosts, the joy of meeting, and some significant contributions, IASCEC notes with concern some negative reports of the Plenary Commission of Faith and Order meeting in Kuala Lumpur in July/August 2004.

Anglicans bear a particular concern for the welfare of Faith and Order, having been strongly committed to the movement from its beginning. Indeed, for many Anglican churches, Faith and Order remains the most privileged instrument for serving the quest for the full visible unity of the Church. We thus regret the tendencies in recent years to weaken the role and particular focus of Faith and Order within the World Council of Churches as a whole. While we welcome the way in which its theological support is often sought for other programmes, we think this should not be allowed to distract Faith and Order from its core responsibilities in the area of ecumenical ecclesiology.

Anglican priorities lead us to insist that in any reconfiguring of the ecumenical movement, the central place of Faith and Order should be maintained and strengthened. Without this, we consider the future of the World Council of Churches may look increasingly vulnerable and the churches' quest for unity may be compromised.

At the same time as we offer these critical points, we want to affirm the new ways of working undertaken by the Council in response to the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation, particularly in making decisions as much as possible by consensus. We believe that this will strengthen the Council's ability to be a fellowship of churches and to serve the member churches in their ecumenical endeavours.

PART FOUR
Anglican Issues

11. Liaison with other Anglican Bodies

Vocation to the full, visible unity of the Body of Christ, as has been noted, has required IASCER to take a comprehensive perspective across every area of Anglican life as it impinges on our relationships with others. Our partners in dialogue are not merely concerned with what Anglicans think in areas of doctrine and ecclesiology. They look at all we are and do – and it is across this spectrum that IASCER has often been prompted to reflect and consider.

This has inevitably brought IASCER into conversation with other Anglican bodies (as Chapter 3 noted in relation to the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission on questions of ‘communion’, considered further below). IASCER’s objective has been two-fold: to offer for our internal reflections the insights gleaned from our ecumenical engagement, and to encourage appropriate consideration of ecumenical dimensions and implications within Anglican deliberations. It was helpful that among the membership of IASCER were members of IATDC, IALC, the ACC, and the 2008 Lambeth Conference Design Group, who ensured liaison.

International Anglican Liturgical Consultation

Anglicans have traditionally set great store by the ancient Christian phrase *lex orandi, lex credendi*, which loosely translates from Latin as ‘the law of prayer is the law of belief’, where prayer and worship can both shape and reflect what we believe. To a considerable degree what we believe, and our Anglicanism, are expressed in our liturgical life. This is of interest then to ecumenical partners, as illustrated in the way that our ordination practices and rites are so often a central question in dialogues and agreements. (See Chapter 5 on Holy Order.) Conversely, Chapter 6 recorded how the bishops at Lambeth in 1998 noted that familiarity with ecumenical understandings and methodology could be of assistance in inculturating liturgy appropriately.

Resolution IV.12 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, urged consonance between ecumenical agreements and new provincial liturgical texts and practices. IASCER pursued this responsibility in relation to Baptism and Eucharist, taking into account the touchstone provided by the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, as recorded in Chapter 4.

Another aspect of our commitment to both self-understanding and ecumenical engagement on the basis of the third element of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, ‘the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself – Baptism and the Supper of our Lord – ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of Institution, and the elements ordained by Him’ was

highlighted by IALC's work on the Eucharist. Research indicated wheat bread and grape wine were sometimes being substituted. IASCER issued two Resolutions, 17.01 and then 11.06 after the finalising of IALC's report, which underlined the normative use of bread and wine. The latter resolution was subsequently endorsed in Resolution 12 of the JSC meeting of February 2007:

That the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council affirm the Resolution of IASCER meeting in 2006 on Eucharistic Food and Drink and endorses its affirmation of the normative use of the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist.

**Decision 17.01:
Eucharistic Food (IALC)**

IASCER noted the resolution of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation that a recommendation be sent to the Standing Committee of the ACC 'that a survey be conducted to determine practice in relation to the elements of Holy Communion throughout the Communion, with particular reference to the reasons for local practice where it is different and also a proposal that the ACC form a small working group, including members of the IALC, to study the data and draft a report with suggested guidelines for further consideration by IALC and the ACC Standing Committee.' The Commission, having studied the paper by Paul Gibson which introduced the IALC debate and the debate itself as summarised in the IALC minutes and recognising the particular difficulties facing churches in certain regions, wishes to draw the attention of the Primates and the Standing Committee of ACC to the following points, which reflect the Church's constant tradition, based on the biblical record:

1. The constitutive authority for the Eucharist lies in the action of Jesus at the Last Supper in taking, blessing, breaking and giving bread and wine and commanding his disciples to do this in remembrance of him. As Paul writes, 'As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup we proclaim the Lord's death until he comes' (1 Corinthians 11.26).
2. It has been constant Anglican practice, in accordance with the continuous tradition of the Church, to do this with the elements of bread and wine in obedience to the Lord's command.
3. Although the other symbolic occasions on which Jesus shared meals with his disciples and with many whom the society of his day regarded as outcasts speak powerfully to what it means to share his

life and break bread in obedience to his command, it is the dominical command to 'do this' at the Last Supper which is fundamental.

4. To vary in any way official Anglican practice in this respect would be to put hard won ecumenical agreements on the Eucharist seriously in jeopardy, and we have no authority to do this.
5. In contexts where there are severe difficulties in the obtaining of wine for the Eucharist, Anglicans should seek to remedy this in conjunction with Roman Catholics and other ecumenical partners. Where the issue is one of expense this should be a primary call on the support of wealthier churches in the Communion. Assistance with practical difficulties can be given by the Anglican Communion Office.
6. It should be noted that Christians work within a given symbolic framework inherited from God's revelation in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New and this should be regarded as normative.
7. Whilst it may often be possible, as Gregory the Great commanded Augustine, to 'baptise' many local customs and use them in Christian worship, the matter of the sacrament should be inviolable, and we should recognise that Christians have often had to be 'counter-cultural' for the sake of the Gospel.
8. Where practices of using other sacramental elements are being pressed, or are even occasionally used, Provinces should be reminded of the fundamental obligation to use the elements used by our Lord at the Last Supper, and adhere to that rather than adopting a cultural relativism.

**Resolution 11.06:
Eucharistic Food and Drink**

IASCER

1. receives with gratitude the IALC report 'Eucharistic Food and Drink' and acknowledges the substantial research that has gone into the report
2. endorses the first recommendation of the report, 'that the normative principle and practice of the Anglican Communion has always been and continues to be the use of the elements of bread and wine at the Eucharist', and affirms this to be consistent with our ecumenical agreements. Accordingly, IASCER reminds all Provinces of the

Anglican Communion of the third of the articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral

3. views with concern the evidence indicating that elements other than bread and wine are used in some Provinces, and draws attention to its earlier resolution of 2001. We note that the content of recommendations 2 and 3 of the IALC Report are best understood as descriptive rather than prescriptive. IASCER also notes that some churches with whom we have ecumenical agreements experience similar anomalies in the same circumstances, yet they also affirm the normative use of the elements of bread and wine for the Eucharist.

Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission

Chapter 3 recorded the overlap between IASCER's consideration of the nature of communion, and the particular brief given to the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (IATDC); and the divergence of perspectives in relation to the episcopate.

IASCER Resolution 10.06, and the more detailed Response appended to it, set out both IASCER's concerns and the important insights IASCER felt might be gleaned from an ecumenical perspective in considering the episcopal office. (This Response was also offered for consideration to bishops in the *Lambeth Reader* provided for the 2008 Lambeth Conference.)

Resolution 10.06:

IATDC

IASCER

1. is grateful for the work in progress of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (IATDC) as set out in 'The Anglican Way: The Significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church'
2. is concerned to note the omission of significant theological, ecclesiological and sacramental foundations of episcopacy such as Eucharistic presidency, historic succession and the sanctifying ministry of a bishop. These dimensions have been highlighted in the emerging consensus on episcopal ministry in major ecumenical dialogues. This consensus enriches and often reflects the Anglican understanding of episcopacy

3. intends, before September 2007, to offer a contribution to the revision of the paper to enable IATDC to take these dimensions into account. We hope that this contribution will assist the Commission.

A Response by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to 'The Anglican Way: The Significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church', July 2007 (see Resolution 10.06)

IASCER received the IATDC document 'The Anglican Way: The Significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church' at its December meeting, 2006. From the perspective of our work as an ecumenical commission, we have two principal observations: 1) The theology of episcopal ministry in the document could be given a more sacramental and less functional orientation, and 2) The document would be strengthened by taking explicitly into account the contribution to an Anglican theology of episcopal ministry that is reflected in our ecumenical agreements. A sacramental understanding of episcopal ministry is central both in the patristic tradition and in our ecumenical agreements. It is primarily as president of the Eucharist that the bishop is the sign of ecclesial communion and communion with the Triune God. Noting that *The Anglican Way* is a work in progress, IASCER offers the following reflections as a contribution to the further development of the document, taking these considerations into account. In an earlier paper⁸⁴ we offered a response to the Lutheran document 'The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church'.⁸⁵ We have drawn on our response to this document as well as the various ecumenical agreements in our response to *The Anglican Way*.

We clearly affirm the statement in the preamble to *The Anglican Way* that 'bishops bear a particular responsibility for the maintenance and nurture of *koinonia*'. The question, however, is: What is it that gives unity and coherence to the bishop's ministry? What is its centre? The thesis-form that the document takes tends to reinforce a functional view of episcopal ministry, suggesting that the bishop is someone who fulfils these various functions. The Anglican theology of episcopal ministry, grounded in the evangelical and scriptural office of proclamation and witness as noted in Thesis 2, finds its classic expression in the patristic period and contemporary expression in Anglican ecumenical agreements. In both these sources the bishop is portrayed as a sacramental person and president of the eucharistic assembly. It is this portrayal of the bishop as a visible sign of ecclesial communion and communion with the Triune God that underlies and informs the various evangelical and pastoral functions of episcopal ministry that are set forth in the various theses. If this could be given clear expression at the beginning of the document, the various theses could be seen as flowing

out from that centre. This would reinforce the point which the document rightly makes at the conclusion of the preamble ‘that the deeper issue concerns not only what a bishop does but who a bishop is for Christ and the people’.⁸⁶

One way of incorporating the patristic and ecumenical witness into *The Anglican Way* would be to make Thesis 2 the first thesis, thus providing the scriptural foundation for a theology of episcopal ministry. Theses 1, 3, 8, and 9 could follow, with appropriate references to the patristic sources and our ecumenical agreements, showing how the bishop serves the *koinonia* of the church as president of the eucharist, teacher and defender of the apostolic faith, and sign of catholic continuity and unity. The present Thesis 1, for example, would be a natural place to make the point about the interdependent relationship between the bishop, the eucharistic celebration, and the church.

In IASCER’s response to the Lutheran document ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church’ particular note was taken of the patristic tradition concerning episcopal ministry:

Historians commonly agree that there are three principal images or models of the office of a bishop in the pre-Nicene church, which are best exemplified in Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, and Cyprian.⁸⁷ For Ignatius, the bishop is primarily the one who presides at the eucharist. This is central for Ignatius because of his understanding of the nature of the church. ‘The church, in Ignatius’ view, is essentially eucharistic by nature: there is an organic relation between the Body of Christ understood as community, and the Body of Christ understood as sacrament. For Ignatius, then, the bishop is ... the one who presides at ... the eucharistic liturgy.’⁸⁸ The theme of unity and the interdependent relationship between one bishop, one eucharistic body, and one church is common in his writings. ‘The context of the emphasis on unity in Ignatius, of course, must be kept in mind. Ignatius is writing at a time when there was probably only one bishop for any city and also no more than one eucharistic assembly for any city; a situation which greatly reinforced the bishop’s function as the visible focus of unity ...’⁸⁹

Irenaeus, on the other hand, while echoing the eucharistic teaching of Ignatius, places primary emphasis on the bishop’s role as teacher of the faith. The context here is the conflict with Gnosticism. For Irenaeus, the bishop is above all the one who preserves the continuity of apostolic teaching in unbroken succession from the apostles. It is through the bishop’s faithful proclamation of the Gospel in each local church that the unity of the church and the continuity of the church in the apostolic tradition is preserved.

For Cyprian, the bishop serves as the bond of unity between the local church and the universal church. Here the collegial aspect of the

bishop's role comes to the fore. The bishop is one member of a worldwide 'college' of bishops who are together responsible for maintaining the unity of the churches. Cyprian's primary emphasis, therefore, is upon the bishop as the bond of unity between the local church and the church universal. In his treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae* 'he stresses the conciliar or collegial character of the worldwide episcopate, of bishops meeting in council and together reaching a common mind under the Spirit's guidance, and so he calls our attention to this conciliar and collegial feature of any episcopate that would claim to be truly 'historic' ... Each bishop shares in the one episcopate, not as having part of the whole but as being an expression of the whole; just as there are many local churches but one universal church, so there are many individual bishops but only one worldwide episcopate.'⁹⁰ In each of these models, therefore, the bishop is the sign of unity between the local and the universal church, either through the maintenance of eucharistic communion, continuity in apostolic teaching, or common oversight of the churches.

There is, however, a deeper theological unity to these models than is apparent from what has been said so far. As Mark Dyer has pointed out, the early church considered episcopal ministry to be a divine gift for the preservation and nurture of communion (*koinonia*) with the Triune God. 'The bishop is called by God from within God's People to serve the mystery of our communion with one another and with God. The ministry of the episcopate is a series of sacred acts that serve, preserve and nurture communion. As president of the eucharistic assembly, chief teacher of the Word of God and the Holy Tradition, sign of unity between the local church and the church universal,⁹¹ the bishop is a sign that communion in the one body of Christ, the church, involves communion in the very life of the Triune God. This communion is nurtured by the life of prayer, which finds its centre in the liturgy. That is why the presidency of the eucharist is at the heart of the bishop's ministry. 'In celebrating the Eucharistic meal the Church, in time, becomes identified with and prefigures that communion with God the Holy Trinity that will come when the kingdom of God is finally established. Word and sacraments signify the church's essential participation in the mystery of the life of God.'⁹² ... The thread which unifies the bishop's various roles, therefore, is the nurturing of communion within and among the churches for the sake of the building up of their communion with one another and with the Triune God. ... This communion has both an historical and an eschatological aspect. The bishop is both a sign of the communion of the churches with one another in time and in space and a sign of the eschatological fulfilment of communion with the Triune God, a foretaste of which we already share in the eucharist.'⁹³

There is a growing ecumenical consensus on the nature of ministry, including the bishop's ministry, reflected both in the multilateral document *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*⁴ and in the bilateral Anglican ecumenical agreements. *BEM* reflects a clearly sacramental understanding of ordained ministry. All ministries in the church, including the ordained ministry, are gifts (*charisms*) of the Spirit for the building up of the body of Christ (Romans 12.4-8; 1 Corinthians 12.4-11). 'The Holy Spirit bestows on the community diverse and complementary gifts' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 5). This charismatic understanding of ordained ministry is reflected in *BEM*'s interpretation of the meaning of ordination: 'Ordination denotes an action by God and the community' which through long tradition takes place 'in the context of worship and especially of the eucharist.The act of ordination by the laying on of hands of those appointed to do so is at one and the same time invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*); sacramental sign; acknowledgment of gifts and commitment. Ordination is an invocation to God that the new minister be given the power of the Holy Spirit in the new relation which is established between this minister and the local Christian community and, by intention, the Church universal' (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 40-42).

Already in the early paragraphs of the Ministry section of *BEM*, the sacramental and not merely functional aspect of ministry, and indeed of episcopal office, is implied and assumed:

The chief responsibility of the ordained ministry is to assemble and build up the body of Christ by proclaiming and teaching the Word of God, by celebrating the sacraments, and by guiding the life of the community in its worship, its mission and its caring ministry. It is especially in the eucharistic celebration that the ordained ministry is the visible focus of the deep and all-embracing communion between Christ and the members of his body. In the celebration of the eucharist, Christ gathers, teaches and nourishes the Church. It is Christ who invites to the meal and who presides at it. In most churches this presidency is signified and represented by an ordained minister. (*BEM*, 'Ministry', 13-14)

In the Anglican tradition it is primarily the bishop as eucharistic president who is the sign of communion. This sacramental understanding of episcopal ministry is also found in the ARCIC documents. Ordination is described as a 'sacramental act' in which 'the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers, with the promise of divine grace for their work and for their sanctification' (ARCIC, *Ministry and Ordination*, 15). The 1979 *Elucidation* says that 'both traditions agree that a sacramental rite is a visible sign through which the grace of God is given by the Holy Spirit in the Church. The rite of ordination is one of these sacramental rites. Those who are ordained by prayer and the laying on of hands receive their ministry from Christ through those

designated in the Church to hand it on; together with the office they are given the grace needed for its fulfilment (cf. para. 14). Since New Testament times the Church has required such recognition and authorisation for those who are to exercise the principal functions of *episcopos* in the name of Christ. This is what both traditions mean by the sacramental rite of ordination (ARCIC, *Elucidation* 1979, 3).

The bishop's role as president of the eucharist and its eschatological dimension is given particular emphasis in the recent *Cyprus Agreed Statement* of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue. The origin of episcopal ministry in the early Church is related to 'the context of worship and pastoral oversight in which episcopal leadership in the local church emerged ... The association of *episcopos* with the local church and with the Eucharist [also] implied that whenever the local community gathered to celebrate the Eucharist, the eschatological community was present in its fullness ...'⁹⁵

The most prominent spokesman for the Orthodox view of episcopal ministry in ecumenical conversations has been John Zizioulas.

In his book *Eucharist, Bishop, Church* Zizioulas focuses on the bishop as president of the local eucharistic community, characteristic of the Ignatian model of episcopal ministry, while integrating the perspectives of Irenaeus and Cyprian. This understanding of the role of the bishop is rooted in a sacramental ecclesiology. Each local church finds its identity and unity through sacramental incorporation into Christ. The unity of the church is to be understood '*sacramentally*, i.e. as the *incorporation* of human beings *in Christ*.'⁹⁶ 'The local Church is a full, complete entity, the whole Church of God, because the whole Christ is to be found in her and makes her a unity, the one body of Christ, through the Divine Eucharist.'⁹⁷ In the first three centuries of the church's life this unity of the local church was expressed in the one eucharist celebrated in each place under the presidency of the bishop....

The historical shift that took place in the fourth century when presbyters normally came to preside at the eucharist in local communities and the bishop became the chief pastor of a diocese creates an ecclesiological question of considerable importance for Zizioulas, since it was primarily as president of the eucharistic assembly that the bishop represented the local church in the communion of the local churches. The result of this historical shift is that the diocese rather than the local congregation becomes the local church in both the East and the West. Zizioulas asks, therefore, what 'the relationship [is] of the eucharistic unity of the parish to episcopal eucharistic unity once the institution of parishes was established.'⁹⁸ He concludes that the parish eucharist is not 'a self-sufficient and self-contained eucharistic unity,

but an extension⁹⁹ within the area of the diocese of the one eucharist which is under the leadership of the bishop. ...What is important in this vision [for Anglicans] is not that the bishop is always the eucharistic president of the local community sociologically, but that theologically the bishop is understood to be the chief pastor and president of the eucharist for the diocese or region that he/she represents.¹⁰⁰

It is primarily in this way that the bishop is the sign of *koinonia* at all levels of the church's life.

It is IASCER's hope that these reflections will be a helpful contribution to the further development of our sister commission's document *The Anglican Way*.

Theological Education in the Anglican Communion Working Group

Chapter 6, Reception, underlined the importance of Anglicans, especially bishops, being familiar with ecumenical matters, including both methodology and the substance of significant bilateral and multilateral agreements. IASCER therefore welcomed, in Resolution 4.08, the proposals of the Theological Education in the Anglican Communion (TEAC) Working Group for ecumenism to be addressed in the training of bishops.

Alongside the comprehensive review of recent Anglican ecumenical engagement offered in this book, it is hoped that IASCER's work on the office of a bishop (as covered in Chapter 5, and in dialogue with IATDC, above) might be of particular assistance.

As noted in Chapter 1, effective ecumenical engagement also requires a good understanding of what it means to be Anglican, and additionally underlines the importance of Anglican studies at every level of theological education and training.

Resolution 4.08: Ecumenical formation of bishops

IASCER

- notes with gratitude that the Theological Education in the Anglican Communion (TEAC) Working Group recommends that candidates for the episcopate be 'alert to ecumenical and inter-faith issues' and that bishops 'encourage honest and open ecumenical and inter-faith relationships'

- reminds the Provinces of the Anglican Communion that this requires adequate formation for new bishops in the history of the ecumenical movement and the current state of ecumenical agreements and inter-faith relationships
- and, therefore, recommends that educational programmes for new bishops invariably include work in both ecumenical and inter-faith relations as part of the curriculum.

12. Developments within the Anglican Communion

The Consecration in 2003 of Gene Robinson and the authorisation by the Diocese of New Westminster of services for use in connection with same sex unions had a considerable impact on relations between Anglicans and our ecumenical partners. As the *Windsor Report* subsequently recorded, while some churches in other denominations were making, or considering making, provision for the ordination, or the blessing, of persons in sexually active same-sex relationships, sometimes in response to changes in civil law, there was also condemnation from the Russian Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, as well as a statement from the Roman Catholic Church that these developments had created ‘new and serious difficulties’ to ecumenical relationships.

As previously noted, there was a broad spectrum of views within IASCER’s membership, and strains were felt in our meetings, particularly in December 2003. We nonetheless strived to work together as far as possible, and the strength of relationships already forged allowed a degree of honesty and clear speaking that helped, rather than hindered, our efforts. At that and all subsequent meetings, a considerable proportion of time was spent on considering the ecumenical consequences of questions of human sexuality and how these were handled within the Communion. Though the presenting issue remains important, there has been something of a shift of focus to concerns around ecclesiology and authority prompted by the responses of the Instruments of Communion as well as of others (especially at the level of the episcopate).

In this IASCER, as with so many issues, looked both inwards and outwards – attempting both to engage with partners as fully as possible through evolving circumstances, and to ensure that ecumenical concerns and insights were appropriately received within the Communion’s own handling of the matter. IASCER warmly welcomed the way in which ecumenical partners have been consulted at various stages. This transparency has also been widely appreciated by our partners, who have engaged frankly with us, for example at the 2008 Lambeth Conference. The *Indaba Reflections* acknowledged the ecumenical dimension of this continuing challenge to Anglican life (for example, in sections 79 and 128).

The Windsor Process

Events in North America gave rise to swift responses from ecumenical partners. In Resolution 1.03, IASCER recorded ecumenical concerns, and welcomed the establishment of the Lambeth Commission on Communion.

Two members and one former member of IASCER were appointed to the new Commission. The Director of Ecumenical Affairs served as Secretary to the Commission. The ensuing Windsor Report made references to the wider ecumenical context.

Ecumenical partners had been invited to offer contributions to the Lambeth Commission, and were now requested to respond to the *Windsor Report*, being specifically asked:

1. What do you find helpful in the Windsor Report 2004?
2. What questions does the report raise from the perspective of your church?
3. If the recommendations of the Windsor Report were implemented, how would this affect your church's relationship with the Anglican Communion as an ecumenical partner?

Partners' responses to these questions are available at www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/process/reception/index.cfm. The General Secretary of the LWF also served on the Windsor Report Reception Reference Group, which prepared a presentation for the Primates' Meeting of February 2005, as did two members of IASCER.

IASCER was also asked to make a response, which is carried in Resolution 2.04 and its appended statement (carried at the end of this section). This resolution was reaffirmed the following year (1.05), when related resolutions were passed on Civil Partnerships (2.05) and Episcopal Collegiality (3.05 – the text of this is printed in Chapter 5). A year later, Resolution 1.06 on The Life of the Anglican Communion drew attention to the fact that not only the presenting issue, but the way it was being handled, had implications for ecumenical relations and the ways Anglicans were perceived by partners. In 2007, further concerns on the handling of disagreements led to Resolution 7.07, Episcopal Ministry and Jurisdiction in the Anglican Church.

Resolution 1.03: Recent Developments in the Anglican Communion

IASCER

- deeply regrets the ecumenical consequences for Anglican international ecumenical dialogue resulting from the consecration in the Episcopal Church (USA) of a non-celibate priest in a committed same-sex relationship as Bishop Co-adjutor of New Hampshire, noting with particular concern the impairment of the work of the

Anglican - Oriental Orthodox International Commission (AOOIC) and of the International Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission (IARCCUM) and the declaration of the Russian Orthodox Church, which severed ties with ECUSA whilst 'wanting to maintain contacts and co-operation with the members of the Episcopal Church in the USA who clearly declared their loyalty to the moral teaching of the Holy Gospel and the Ancient Undivided Church'

- acknowledges the urgent need to address the ecclesiological and practical issues for the Communion and its ecumenical relations that arise from a Province of the Communion taking unilateral action involving a substantive matter of faith, order or morals
- welcomes the establishment by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the request of the Primates of the Anglican Communion of a Commission to address the ecclesiological questions concerning the unity and working together of the Communion
- notes that in the past Anglican participation in global ecumenical dialogues with other world communions has been predicated on the assumption of common faith and practice, and
- therefore urges the Commission to find ways of reasserting and maintaining common faith and practice so that such world-wide ecumenical dialogue may proceed with confidence in the future.

Resolution 2.04:

The Windsor Report

IASCER

- adopts the attached statement (below) as a summary of their reflections on the Windsor Report, as requested by the Reception Reference Group established by the Primates' Standing Committee, and submits the document to the Reception Group for consideration by the Primates at their meeting in February 2005.

Resolution 1.05:

The Windsor Report

IASCER

1. reaffirms its statement of December 2004

2. re-emphasises the value and significance of The Windsor Report in addressing critical issues in Anglican ecclesiology and as a vital resource in the ecumenical relations of the Anglican Communion
3. underlines the necessity of engaging with ecumenical partners as part of deeper reflection on the issues the report raises, particularly in relation to ecclesiology
4. notes gratefully the responses made to the report by ecumenical partners, draws attention to their availability at www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/reception/responses/p6.cfm and looks forward to further contributions from those ecumenical partners and from others, as the Windsor response process unfolds
5. encourages Provinces to consult with appropriate ecumenical partners as the Provinces develop their own responses to the report as requested by the Primates' Statement issued at Dromantine, and by ACC-13
6. recommends that the Anglican Communion consult ecumenically as it works toward developing an Anglican Covenant, taking into account existing agreements, commitments and ecumenical covenants.

**Resolution 2.05:
Civil Partnerships**

IASCER

1. notes that recent legislation proposed or enacted in several countries permitting the formal 'registration of same-sex partnerships' or 'civil marriage' of same-sex partners raises concerns for all the churches
2. notes that ecumenical concerns have also arisen as a consequence of the responses given to such legislation within certain Anglican Provinces and other churches
3. recommends that further study should be undertaken, in consultation with ecumenical partner churches, of theological anthropology and of the way that the Church should respond to socio-cultural changes in this area.

**Resolution 3.05:
Episcopal Collegiality**

[Text carried in full above. See Chapter 2, Holy Orders.]

**Resolution 1.06:
The Life of the Anglican Communion**

IASCER

1. notes that ecumenical partners derive their understanding of Anglican identity not only from formal statements and official dialogues, but from observing all aspects of Anglican practice including the living out of our common life, and
2. therefore draws attention to the implication for ecumenical relations of the way we conduct ourselves in debating disputed questions within the Anglican Communion.

**Resolution 7.07:
Episcopal Ministry and Jurisdiction in the Anglican Communion**

IASCER

- noting that the current tensions and difficulties in the Anglican Communion have raised serious questions, both for ourselves and for our ecumenical partners, some of which relate to episcopal ministry and jurisdiction, urges the Lambeth Conference to bear the ecumenical context in mind in its consideration of the ministry of bishops.

Response to the Windsor Report (attached to Resolution 2.04)

IASCER has been asked to respond to the Windsor Report in preparation for the meeting of the Primates in February 2005. Below are the initial reflections on the Report and its ecumenical implications, agreed at IASCER's meeting in December 2004.

The Windsor Report is a rich resource for ecumenical endeavours, offering mature consideration of Anglican self-understanding, grounded in Scripture, which invites partners to engage with the fundamental issues that it addresses.

These issues, and the Communion's response, have major ecumenical implications.

Reception of the Windsor Report: Implications for Ecumenical Relations

IASCER hopes the Communion will pursue the Report's recommendations, as this will significantly assist ecumenical relations.

Not following this course is likely to complicate and further impair relations.

Provinces should note that ecumenical partners will follow their responses in close detail.

IASCER welcomes in principle the proposal for a Council of Advice for the Archbishop of Canterbury (§111,112). This should contain ecumenical expertise and be charged with considering ecumenical dimensions of the matters before it, in conjunction with appropriate advice from IASCER.

IASCER also welcomes in principle the proposal for an Anglican Covenant (§118-120). This could have major implications for the conduct of ecumenical relations, as a covenant might clarify the process by which the Anglican Communion makes decisions about proposed ecumenical agreements.

IASCER believes the recognition and articulation of the body of shared principles of Canon Law could strengthen the ecclesial character of the Anglican Communion (§113-117).

In their legislation, Anglican Provinces should always be mindful of their local and global ecumenical responsibilities (§47, 79, 130).

Associated Developments in Ecumenical Relations

Several ecumenical partners have reacted strongly to the developments behind the Windsor Report (§28, 130).

Consequentially, there is a slow-down in some bilateral dialogues during what partners see as this unstable period prior to Provinces' responses to the Report. Some have questioned whether we are a reliable and consistent ecumenical partner.

Nevertheless, partners have appreciated our ecumenical intent, shown by seeking their contributions to the Lambeth Commission, and now inviting their responses to the Report.

IASCER looks forward to studying these responses, as a further contribution to our ecumenical relations.

The Windsor Report as a Resource for Ecumenical Relations

Many of the Report's themes are prominent in ecumenical relations, eg the nature of the Church and local, regional and international ecclesial bodies, and relationships between them; authority; the instruments of unity; and *episkope*, including primacy.

Koinonia refers primarily to the life of the one Church of Christ. Its theological principles therefore are relevant both to the life of the

Anglican Communion and to ecumenical relations (Section B in particular). Fractures in communion are always serious and care should be exercised in using such expressions as ‘impaired communion’.

The report also articulates a vision of the nature of Anglicanism which can be offered in ecumenical relations. Whatever we say about the Anglican Communion and its ecumenical relations should be brought to the touchstone of the four credal marks of the Church – One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic (§49).

Issues for Further Consideration

Many partner churches experience similar tensions over human sexuality. They also face the legislative redefinition of marriage in many countries (§28). We might profitably share with each other our continuing work on the theological understanding of human sexuality, and its grounding in Scripture, tradition and reason.

Many Provinces have entered various Covenants with partners: fuller theological reflection on the meaning of Covenant might help our understanding of our interdependence.

IASCER considers that ecumenical relations would be assisted by further careful clarification of terminology (eg distinguishing between homosexual orientation and practice; also clarifying usage of ‘Church’ between the Universal Church and its Anglican expressions).

Ecumenical relations would similarly be helped by fuller exploration and articulation of the following matters to which the Windsor Report refers:

- The role of the Archbishop of Canterbury – noting the Communion-wide ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury as an Instrument of Unity, and in the service of the other Instruments of Unity (§108-110). *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* speaks of personal, collegial and communal dimensions of ministry operating at every level of the Church’s life (*BEM*: ‘Ministry’, III.B.27).
- *Adiaphora* – noting that Hooker spoke rather of ‘things accessory to salvation’ (§36,37)
- The ‘common good’ – noting this applies within the Anglican Communion, and within the Universal Church and wider world (§51,80)
- Covenant – noting that several Provinces have entered various types of covenant with ecumenical partners, and that fuller theological reflection on the meaning and expression of covenant may help our understanding of our familial relationship (§119)

- Language used to describe interdependence within the Anglican Communion, which may help us, and our partners, better understand and live out the autonomy within mutual commitments.

An Anglican Covenant

Two of the six points made by the *Windsor Report*, section 119, in support of the proposal for an Anglican Covenant had an ecumenical dimension:

- The concept of the adoption of a covenant is not new in the ecumenical context. Anglican Churches have commonly entered covenants with other churches to articulate their relationships of communion. These ecumenical covenants provide very appropriate models from which Anglicans can learn much in their own development of inter-Anglican relations.
- A Covenant incarnates communion as a visible foundation around which Anglicans can gather to shape and protect their distinctive identity and mission, and in so doing also provides an accessible resource for our ecumenical partners in their understanding of Anglicanism.

IASCER endorsed both views, and in 2006 developed some informal discussion points (below, after the resolutions) which were sent on to the Covenant Design Group – which was chaired by IASCER’s own Chairman. Resolution 8.07 the following year gave further affirmation, drawing attention to the resources that existing ecumenical agreed texts could offer, and proposing that partners be invited to comment on the forthcoming revised draft.

At its final meeting, IASCER gave detailed consideration to the St Andrew’s Draft, and to the accompanying Lambeth Commentary. Resolution 16.08 drew attention to a number of areas where IASCER was concerned that inadequate attention had been paid to the ecumenical dimension – whether in reflecting the commitment of Anglicans to the full, visible unity of the Church; or to the particular position within the wider Christian family of the United Churches within the Communion; or to the impact of commitments under the Covenant on existing or future ecumenical relationships and agreements.

However, IASCER also offered encouragement, drawn from its own reflections, on anomalies which could in certain circumstances be considered ‘bearable’ (see Chapter 2, The Processes of Ecumenism).

**Resolution 8.07:
The Covenant**

IASCER

1. believes that an Anglican Covenant could lend greater coherence and credibility both to our life as a communion and to our ecumenical engagement
2. urges the Covenant Design Group to use as a resource the agreed statements between Anglicans and their ecumenical partners
3. urges that the Covenant Design Group invite ecumenical partners, especially those with whom Churches of the Anglican Communion are in dialogue or in relationships of communion, to engage in the covenant process as soon as possible. This would most likely take the form of them being asked to comment on the next draft text when it is published. The Covenant Design Group may want to consider developing specific questions that would encourage other churches to address the issues identified in this paper
4. believes that the covenant proposal needs to be undergirded by the work on ecclesiological principles project of the Anglican Communion Legal Advisers' Network.

**Resolution 16.08:
The Anglican Covenant**

IASCER

1. notes the publication of the St Andrew's Draft of An Anglican Covenant, and 'A Lambeth Commentary' following discussion of the draft at the Lambeth Conference
2. draws to the attention of the Covenant Design Group its concern that any Covenant should take adequate account of:
 - the need for a stronger affirmation of Anglicanism's ecumenical vocation, and our commitment to the biblical and patristic vision of Church unity, in response to Christ's prayer that 'all may be one'
 - the particular nature of the United Churches of South Asia, including their internal ordering (and so their ability to adopt a Covenant) and their commitments to other Christian World Communions in which they also have a part

- the relationship between a Covenant and any other commitments already made by Provinces and the Anglican Communion to ecumenical partners
- openness to the further development of ecumenical commitments
- the need to acknowledge that there may, under carefully considered conditions, be occasion for allowing ‘bearable anomalies’ during transition periods, for example, in ecumenical agreements and schemes of union and unity
- concerns that ecumenical partners may have about the ways that Anglicans handle potentially difficult and divisive questions, recognising that these can be addressed by an increased clarity around consultation procedures.

Discussion Points on the Anglican Covenant Developed at IASCER 2006

1. IASCER welcomes the idea of a Covenant for the Anglican Communion and is eager to make a contribution to the process of its development
2. IASCER might concentrate on the ecclesiological issues, particularly as they touch on our ecumenical relationships.
3. The London conversation found both negative and positive aspects as noted in paras 5 and 6 of the ACC document ‘Towards a Covenant for the Anglican Communion’:
 - anxiety about becoming a confessional ecclesial community
 - concern lest the word ‘covenant’ be used to mean too much and thus have no meaning – cannot be so general as to have no reality; must go beyond a commitment to listen to one another
 - it could be helpful for our ecumenical partners in understanding what the Anglican Communion is, noting that ‘covenant’ may have different connotations for different partners
 - can hold us to mutual accountability
 - can strengthen our mission.
4. ‘To covenant’ with someone is very different than having a covenant with someone - explore working with the concept as a verb
5. It was noted that most ecumenical covenants have a declarative statement followed by a commitment section. An IASCER

contribution could include an analysis of what Anglicans have committed themselves to in ecumenical covenants, particularly doctrinally.

6. Common principles of canon law (the Legal Advisers' Network project) an important foundation - make explicit what already exists (noting the caution that canon law must be read theologically used under grace). An examination of forms of assent might also be beneficial (this also raises the subsidiary question of the extent to which any requirement beyond baptism should be made of lay participants in synodical structures).
7. The question of how far a Covenant might go in identifying 'who's in and who's out' was addressed: having a way to discern and define together what is communion-breaking would be a helpful corrective to the current personal determination ('I'm not in communion with my bishop'). The Anglican - Orthodox work on heresy might be helpful here.
8. It was noted that there were a variety of models of covenant being promoted within the Communion. It might be useful for IASCEC to produce a differentiated commentary that addresses the breadth of possible forms of covenant and the ecumenical implications of each.

The Canon Law Project

Anglicans engaged in ecumenical matters are now greatly assisted by the publication of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*. Not only does this compilation help express the distinctiveness of Anglican tradition, on which we can draw in offering all we have received in Christ to others in their discerning of what they may recognise and receive from us; it also, in its final section, draws out the key elements of the body of legal instruments through which Anglicans have sought to facilitate and order ecumenical commitment and engagement: 'In part giving expression to the various ecumenical agreements and covenants, and in part seeking to enable and equip Anglicans for ecumenical endeavour, canon law concentrates on the application of the theology of *koinonia* (communion), which undergirds much of the ecumenical movement, and addresses in the main issues of ecclesial communion and reciprocal membership and participation.'

Thus Part VIII offers Principles 93 to 100, which relate, respectively, to ecumenical responsibility, ecclesial communion, ecumenical freedom, ecclesial recognition, ecumenical agreements, ecumenical collaboration, reception and eucharistic hospitality. Professor Norman Doe, in his essay within the book, also gives consideration to the ecumenical significance of

the Anglican *Ius Commune*. IASCER followed the production of the publication closely and with considerable enthusiasm. The Commission recognised the usefulness and importance of the project within the ecumenical arena even while the project was still incomplete, in its Resolutions 4.07, Admission of the Non-baptised to Holy Communion (considered in Chapter 4), and 8.07, The Covenant (above).

The publication of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* was welcomed in Resolution 15.08.

Resolution 15.08:

The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion

IASCER

- welcomes the compilation and publication of *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*, and commend it as a resource for theological and ecumenical study and research
- welcomes the attention given to Ecumenical Relations in *The Principles of Canon Law*, in particular Principles 93-100 in Part VIII (Ecumenical Relations) and Section IV (The Ecumenical Significance of the Anglican *Ius Commune*) in Professor Norman Doe's concluding essay, 'The contribution of common principles of canon law to ecclesial communion in Anglicanism', and commends what is said to all Anglicans concerned with ecumenical dialogue.

13. The Lambeth Conference 2008

From its inception, there was an expectation that the Lambeth Conference would play a significant role in ecumenical affairs. As mentioned in Chapter 2, when the Canadian provincial synod of 1865 first called for a ‘General Council’ of the Anglican Communion, the Bishop of Montreal suggested to the Archbishop of Canterbury that such a gathering might play an indispensable role in the relationship, and aspiration to reunion, between Anglicans and other Christians.¹⁰¹ The second conference commended ‘a season of prayer for the unity of Christendom’, as well as discussing relations with the Mennonites, and from the third conference onwards, relations with other churches and ecclesial bodies became a central part of the agenda, and the subject of numerous reports and resolutions, all of which are available through the archive pages of the Lambeth Conference website, www.lambethconference.org. In both the 1988 and 1998 Conferences, Christian unity was the theme of one of the four ‘sections’, giving rise to substantial reports (working respectively with the Emmaus and Agros Reports submitted to them by the Ecumenical Advisory Group).

As has been noted, the 1998 Report *Called to Be One* and the accompanying resolutions (including that on the Standing Commission itself), set the scene for IASCER’s work.

Debates and resolutions at Lambeth Conferences have been one means of the Communion taking stock of ecumenical developments and, in particular, affirming shared statements, common texts, or agreements. Bishops have committed themselves to pursue the incorporation of these developments into the life of Provinces, and through to local churches, for example through commending them for study and reflection, or for endorsement through formal synodical processes.

As recorded in the earlier consideration of reception (Chapter 6), the nature of the Lambeth Conference, including the fact that its resolutions are not legally binding on Provinces, means that it cannot offer the sort of formal and definitive acceptance that some other churches might give through their international bodies, and so tend to expect also of us. The ten year interval between Conferences does not always sit well with the working cycle of bilateral dialogues, which has, for example, resulted in ‘the results of the Anglican - Roman Catholic dialogue ... being communicated and received in the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion ... somewhat unevenly’ (*Called to Be One*). Conferences have sometimes addressed documents published a considerable number of years previously. Given its ecumenical

remit, the ACC also receives reports and passes resolutions, but these are similarly limited in their legal force.

The ecumenical dimension has become important to the Lambeth Conference in other ways, not least with attention being paid to the benefits of ecumenical co-operation in areas such as mission, international relations, the pursuit of peace, conflict resolution, and social and economic justice. Then there has been the significant presence of ecumenical participants, who have increasingly taken a more integral part, bringing greetings, giving addresses, reflecting their impressions to the gathered bishops, and in many other ways enriching the life of the Conference. It is hoped that in turn, through their experience, they will come into a fuller understanding of the nature of Anglicanism, our self-understanding and how we conduct our common life. In the course of planning for the 2008 Conference, IASCER offered the Design Group suggestions on ecumenical participation, and on how issues of inter-church relations and church unity might be addressed.

The Lambeth Conference of 2008 moved away from the earlier practice of producing reports and debating resolutions, in a way that reflected more westernised and polarising practices, and followed an *Indaba* approach. A full day of the Conference followed the theme ‘The Bishop, Other Churches and God’s Mission: Discerning our Shared Calling’. Furthermore, thirteen of the self-select sessions spread across the Conference, had specific ecumenical dimensions, and many included ecumenical participants among their speakers.

While pre-conference briefing was significantly reduced from previous years, IASCER’s response to the IATDC’s paper, ‘The Significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church’ (printed in Chapter 11), was included, under the title ‘The Ministry of Bishops in Ecumenical Perspective’, in the *Lambeth Reader* that was provided to all bishops. The *Reader* also contained summary introductions to *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (an Agreed Statement of the International Anglican – Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission) and *The Church of the Triune God* (the Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican – Orthodox Theological Dialogue). ‘Called to be the One Church’ (from the Porto Alegre Assembly of the WCC) was also provided as a resource.

These reports were commended for study and reception in the Anglican Communion, within Section E: Ecumenism of the *Indaba Reflections* (available through the Lambeth Conference website). This reaffirmed Anglican commitment to full visible unity of the Church, and offered wide-

ranging reflections on the nature of the Anglican ecumenical vocation, as well as commending the work of IASCER. The importance of deepening our ecumenical relationships for the sake of the life of God's Church in God's world was also underlined elsewhere in the *Reflections*, in relation to areas including mission, advocacy on social justice, the environment, development aid and relief work.

There were over 80 ecumenical participants in the 2008 Lambeth Conference, together with bishops in communion with the whole Communion. Among them were bishops from the Lutheran Churches in communion with some Provinces, and representatives from the WCC. Ecumenical participants and bishops in communion were included in the Bible studies and *Indaba* groups. There were two plenary speakers and 20 personal guests of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Ecumenical participants had an orientation session, a welcoming reception with the Archbishop of Canterbury at which they met their 'host' bishops, and they were welcomed officially at an Ecumenical Vespers on the first full day of the Conference. On two occasions they met together and had an opportunity (the second time with the Archbishop of Canterbury) to discuss their experience of, and offer reflections on, the Conference.

At its subsequent meeting in December 2008, IASCER passed Resolution 1.08, below, appreciating the high level of ecumenical participation and the support given by Conference staff.

IASCER drew attention in this resolution to a considerable number of significant contributions on ecumenical themes, which are all available through IASCER pages of the Anglican Communion website. The Commission also passed Resolution 2.08 (printed in Chapter 6), which regretted that the nature of the programme at the Conference prevented more sustained attention being given to significant ecumenical agreements, and encouraged ACC-14 (meeting in May 2009) to consider the matter. A supplementary paper, *Reception in the Anglican Communion: Responding responsibly to ecumenical and inter-Anglican developments* (also in Chapter 6) explored the issues at stake.

The handling of ecumenical topics at the 2018 Lambeth Conference will be an important issue on which IASCUFO will be able to offer advice.

Resolution 1.08
The 2008 Lambeth Conference

IASCER

- notes with appreciation the high level of ecumenical participation in the 2008 Lambeth Conference
- notes with appreciation the outstanding support given to the ecumenical participation at the Lambeth Conference by Canon Gregory Cameron, Dame Mary Tanner and the other staff
- commends the document ‘A Guide for Ecumenical Participants’ produced for that Conference
- commends the inclusion of a corresponding level of ecumenical participation within future Lambeth Conferences
- commends for the attention of the Communion the contribution of ecumenical participants and the messages of greeting from other Churches:
 - Greetings from ecumenical partners
 - Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Avenues for Co-operation – Contributions from Cardinal Cormac Murphy O’Connor; Dame Mary Tanner; Archbishop David Moxon; Monsignor Donald Bolen; Bishop Lucius Ugorji; Bishop Anthony Farquhar.
 - Roman Catholic Perspectives on Anglicans – Contributions from Cardinal Walter Kasper; Dr John Gibaut; Bishop Christopher Hill.
 - Full Communion’ Agreements: Mutual Accountability and Difference – Contribution from Canon Alyson Barnett-Cowan
 - Address by Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia to the final plenary session.
 - Address by Professor Iain Torrance to the final plenary session.
 - Address to a plenary session by Cardinal Ivan Dias
 - Cardinal Walter Kasper and the Archbishop of Canterbury’s addresses at the Nikaeen dinner.

PART FIVE
Looking to the Future

14. The Challenges Ahead

In the *Indaba Reflections* of the bishops at the 2008 Lambeth Conference, we are reminded:

Unity is both a gift and a vocation from God to the Church for the world. We must learn how to receive that gift. Mindful of the fact that our Lord Jesus Christ prayed that the Church be one, it is, therefore, an imperative for all his followers. They should use 'every ounce of their energy' in seeking for that unity. It is ultimately a question of integrity and credibility, for if Christians are not seen to stand together in worship and work, our witness is impaired and none will believe us. (74)

IASCER has completed its term of office, and its part in responding to this gift and vocation has ended. But the ecumenical journey continues, and the baton will now pass to IASCUFO. The new commission is likely to meet for the first time towards the end of 2009. At the time of going to print, its chair and membership were yet to be decided.

IASCUFO's mandate was approved by JSC in November 2008:

Mandate of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order

The Standing Commission shall have responsibility:

- to promote the deepening of Communion between the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and between those Churches and the other churches and traditions of the Christian *oikumene*
- to advise the Provinces and the Instruments of Communion on all questions of ecumenical engagement, proposals for national, regional or international ecumenical agreement or schemes of co-operation and unity, as well as on questions touching Anglican Faith and Order
- to review developments in the areas of faith, order or unity in the Anglican Communion and among ecumenical partners, and to give advice to the Churches of the Anglican Communion or to the Instruments of Communion upon them, with the intention to promote common understanding, consistency, and convergence both in Anglican Communion affairs, and in ecumenical engagement
- to assist any Province with the assessment of new proposals in the areas of Unity, Faith and Order as requested.

Thus IASCUFO will be able to tackle ecumenical issues in dialogue with the questions of faith and order with which, as IASCER discovered (see Resolution 6.07), they are so closely entwined.

Previous chapters have pointed to a number of areas where IASCER's work is incomplete, and where new circumstances are likely to raise new questions on the ecumenical journey that is the calling of all faithful Christians. Primarily among these, IASCER offers the 'Four Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism' (Chapter 2), as a resource for reflection, and also for refinement and re-enunciation in the changing contexts not only of the world around and the wider *oikumene* (the household of faith) but also of the Communion's own polity, as pursuit of a Covenant and the Windsor Process continue (Chapter 12). As part of this, new life must be breathed into the framework of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral so that it may be a vital companion on the ecumenical journey and a trustworthy guide to the way ahead.

Matters that are likely to require particular attention include reflection on the wide area of communion and *koinonia*, and with them the anomalies of parallel jurisdiction (Chapter 3); issues surrounding the Eucharist, as outlined in "The Sacraments duly administered"?' (Chapter 4); responses to the questions posed on the paper 'Holy Orders in Ecumenical Dialogue' (Chapter 5); and the processes of reception, at both practical and theological levels (Chapter 6, and also cited in relation to various bilateral and multilateral relationships). Within dialogues there is the challenge of bringing a greater forward momentum into Anglican relationships with Churches in Communion, and of addressing the historic legacy of continuing churches (Chapter 7); and ensuring a greater synergy between the international and the local (Chapters 8 and 9), as well as between cognitive and affective, including more overtly 'spiritual', approaches (Chapters 2 and 10). Developments within multilateral ecumenism are also under review (Chapter 10). In the longer term, the 2018 Lambeth Conference will require attention (Chapter 13). Through it all will run the imperative of communicating (with adequate translation where necessary) and so sharing the fruits of our ecumenical engagement, so that all can be fed and resourced by them.

Finally, IASCER concluded its mandate with Resolution 21.08, and offered its prayers for IASCUFO, that its work might be blessed, and that, inspired by 'the vision before us' we might go forward towards fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for his Church 'that they may all be one'.

Resolution 6.07

The continuation of the work of IASCER

IASCER

1. welcomes the proposals which are being developed for an Anglican Communion Commission on Faith and Order
2. believes that, in the light of the experience of a decade of reflection on the ecumenical dialogues of the Communion, any such Commission must include the mandate given to IASCER by the 1998 Lambeth Conference building on the work of ACC-10
3. therefore recommends that there should be an explicit reference to 'Christian Unity' in the title of any such Commission.

Resolution 21.08

On the Conclusion of the IASCER Mandate

IASCER

- has appreciated the mandate given to it following its setting up by the Lambeth Conference of 1998
- has found the experience of the annual review of Anglican involvement in ecumenical endeavour around the world a valuable one, which has provided the opportunity of achieving consistency and coherence in ecumenical dialogue, as well as highlighting important matters of faith and order
- is grateful for the privilege of meeting every year, by invitation, in various Provinces of the Communion, and trusts that its engagement with these local Churches has been an encouragement to them, as its members have been encouraged and learned from them
- notes with sadness that internal tensions within the Anglican Communion have hampered some ecumenical progress during the time of its meetings
- hopes that its successor (IASCUFO) will be able to sustain and build on its work and enjoy the continuing confidence, encouragement and support of the Instruments of Communion
- wishes to thank Archbishop Drexel Gomez for his Chairmanship and wishes him a long and fulfilling retirement

- thanks the staff who have served IASCER during its existence, and likewise the Churches who have hosted its meetings
- above all gives thanks to God for the many blessings received and continues to pray for the fulfilment of the Lord's prayer for his Church, 'that they may all be one'.

IASCER Meetings

2000

Nassau, Bahamas,
2 - 8 December

2001

Cape Town, South Africa,
1 - 7 December

2002

Monastery of Bose, Italy
30 November - 6 December

2003

Duncan Delray Center, Florida, USA
29 November - 5 December

2004

Montego Bay, Jamaica
4 - 10 December

2005

Valletta, Malta
4 - 10 December

2006

Mahé Island, The Seychelles
3 - 9 December

2007

Cairo, Egypt
5 - 10 December

2008

Kyoto, Japan
2 - 8 December

The communiqués of the meetings
are available through the ecumenical pages
of the Anglican Communion website,
www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/ecumenical

The Membership of the Commission and Meetings Attended

The Most Revd Drexel Gomez

Church in the Province of the West Indies (Chair)
2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Dr Paul Avis

Church of England
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Alyson Barnett-Cowan

Anglican Church of Canada
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Rt Revd John Baycroft

Anglican Communion Office (Secretary 2002)
2001, 2002

The Revd Canon Gregory Cameron

Anglican Communion Office (Secretary from 2003)
2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Dr William Crockett

Anglican Church of Canada
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Rt Revd Mark Dyer

The Episcopal Church (2000-2003, Vice-Chair 2000)
2000

The Rt Revd Christopher Epting

The Episcopal Church
2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Dr John Gibaut

Anglican Church of Canada (from 2004)
2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Most Revd Dr John Gladstone

Church of South India
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Jonathan Goodall

Archbishop of Canterbury's Representative (from 2005)
2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Jonathan Gough

Archbishop of Canterbury's Representative (2001-2004)
2001, 2003, 2004

The Revd Canon David Hamid

Anglican Communion Office (Secretary to 2001)
2000, 2001

The Rt Revd John Hind

Church of England
2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Dr Jae Joung Lee

(2000-2003)
Unable to attend the meetings

The Rt Revd Justus Marcus

Anglican Church of Southern Africa (died 2003)
2000, 2001

The Revd Canon Richard Marsh

Archbishop of Canterbury's Representative (2000)
2000

The Ven Jane Namugenyi

Church of the Province of Uganda
2000, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007

The Revd Professor Renta Nishihara

Nippon Sei So Kai (from 2004)
2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Luke Pato

Anglican Church of Southern Africa
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Rt Revd Dr Geoffrey Rowell

Church of England (Acting Chair 2001, Vice-Chair from 2002)
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Sarah Rowland Jones

Church in Wales (2000-2002), Anglican Church of Southern Africa (from 2003)
2000, 2001, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Dr Charles Sherlock

Anglican Church of Australia (2000-2003)
2000, 2002

The Rt Revd Dr James Tengtenga

Church of the Province of Central Africa (from 2006)
2006, 2007, 2008

The Revd Canon Professor J. Robert Wright

The Episcopal Church
2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

Observers

The Revd Karackattil George Pothen

The Mar Thoma Church
2002, 2003

The Rt Revd Dr Fritz-René Müller

The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht
2005

The Revd Professor Harald Rein

The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht
2006

Administrative Staff

Mrs Christine Codner

Anglican Communion Office
2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005

Mr Matthew Davies

Anglican Communion Office
2001

Mrs Gill Harris-Hogarth

Anglican Communion Office
2006, 2007, 2008

Miss Elizabeth Hughes

Lambeth Palace
2002

Ms Rosemary Palmer

Anglican Communion Office
2000

The Revd Terrie Robinson

Anglican Communion Office
2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008

Index of Acronyms

AAALC

All Africa Anglican - Lutheran Commission

ACC

Anglican Consultative Council

ACSA

Anglican Church of Southern Africa

ALIC

Anglican - Lutheran International Commission

AMICUM

Anglican - Methodist International Commission for Unity in Mission

AOCICC

Anglican - Old Catholic International Co-ordinating Council

AOOIC

Anglican - Oriental Orthodox International Commission

ARC

Anglican - Roman Catholic (dialogue)

ARCIC

Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission

BEM

Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry

CCM

Called to Common Mission

CONIC

Conselho Nacional de Igrejas Cristãs do Brasil

CS/CWCs

Conference of Secretaries of Christian World Communions

CUIC

Churches Uniting in Christ

CUC

Church Unity Commission (South Africa)

ECUSA

Episcopal Church USA

EEC

Ethiopian Episcopal Church

ELCA

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

ELCIC

Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

GCF

Global Christian Forum

GTUM

Growing Together in Unity and Mission

IALC

International Anglican Liturgical Consultation

IARCCUM

International Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission
for Unity and Mission

IASCER

Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations

IASCUFO

Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order

IATDC

Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission

ICAOTD

International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue

IFI

Iglesia Filipina Independiente

JSC

Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the ACC

LWF

Lutheran World Federation

PCPCU

Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity

PNG

Papua New Guinea

Acronyms

PWF

Pentecostal World Federation

SCIFU

Scottish Church Initiative for Union

TEAC

Theological Education for the Anglican Communion

TEC

The Episcopal Church (USA)

WARC

World Alliance of Reformed Churches

WEA

World Evangelical Alliance

WCC

World Council of Churches

Endnotes

1. From the ACC Constitution, Object:
 - e. To keep before national and regional churches the importance of the fullest possible Anglican collaboration with other Christian churches.
 - f. To encourage and guide Anglican participation in the ecumenical movement and the ecumenical organisations, to co-operate with the World Council of Churches and the world confessional bodies on behalf of the Anglican Communion, and to make arrangements for the conduct of pan-Anglican conversations with the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox churches, and other churches.
 - g. To advise on matters arising out of national or regional church union negotiations or conversations and on subsequent relations with united churches.
 - h. To advise on problems of inter-Anglican communication and to help in the dissemination of Anglican and ecumenical information.
2. Lambeth Conference 1920: 9(iv)
3. The text of the Agros Report is available at <http://www.lambethconference.org/1998/documents/report-9.pdf>.
4. For this, and other printed resources referred to through this volume, see the References section in the pages at the end of the book.
5. *Indaba Reflections*, 77.
6. In his Introduction to *Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867-88* – see References
7. *Indaba Reflections*, 71
8. For example, *Indaba Reflections*, 37, 58, 67, 69, 75, 81-4.
9. *Communion, Conflict and Hope*, the Kuala Lumpur Report of the third IATDC, paras 2, 4.
10. Appendix 2 of *Communion, Conflict and Hope*.
11. While the invitation to the non-baptised to receive holy communion is oftentimes referred to as ‘open communion’, this term already has an ecumenical currency, and confuses two distinct issues: an invitation to all baptised Christians to receive holy communion at an Anglican celebration of the Eucharist, as well as the invitation of the non-baptised to receive the same. For precision’s sake, this paper will use the more descriptive ‘communion of the non-baptised’ for the latter.
12. *Walk in Newness of Life*, Section One: Renewal of the Theology of Initiation, 10, 11, 14; reproduced in David R. Holeton, ed., *Growing in Newness of Life*:

- Christian Initiation in Anglicanism Today* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1993), p.232.
13. Anglicans will recall the painful memory of the 1913 Kikuyu Conference in East Africa, when delegates from ‘Nonconformist’ churches received holy communion at an Anglican celebration of the Eucharist, amidst considerable controversy.
 14. Resolution 12.A.ii. Coleman, *Resolutions*, p.49.
 15. Resolution 42. Coleman, *Resolutions*, p.81.
 16. James B. Simpson and Edward M. Story, *The Long Shadows of Lambeth X* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p.212.
 17. Coleman, *Resolutions*, p.166.
 18. ‘Report of Section III: The Renewal of the Church in Unity’. *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports* (London: SPCK, 1968), pp.125 ff.
 19. Thomas Ryan, ‘Eucharistic Sharing: Why the Churches Act Differently’, *Ecumenism* 110 (June 1993), p.32.
 20. See my ‘L’impact de Vatican II sur l’Église anglicane du Canada’, in Gilles Routhier, ed., *L’Église canadienne et Vatican II* (Montréal: Fides, 1997), pp.359-371.
 21. *Constitutions and Canons of the Episcopal Church* (New York: Church House Publishing, 2000), Title I, Canon 17, Section 7.
 22. James Farwell, ‘Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus’, in *The Anglican Theological Review* (Spring 2004), 86.2, pp.215-216.
 23. Resolution A089 ‘Open Communion’, in *Reports to the 74th General Convention* (New York: Church Publishing, 2003), p.150.
 24. A simple Google search indicates that there are more than 42,000 instances of ‘open-communion’ being discussed on the internet.
 25. Farwell notes that ‘the quality of theological reflection that accompanies the practice has been uneven, at best’. ‘Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus’, p.216.
 26. James Farwell, ‘Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus’, pp.215-238; Kathryn Tanner, ‘In Praise of Open Communion: A Rejoinder to James Farwell’ in *The Anglican Theological Review* (Summer 2004), 86.3, pp.473-485; James Farwell, ‘A Brief Reflection on Kathryn Tanner’s Response to ‘Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus’ in *The Anglican Theological Review* (Spring 2005), 87.2, pp.303-310.
 27. Tanner, ‘In Praise of Open Communion’, p.476.
 28. *Ibid*, p.481.

29. Ibid, p.483.
30. Ibid, pp.481-482.
31. Farwell, 'Baptism, Eucharist, and the Hospitality of Jesus', note 3, p.216.
32. Ibid, p.227.
33. Ibid, p.227.
34. Ibid., p.228.
35. Rabbi Reuven Bulka, 'Ask the Religion Experts', *The Ottawa Citizen*.
36. Resolution A089 'Open Communion', p.150.
37. 'Baptism' II.D.6, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper No. 111), (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), p.3.
38. 'Eucharist' II.D.19, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper No. 111), (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), p.14. The commentary on D.19 states: 'Since the earliest days, baptism has been understood as the sacrament by which believers are incorporated into the Body of Christ and are endowed with the Holy Spirit'. p.15.
39. 'Baptism' II.D.6, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, p.3.
40. Ryan, 'Eucharistic Sharing', p.32.
41. Lumen Gentium II.15, in Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents* (Northport, New York: Costello Publishing, 1980), pp.366-367.
42. *Unitatis Redintegratio* I.3, in Flannery, p.455.
43. Canon 844§4, *Code of the Canon Law* (Washington: Canon Law Society of America, 1983), p.321
44. God's Reign and Our Unity III.62, in Jeffrey Gros, Harding Meyer, William G Rusch, eds., *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982-1998* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 2000), p.132.
45. 'Trinity and the Church' 8, in *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue 2006* (London: ACC, 2007), p.14.
46. 'Priesthood, Christ and the Church, 11-12, in *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue 2006* (London: ACC, 2007), p.70.
47. As a member of the ICAOTD, I find it interesting to recall how Anglicans would come at issues around the Church with a solid baptismal ecclesiology, only to be reminded again and again by our Orthodox colleagues that a

- baptismal ecclesiology is incomplete without a eucharistic ecclesiology. Such a reminder from a tradition which has retained from antiquity an integrated rite of Christian initiation which holds baptism and the Eucharist together so closely was invaluable to Anglican members of the dialogue.
48. All these agreements are conveniently collected in Sven Oppegaard and Gregory Cameron, eds., *Anglican - Lutheran Agreements: Regional and International Agreements 1972-2002* (Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 2004).
 49. Paul Avis, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission* (London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 72-76.
 50. John Erickson, 'Episkope and Episcopacy: Orthodox Perspectives', in Peter C Bouteneff and Alan D. Falconer (eds.), *Episkope and Episcopacy and the Quest for Visible Unity*, Faith and Order Paper No. 183 (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1999), 85.
 51. See Kallistos Ware, 'Patterns of Episcopacy in the Early Church and Today: An Orthodox View', in Peter Moore (ed.), *Bishops But What Kind?* (London: SPCK, 1982), 1-24; J. Robert Wright, 'The Origins of the Episcopate and Episcopal Ministry in the Early Church', in J. Robert Wright (ed.), *On Being a Bishop* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), 10-32.
 52. Wright, 19.
 53. Ibid, 19-20.
 54. Ibid, 28-29.
 55. Mark Dyer, 'Theological Reflections on the Patristic Development of Episcopal Ministry', in J. Robert Wright (ed.), *On Being a Bishop* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), 34.
 56. Ibid, 41.
 57. Erickson, 86.
 58. Rowan Williams, 'The Theology of Episkope', in *The Proposal for the Making of an Ecumenical Bishop in Wales: Background Papers* (The Church in Wales, March 1998), 5.
 59. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985, 171-208.
 60. Nicholas Lossky *et al.*, eds. *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1991), s.v. 'Communion', by Avery Dulles, 208.
 61. J. Robert Wright, ed., *Quadrilateral at One Hundred, Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/1888-1986/88*, *Anglican Theological Review Supplemental Series 10* (March, 1988) (Cincinnati, OH: Forward Movement Publications, 1988), vii.
 62. Erickson, 84-85.

63. *Episcopal Ministry: The Report of the Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate* (London: Church House Publishing, 1990).
64. *Bishops in Communion: Collegiality in the Service of the Koinonia of the Church*, An Occasional Paper of the House of Bishops of the Church of England (London: Church House Publishing), 12.
65. Erickson, 85-86.
66. Paul Gibson, ed. *Anglican Ordination Rites: The Berkeley Statement: 'To Equip the Saints'*, Findings of the Sixth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Berkeley, California, 2001 (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2002), 6. It should be noted that the modern bureaucratic/managerial model of episcopacy requires reform as much as the imperial and feudal models.
67. Erickson, 85. The modern megalopolis raises the question of how the bishop relates to mobile as well as stable societies. It also raises the question how episcopal collegiality can best be exercised in large urban centres.
68. *The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1999), 178-179.
69. *The Lambeth Conference 1948* (London: SPCK, 1948), 82-85.
70. The full text of both these reports is available at www.anglicancommunion.org
71. *Bishops in Communion*, ix.
72. Ibid, 21.
73. Ibid, 28-31.
74. Ibid, 33-36.
75. Ibid, 38-39.
76. Ibid, 47.
77. Ibid, 49.
78. David R Holeton, ed., *Anglican Orders and Ordinations: Essays and Reports from the Interim Conference at Jarvenpaa, Finland, of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, 4-9 August 1997* (Cambridge: Grove Books Ltd., 1997), 61-63.
79. Ibid, 63.
80. On 11 July 2007, Cardinal Kasper was quick to present the Declaration as an 'invitation to dialogue' saying 'A thorough reading of the text does not say that the Protestant churches are not churches, but that they are not churches in the proper sense, i.e. they are not churches in the sense in which the Catholic Church understands itself as church ... When, following the declaration *Dominus Iesus*, I said that the Protestant churches are churches of another type, this was not – as some reactions on the Protestant side seemed to assume

– in contrast to the formulation of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, but it was the attempt to interpret it objectively. And I want to do exactly the same thing now, since Catholics speak, now as always, of Protestant Regional Churches, ... of the Church of England etc. [Vatican underlining] The declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith does nothing else than to show that we do not use the one and same word Church completely in the same sense ...’ At the Consistory of 23 November 2007, he said ‘... the ‘five Responses’ released last July by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith have brought about perplexity and given rise to a certain discontent. Indeed, the agitation that developed around this Document was unjustified, since the text said nothing new but repeated Catholic doctrine in summary form. Yet, it would be advisable to review the form, the language and the presentation of similar declarations to the public...’

81. *Lumen Gentium*: ‘This is the one Church of Christ which in the Creed is professed as one, holy, catholic and apostolic, (12*) which our Saviour, after His Resurrection, commissioned Peter to shepherd (74) ,and him and the other apostles to extend and direct with authority (75), which He erected for all ages as ‘the pillar and mainstay of the truth’ (76). This Church constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him,(13*) although many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside of its visible structure. These elements, as gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity.’

12*: Cfr. *Symbolum Apostolicum*: Denz. 6-9 (10-13); *Symb. Nic.-Const.*: Denz. 86 (150), coll. Prof. fidei Trid.: Denz. 994 et 999 (1862 et 1868).

74: John 21.17

75: cf. Matthew 28.18f

76: 1 Timothy 3.15

13*: Dieitur. *Saneta (catholica apostolica) Romana Ecelesia* .: in Prof. fidei Trid., 1. c. et Concl. Vat. I, Sess. III, Const. dogm. de fide cath.: Denz. 1782 (3001).

82. The words ‘identity’ and ‘full identity’ appear in neither *Unitatis Redintegratio* nor *Lumen Gentium*.
83. *Unitatis Redintegratio*: ‘For many centuries the Church of the East and that of the West each followed their separate ways though linked in a brotherly union of faith and sacramental life; the Roman See by common consent acted as guide when disagreements arose between them over matters of faith or discipline. Among other matters of great importance, it is a pleasure for this Council to remind everyone that there flourish in the East many particular or local Churches, among which the Patriarchal Churches hold first place, and of these not a few pride themselves in tracing their origins back to the apostles

- themselves. Hence a matter of primary concern and care among the Easterns, in their local churches, has been, and still is, to preserve the family ties of common faith and charity which ought to exist between sister Churches.’
84. ‘The Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church: A Lutheran Statement 2002 - An Anglican Response by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations’, March 2006. IASCR document 4.i.06. Hereafter EMAC *Response*. Printed in full pp.77-96.
 85. Hereafter EMAC.
 86. In his book *A Ministry Shaped by Mission* (London: T&T Clark International, 2005, 72-76) Paul Avis makes the point that ordained ministry, including the bishop’s ministry, is a representative ministry. The ordained minister acts both *in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae*. The concept of *in persona Christi* brings out the relationship between the ordained ministry and the High Priesthood of Christ, especially in relation to eucharistic presidency. The concept of *in persona ecclesiae* brings out the role of the ordained ministry as representative of the whole baptised community.
 87. See Kallistos Ware, ‘Patterns of Episcopacy in the Early Church and Today: An Orthodox View’, in Peter Moore (ed.), *Bishops But What Kind?* (London: SPCK, 1982), 1-24; J. Robert Wright, ‘The Origins of the Episcopate and Episcopal Ministry in the Early Church’, in J. Robert Wright (ed.), *On Being a Bishop* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), 10-32.
 88. Wright, 19.
 89. Ibid, 19-20.
 90. Ibid, 28-29.
 91. Mark Dyer, ‘Theological Reflections on the Patristic Development of Episcopal Ministry’, in J. Robert Wright (ed.), *On Being a Bishop* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1993), 34.
 92. Ibid, 41.
 93. EMAC *Response*, p.82.
 94. Faith and Order Paper No. 111 (Geneva: World Council of Churches), 1982.
 95. *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican - Orthodox Theological Dialogue 2006*, V.8.
 96. John D. Zizioulas, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001), 16.
 97. Ibid, 116.
 98. Ibid, 220.

99. Ibid, 226.
100. EMAC *Response*, p.89.
101. See Owen Chadwick's Introduction, especially pp.xi-xii and xxii-xxiii, in *Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1988*, ed. Roger Coleman, 1992, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto.

Useful References and Resources

Communiqués and Resolutions of the Inter Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, Communiqués of Bilateral Commissions, texts of agreed statements and other significant Anglican ecumenical documents are available on the Ecumenical pages of the Anglican Communion website:

www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/ecumenical/

Resolutions of the Anglican Consultative Council are available through the ACC pages in the Instruments of Unity section of Anglican Communion website:

www.anglicancommunion.org

Resolutions of the Lambeth Conferences are available on the Conference website:

www.lambethconference.org

Other Useful Websites

The Archbishop of Canterbury's website:

www.archbishopofcanterbury.org

For Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (Faith and Order Paper No. 111, the 'Lima Text') and other World Council of Churches documents:

www.oikoumene.org

Other Useful Publications

Called to Be One (Lambeth Conference 1998, Section IV Report), 1999, Moorhouse Publishing, Harrisburg, PA

Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences, 1967-1988, Ed. Roger Coleman, Introduction Owen Chadwick, 1992, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto

The Kyoto Report of the
Inter-Anglican Standing Commission
on Ecumenical Relations
2000 - 2008

The Vision Before Us

The Vision Before Us harvests the work of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, which met between 2000 and 2008. The Commission was charged with maintaining an overview of the Anglican Communion's ecumenical engagement, and giving encouragement and advice to the ecumenical activities of the Communion and the Provinces.

This book reviews and analyses the breadth of ecumenical engagement across the Anglican Communion. It contains key texts: the Resolutions of IASCER, and other materials the Commission produced, such as *Guidelines on Ecumenical Participation in Ordinations* and *Holy Order in Ecumenical Dialogues*. It also offers *Principles of Anglican Engagement in Ecumenism* for consideration and future development within the Communion.

This volume is intended as an introduction and handbook for all who are concerned with Anglican participation in ecumenism, and constitutes the Report of IASCER to ACC-14.

£8.99

ISBN 978-0-9558261-6-0



THE
ANGLICAN
COMMUNION
OFFICE