

DEBATE BY THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON THE  
BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY STATEMENT OF THE FAITH AND  
ORDER COMMISSION OF THE WCC AND THE FINAL REPORT OF ARCIC-I

---

The following is a transcript of the debate on the Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry Statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC and the Final Report of ARCIC-I.

Members of ARCIC-II will be especially interested to know that the resolutions on the work of ARCIC were decisively endorsed. Its work on Eucharist and Ministry was declared to be "consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England". On Authority the Synod saw "sufficient convergence on the nature of authority in the Church for our communions together to explore further the structures of authority and the exercise of collegiality and primacy in the Church".

During the debate an amendment to substitute "convergence" for "consonance" on Eucharist and Ministry was decisively rejected.

There were also separate votes on the three main areas of ARCIC's work, and the resolution on Authority was decisively passed (by 238 to 38, with 25 abstentions - all other votes showed substantial majorities by a show of hands) in spite of the suggestion that some might want to accept Eucharist and Ministry, but not Authority.

I also attach the full text of the resolutions and unaccepted amendments.

This is the first step towards the definitive Church of England response to ARCIC-I. The General Synod debate was on a 109 page document produced by the Faith and Order Advisory Group of the General Synod called Towards a Church of England Response to BEM and ARCIC (CIO, London, 1985) which is also being sent to ARCIC-II members. This Report and the attached resolutions now go to all the dioceses. It is hoped the resolutions will be passed in the dioceses and so return to the General Synod for final approval in November 1986.



CJH



(11) ARCIC

12 'That this Synod recognizes that:

(a) the Windsor Statement on the Eucharist together with its Elucidation (The Final Report pp. 12-25) is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England;

(b) the Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination together with its Elucidation (The Final Report pp. 30-45) is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England and provides a firm basis upon which to move towards the reconciliation of the ministries of our two communions;

(c) the Venice Statement on Authority 1 together with its Elucidation and Authority 11 (The Final Report pp. 52-98) record sufficient convergence on the nature and authority in the Church for our communions together to explore further the structures of authority and the exercise of collegiality and primacy in the Church.'

13 'That this Synod affirms that the Final Report offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete steps towards the reconciliation of our Churches and proposes that such steps should include those listed in paragraph 271 of the Report.'

14 'That this Synod invites the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops to consider how best to help the Church of England to reflect upon those challenges which the Final Report presents to the exercise and understanding of authority in the Church of England referred to in paragraphs 251-254.'

15 'That this Synod invites the Anglican Consultative Council to think how it can assist the Anglican Communion to reflect upon matters in the text relating to collegiality and primacy.'

---

ITEM 12

Prebendary J. Pearce (London) to move the following amendments:

48 'In item 12(a) leave out the words "is consonant in substance with" and insert "convergent with".'

49 'In item 12(b) leave out the words "is consonant in substance with" and insert "convergent with".'

## THE CHAIR

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd M E Adie) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

TOWARDS A CHURCH OF ENGLAND RESPONSE TO BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY (The Lima Text) AND THE FINAL REPORT OF THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION: A REPORT BY THE FAITH AND ORDER ADVISORY GROUP OF THE BOARD FOR MISSION AND UNITY (GS 661)

The Chairman: We come now to the discussion on BEM AND ARCIC. There is no 't' in ARCIC. People may like to know that in a few moments the television lights will go on. That is not in order to give more publicity to this debate but in the hope of warming people up somehow.

As members will have observed, our consideration of the Faith and Order Advisory Group's report on the Lima and ARCIC texts at this group of sessions is in two parts. Today we are to have a general debate on the motion that this report be received; and then on Thursday we will be considering a series of substantive motions arising from the FOAG report. The Standing Committee have designated the FOAG report under Standing Order 107. This means, first, that we can only take the 'report to be received' motion today and that we cannot move on to the other motions until Thursday. In other words, we are to have time to reflect before we go on to make any decisions. Secondly, it means that the debate will start without any time limits on speeches. It will be open to the Synod to impose a limit when it feels so disposed. Perhaps I ought to say now that I shall not expect to give my consent to a speech limit motion if I think that there are still some major speeches in the offing. Once we do have a limit I may in some cases be prepared to give a particular speaker extra time; if I am going to do that I shall indicate my intention before he or she begins.

We are debating GS 661 but it will, of course, be open to members to refer to the two underlying texts, that is, to the Lima text and to the ARCIC text.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd E W Kemp): I beg to move:

'That this Report be received.'

I cannot promise to add to the heat or raise the temperature but only perhaps to add a little to the light. I begin the presentation of this report with some words about the programme for dealing with it. The World Council of Churches desires comments on the Lima text from all its member churches and our response will, therefore, be sent direct to Geneva, although the Anglican Consultative Council also wishes to collate responses from the various parts of the Anglican Communion. The response to ARCIC will be sent to the ACC which will present the collated responses to the Lambeth Conference in 1986, from which, I understand, the final expression of opinion on behalf

of the Anglican Communion will be sent to Rome.

Members of the Synod will perhaps know that all the episcopal conferences of the Roman Catholic Church have been asked to make their own comments on ARCIC, which are being sent to Rome; what is known of the comments already made by episcopal conferences is certainly encouraging.

Such is the end towards which our synodical programme is directed. If the resolutions set down for Thursday are passed, they will go, with the report, to the dioceses and it is hoped that their deliberations will enable the General Synod to give final approval in November 1986. Under the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution, which I imagine will have to be brought into this as the matter clearly touches the doctrine of the Church of England, the final resolutions will have to be scrutinised and passed by the House of Bishops before being presented for final approval.

There is one other thing that I wish to say before coming to the report itself, something which I am sure all members of FOAG would wish me to say, namely, that we owe it to Mary Tanner, our secretary, that this report reaches the Synod at all. Her drafting for us has been invaluable; her ability to balance and, wherever possible, to reconcile conflicting expressions of opinion has perhaps more than anything else enabled us to produce a document which all members of FOAG have felt able to support. Each of us would no doubt have preferred some passage to be more critical or stronger in approval, but as a group which represents a broad spectrum of Anglicanism, as you can see from the names, we are able to present a report from which no member of the group has asked to record dissent.

The two texts with which this report is concerned are in no way new to Synod. They were introduced in July 1983 by Dr Chadwick in a speech which I am sure all of us remember; but earlier than that the Synod has on three separate occasions passed encouraging resolutions concerning the ARCIC texts. The Lima report has been less discussed synodically, but there is evidence that it has attracted widespread discussion and interest in the dioceses. I shall, therefore, at any rate today, say little in detail about the contents of the two reports, and, because there has been so much previous discussion, will, I hope, make my opening remarks reasonably short.

Both reports are concerned with progress towards the same end, namely, Christian unity; and both have this in common, that they try to move away from the confessional formulations of the past 400 years and to see the questions at issue in the light of Scripture and of the understanding and practice of the Church before the great divisions of East and West. They must, therefore, be examined in terms of what they have tried to do, rather



than be brought to the bar of our own Anglican formularies. We must not act like the judicial committee of the Privy Council in the nineteenth century doctrine cases and try to compare passages from the report with passages from the Articles and Prayer Book, to see whether there is a verbal consistency. We are asked to consider more broadly whether in one case we can 'recognise the faith of the Church through the ages' and in another whether what is said 'is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England'. Those phrases are set out in chapter 1 of the FOAG report and discussed more explicitly on pages 22 to 32 and 166 to 180. They shaped much of our discussion. The Synod will come back to them in the resolutions to be proposed on Thursday.

Both Lima and ARCIC are to be seen within a context of theological discussion which is still continuing. Lima has a longer history and it fits into a three-part agenda on which the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches is working - the other two parts being concerned with 'a common expression of the apostolic faith' and 'common structures of decision making'. Our own failures must make us see how important these other two parts are, but neither is yet developed to anything like the same degree as the Lima text. The work of the Faith and Order Commission is done by theologians from all the main-line churches, including the Roman Catholic Church, which participates in this exercise although not being a member of the WCC. What they have produced is not so much a record of formal agreement as a clearing away of misunderstandings, an identification of the main areas where agreement is needed, an indication of how far progress towards such agreement seems to have been made, and all within a general picture of convergence. This is a convergence not a consensus text.

The three parts - Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry - do not all record the same degree of convergence. The first two take us a long way and, if they are found generally acceptable, will have laid some substantial foundations for negotiations between particular churches. The ministry text does not go so far and we are already aware of quarters in which it is less acceptable than the other two; greater agreement obviously remains to be sought here. Nevertheless, it represents an important achievement and one which has undoubtedly been influenced by earlier responses of this Synod. If it comes to be broadly accepted then it offers real hope for the future, and hope in what has been so far the most intractable area in unity negotiations. The greater part of our discussion of Lima necessarily concentrates on its doctrine, in answer to the first question about the faith of the Church through the ages, but I do call the attention of the Synod to the comments that

we have proposed in Questions 2 and 3 and, more particularly, to what we say on pages 57 to 60 about possible changes in our own Church which we ought seriously to consider. Faith has to be carried out in life and if we agree those things about faith we cannot just stay as we are but must consider what changes that common faith requires in ourselves.

When we turn to ARCIC we are looking at a somewhat different kind of text for here we have the product of a dialogue between two churches, a dialogue which is shaped by the questions which have been at issue between them in their separation and by the hope of clearing the way for certain practical steps towards unity. Thus the statement on the eucharist does not attempt to cover the whole doctrine of that sacrament as does the corresponding Lima text but concentrates on two main issues which have been matters of controversy between us. The statement on ministry and ordination is similarly controlled by the fact that both churches have and attach significance to episcopacy, and have preserved the historic threefold order. These two statements were welcomed by the Synod in 1974, although some criticisms were made; now they are published with the elucidations which take account of many of those earlier comments and, it is hoped, go some way at least towards reassuring those among us who were disturbed by certain phrases. FOAG itself is discussing the theme of priesthood and hopes before long to present a paper on that subject to the Synod.

The two statements on authority are on a different footing from those on eucharist and ministry. Certainly they deal with questions which have been at issue between us, but they deal with them in a more tentative way, recognising that there are important matters which still need to be explored. Here, as in the case of Lima, there is convergence if not substantial agreement, and it is here that we are brought most clearly face to face with the problem of the difference between the ideal and the actual which runs right through both Lima and ARCIC. It is one thing to accept, for example, the value of a universal primate servicing the unity of the Church; it is quite another to see that ideal actualised in the Roman Curia. Of course, there are many Roman Catholics who agree with us about this, and there is already evidence that the Observations of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith are by no means shared by many of the local hierarchies who have been asked to comment on ARCIC. We await with interest the outcome of the episcopal synod to be held at the end of this year. But paragraph 240 of the report expresses the anxiety on this matter which exists among us.

In commending this report to the Synod, there is another thing that I wish to say. We are dealing here with a widely ecumenical text in the Lima

report and with an international dialogue between two communions in ARCIC. We must not overlook the fact that there are other international dialogues in which our Church is engaged. Reports on those with the Lutherans and with the Reformed have already been published, and FOAG will be beginning its examination of them on 1 March. Like ARCIC, they are shaped by the questions which have in the past been at issue between us and these other communions, and equally they have their contribution to make to the whole. We have not yet seen - or at least I had not until this morning - the latest report of the Anglican/Orthodox dialogue just published. It is important that we hold all these together and that, although the circumstances of the past may dictate differences of emphasis in subject matter, we do not allow the various dialogues to become inconsistent with one another. For that reason, if for no other, it is important to do as we have tried to do in this report with ARCIC, and set them within the wider ecumenical discussion and convergence shown in the Lima report.

We see also, I think, that some earlier ecumenical projects which failed were not entirely wasted. In our work on this report, for example, we have found both the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal and the book Growing into Union, written in criticism of that particular scheme, helpful, as also some of the material produced in connection with the Covenant. This shows that the failure of particular schemes is not necessarily a blow to ecumenical progress but rather that these schemes must themselves be seen in relation to what is a steady movement. If the report which I have the honour of presenting today manages to convey this sense of movement, I trust that it will be for the Synod a message of encouragement and of hope.

The Provost of Southwark (Very Revd D L Edwards): How does one pay a compliment to a lady? Chocolates, roses? No. The Bishop of Chichester has shown this afternoon, as we ask ourselves how we can reward Mrs Tanner, that the best way is to do our theology constructively, as she has done it so well on the Faith and Order Advisory Group. I watched her at work as secretary, motivator and drafter.

What kind of theology are we to do? We can rejoice in the emergence of a new style of theology in many parts of Christendom. It is a style especially congenial to Anglicans for we can find in it our own tradition of appealing to the whole Bible, to the whole Church and to the individual's experience, conscience and reason, the dispersed authority which we acknowledge. But Anglicans have no monopoly; indeed, this style can be seen in all the reports of recent or current dialogues between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, the Lutherans and the Reformed, surely

a remarkable phenomenon itself? It is a style which begins with the Bible but does not regard the Bible either as a clear blueprint to be copied accurately in the twentieth century or as a quarry out of which may be extracted rival proof-texts which, like ballistic missiles, will devastate our debates. The Bible is a library produced by the people of God wrestling with the mystery of God. What is of God in the long and often tragic history of the Church is the continuation of that biblical experience of meeting God. The Holy Spirit has been continuously active, and the response to the Holy Spirit has been 'the faith of the Church through the ages', although the Church has found that this mystery cannot be pinned down completely in words, however official. It is our task, guided by the Holy Spirit and despite our own evident weakness, to do something fresh. We must apply this enormous holy tradition to the questions and needs of today, in order that the Church, by its outgoing life as well as by its united words of power, may itself be a sacrament of something far greater than the Church - the coming Kingdom of God.

This style of doing theology, which has learnt from the positive insights of the Catholic, evangelical, liberal and charismatic movements, can be seen in the documents before us as it is applied to the sacraments and the ministry. It could be applied in other spheres as important or more important. Many of us hope that tomorrow morning it will be so applied. Because we have got into such a mess with past controversies, it cannot be applied without patience or pain; but out of that travail come birth and growth.

As I have discussed BEM and ARCIC in FOAG and in diocesan and deanery synods and parish meetings, some central themes have emerged from discussions with brother priests and with lay people. They are themes which both encourage and challenge Anglicans at the same time. Baptism is admission into the fellowship of Christ's people as by faith and love we participate in his death and resurrection. It surely needs to be recognised that our conventional approach to baptism, at the popular or theological level, has been far too individualistic. If baptism is what the Lima text says it is, and if we Anglicans go on baptising infants, as we shall, then we have an obligation to develop a much more systematic policy for training the baptised in congregations and in house groups. In theology, we in the Church of England have made too much of confirmation; but it matters far more that in practice we have made far too little of adult education of the baptised.

The eucharist is the corporate communion of the baptised, as all of us who share in it know these days, but it is also a profoundly personal sacrifice. On that BEM and ARCIC significantly agree. Our conventional



understanding of it in the Church of England since the triumph of the 'parish people' movement has become too matey. 'Sacrifice' is not merely a word to be refined in the higher reaches of theological diplomacy. I am afraid that I must sacrifice myself as I am drawn into the mystery of my Lord's sacrifice of himself, a sacrifice which is made effectively and often alarmingly present as it is remembered in faith. The eucharist can be understood as the real presence of the living Lord without using the language of transubstantiation. But it cannot be understood if it is what BEM and ARCIC say it is, without using, in some sense, the language of sacrifice. We in the Church of England have to learn from other churches what it means to say to the self-sacrificed Lord, "For you, I am prepared to give my body and shed my blood."

On the ordained ministry and its authority, there is as yet less convergence, as the Bishop of Chichester noted. Some progress needs to be made in further theological dialogue. But we are, as the Bishop also said, challenged to change in practical ways, and I suggest that this matters more. The agreement, as I understand it, is that the ordained ministry, distinguished by its self-sacrifice, should consist of overseers, elders and servants, or, to use words not English in derivation, bishops, presbyters and deacons. We Anglicans have every reason to be pleased by this recognition by Lima in 1983 of an advance on Accra in 1974. But if the ministry is what BEM and ARCIC say it is, there is no room for the bishop as dictator, for the priest as magician or for the deacon as apprentice sorcerer. Whether or not we think women priests right - and I am one of those who do - we can all agree that these reports force out of us the admission that we have only just begun to explore the richness of the ministry that the Holy Spirit would give within the calling of the priestly people of God. We in England have only just begun to enable bishops so to function as pastors that episcopacy is commended by its practice, not as something which the Free Churches tend to regard as the price to be paid for reunion. Recently we have been reminded what uncertainty there is about the responsibility of the bishop as a teacher of the apostolic gospel. That needs to be cleared up. We have only just begun to think out what kind of patriarchate Canterbury is. We avoid the very word, yet it is a patriarchate, in all but name. We have only just begun tentatively, fearfully, to think out what kind of presidency over the worldwide college of bishops is right, a position for which in practice the Bishop of Rome is the only candidate. If the Pope needs to abdicate jurisdiction and to renounce infallibility, we need to abandon many prejudices inherited from 'no Popery' days. That process is still in a very early stage.

We have only just begun to think in terms of a team ministry in every parish so that the vicar is clearly no longer the one-man band who is applauded or criticised by his audience. And we all know that we are only at the very beginning of the discovery of the diaconate. We have been given by these reports an agenda for our own renewal and reform and - let us face it - if the papacy is challenged to go back on the centralising tendency of a thousand years the Church of England, as it has existed since the days of Henry VIII, is also challenged to change radically.

We are explicitly or implicitly challenged by these reports to say what we believe is right about the unity of the Church. HEM makes it clear that the unity of the baptised should allow for greater diversity: for example, diversity about the legitimacy of baptising babies. It may well be that, as HEM suggests, differences over the ordination of women must be part of this acknowledged diversity. Similarly, as ARCIC suggests, differences over reservation could be accepted. So too the connection between the English Church and the English Crown could find a place among what Pope Paul VI called 'a worthy patrimony of piety and usage'.

However, Cardinal Ratzinger has asked some pertinent questions. In the Church of England, do we value our continuing links with the state more than we value the hope of closer links with our fellow Christians? Do we not need to share more systematically our decision making as provinces of the Anglican Communion, so that we can think internationally? Are we prepared to sacrifice any of our habits in order to reach closer communion and collaboration with non-Anglicans? Or are we going to go on saying until the end of time, "We are the national Church, we are the established Church, we are the Church with Church Commissioners and nothing is going to change us"?

The FOAG report calls on us to reaffirm our commitment to the ecumenical goal which is not, not, not uniformity but is 'visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship'. We all know that since the 1920 Lambeth appeal Anglicans have proved unable to enter into union schemes outside the Indian subcontinent and the unique society of China. We all know how often it has been said recently that we are not unitable with, since too warm a welcome to non-episcopalians would offend Catholic Anglicans interested chiefly in reunion with Rome, yet too cold an insistence on episcopacy would offend evangelical, liberal and charismatic Anglicans. The success of Anglicanism - and it is a remarkable success - in holding together Catholics and Protestants, orthodox and liberals, has inspired an ecumenical vision, for, if Anglicans can bridge these gaps, why can other Christians not do so? But this success has barely concealed a continuing disunity within

our Anglican family, which is bound to emerge, it seems, and emerge ruinously, once any change in the formula of unity is proposed. Hence our agreement - it seems to be a tacit agreement, at any rate - to let matters rest, apart from local experiments. This amounts to an agreement to erect "No Entry" signs at both ends of the bridge Church. But the trouble about that agreement is that while it may suit us it does not suit the God revealed in the New Testament. We are commanded in the New Testament to seek a unity more substantial than the friendship with other churches which, thank God, we already enjoy. We are not commanded to act against our essential convictions, but we have to ask ourselves whether the causes of our present divisions, which still go so tragically deep, really are conflicts of conscience about fundamental doctrines. Are they not, rather, historical, psychological, sociological, to a large extent? These reports suggest that the area of theological agreement is already found to be very extensive, once Christians will take the time and trouble to sit down together.

If this General Synod can endorse what FOAG cautiously recommends as the logical consequences of BEM and ARCIC for Anglicans, it will be one signal that the ecumenical movement can begin moving again. That will be significant, although I am one of those who hope that something very definite and exciting will come out of the ideas now published for a major British conference of the Faith and Order Commission of the Church and, let us hope also, for the public, national celebration of the Lima liturgy as a manifestation of the theological and spiritual unity already achieved. We need many signals of hope, showing everyone that on our bridge Church there will green lights for traffic from Rome and the East and from the historic Free Churches.

Mrs J M Mayland (Sheffield): I would like to thank the members of FOAG very much indeed for the excellent report which they have submitted to us, a vital step in the whole process of reception and response by the Church of England to BEM and ARCIC. I find this report very thrilling and very encouraging. After all the failure to achieve schemes of unity and the subsequent gloom and despond, we can all begin to pick ourselves up, metaphorically speaking, and begin to find a new way together. It seems to me that this new way has two paths which run side by side. The one is the path of hard theological study and the other is the path of practical experience through local ecumenical projects. In the path of hard theological study and dialogue, BEM and ARCIC have a vital role to play.

I also know, from my membership of the Central Committee of the World Council, what great hope is placed on BEM and the responses of the churches to it

on a very wide ecclesiological front. Nevertheless, there is no false optimism. At our meeting last summer we were already beginning to hear from some members of some of the Reformed churches about their unhappiness at the stress on the eucharist in BEM; something which gives great hope and encouragement to some of us is seen as an obstacle to others. Nevertheless, in spite of these warning signs, the convergence expressed in BEM and the beginnings of responses to that convergence is encouraging and the potential of study by the churches is very, very great. Of course, on a different level, that of a bilateral conversation, the report of ARCIC is of great significance, representing as it does the voice of one of the very largest world churches.

On our national scale, however, I do believe that in the next few years BEM and ARCIC both have a very important part to play. We have already had some reference to the publication of plans for movement forward on the British ecumenical scene and it has been suggested that this search together should begin with the fundamental question of what the Church is for. I believe that BEM and ARCIC can give us some great help in answering that fundamental question. The FOAG report gives some hint of this material, some hint of this answer, but, of course, because it is geared to answering very specific questions which on Thursday will be turned into motions, it has not been able to give the fullest attention to the material in BEM and ARCIC on the subject of the nature of the Church. There are hints, as I have said, in paragraph 82 on page 83, in referring to BEM, and on page 75 when referring to ARCIC. But as they are only hints, I would like to stress the original statements because I think that we can learn a lot from them.

The BEM document introduces a section about the whole people of God with this sentence, "In a broken world God calls the whole of humanity to become his people." A little later on, in paragraph 4, it states that "the Church is called to proclaim and prefigure the Kingdom of God. It accomplishes this by announcing the gospel to the world and by its very existence as the Church." BEM continues later, "Living in this communion with God, all members of the Church are called to confess their faith and give an account of their hope. In so doing, they bring to the world a foretaste of the joy and glory of God's Kingdom."

In a similar vein, the ARCIC 1973 statement on ministry and ordination, section 11, paragraph 3, says, "The Christian community exists to give glory to God through the fulfilment of the Father's purpose. All Christians are called to serve this purpose. They should witness to God's compassion for all mankind and his concern for justice in the affairs of men."



What then is the Church for? In the view of ARCIC and BEM, it is the pledge and sign of God's love to the world. It exists not for its own sake but only as a foretaste and instrument of the Kingdom of God. In our reception and our discussion of BEM and ARCIC, we, just as the FOAG report, will have to get down to the nitty-gritty of "churchy" matters, the churchy matters which divide us, especially in connection with eucharist and ministry; but we must do this against the essential reminder that we do it not for the sake of the Church but so that the Church may truly be God's instrument in bringing about his Kingdom. This challenge has a tremendous bearing on the way in which we regard questions concerning ministry. Questions of order have done more than anything else to cause the failure of unity schemes in the past, such as the Anglican/Methodist or the Covenant. Sometimes I have felt that we are bedevilled by a kind of fundamentalism about Church order which can be as damaging as, if not more damaging than, biblical fundamentalism. I believe that our basic question must be the one enunciated so firmly in BEM and referred to on page 34 of the FOAG report, namely, how according to the will of God and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church to be ordered so that the gospel may be spread and the community built up in love?

This seems to me to be a question from the right perspective. Surely we should be looking at matters of Church order not from the inside, not as a matter of Church continuity, still less of Church politics, but from the angle of service to the world.

I must then go on to ask the question, if we in the Church of England had regarded plans for covenanting from this angle, would we have come to a different decision? Furthermore, what bearing does this challenge have on our current discussions concerning the ordination of women? This basic stance of looking at the Church from the point of view of the world also has vital implications for the eucharist. It can no longer be regarded as a cosy breakfast or supper for the Church club. Some of the most challenging statements in BEM are those concerning the eucharist and the world. I welcome the way in which the FOAG report receives them, on pages 29 and 30. "The eucharist is the centre from which Christians go out renewed by the power of the Spirit to act as servants of reconciliation in a broken and divided world. This concern for the world is not an optional extra in our agreement on the eucharist but rightly belongs as an integral part of our common belief about the eucharist." Similarly paragraph 75 refers to the same ideas in the ARCIC report, where it states, "The eucharist involves the believer in the central event of the world's history. As participants in the eucharist, therefore, we prove inconsistent if we are

not actively participating in this ongoing restoration of the world's situation..."

There is one final point I would like to make, arising from this background. All that I have said about the nature of the Church, the ministry of the whole people of God, the eucharist, and their significance for the world, has grave implications for the laity, who live our daily lives outside the reach of the Church, sometimes in very secular situations. It means that the lay outlook, lay participation, lay concerns, are of great importance for the Church. This fact is recognised by both BEM and ARCIC, but more strongly by the first than by the second. In my view, the ARCIC statement gives far too passive a role to the laity, especially in the whole process of reception of authoritative statements; and ARCIC is totally inadequate in its recognition of the importance of the laity in the government of the Church. I would maintain that the FOAG report, on pages 87 and 88, does not adequately reflect this concern and that FOAG has not sufficiently upheld the role of the laity in these matters, perhaps because of its own very clerical composition. FOAG seems, in fact, to believe that there is no problem, and on page 86 the report states, quoting ARCIC, "The sensus fidelium is a vital element in the comprehension and declaration of God's truth", and comments, "Such language implies that lay participation in the realm of authority is not simply confined to the participation of a few lay people in synodical bodies."

It is all very well to be dismissive of synodical bodies. Synodical government, we know, has plenty of weaknesses. We still have a long way to go before it is working properly. But, for all its faults, it is a genuine and vital attempt to enable bishops, clergy and laypeople to co-operate in discussing doctrine and organising the government of the Church and trying to enable the Church to have an influence on the affairs of the world. The ARCIC reports and the nature and behaviour of the Church of Rome at the moment do not seem to me to give adequate regard to this vital activity of the laity, and this is one area where I for one would need to see a considerably change before I could happily opt for further organic unity.

However, with this very grave reservation, I warmly welcome this report and I hope that we shall receive it gladly.

Canon P H Boulton (Southwell): I would like to extend one special welcome to this report because of the particular moment at which it appears, namely because, together with the BEM and ARCIC reports, it will be considered in many dioceses alongside the motions connected with the ordination of women, passed at the last group of sessions. I welcome this because I believe that the relative importance of these various motions, together with

the contents of this report and its associated reports, may become clearer and that an order of priorities may emerge for the programme of our Church during the next five-year session of the General Synod.

I welcome this report and will add more from my experience as a member of the now defunct Churches' Council for Covenanting and its failure to gain a full-hearted consensus from the Church of England. I believe that the arrival of BEM and ARCIC on the scene at this time, so soon after the failure of the Covenant, is indeed providential, and I hope that we shall all see it in that light.

As I see it, there are four contributions that GS 661 makes and which begin to indicate the healing of our confused English ecumenical scene. In paragraph 99 and 100 it draws attention to the remarkable convergence between BEM, ARCIC and the other bilateral discussions with the Lutherans, Reformed and Orthodox on the theology of episcopacy, and it indicates the wide acceptance of the detailed terms of episcopacy set out in the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal, to which the Bishop of Chichester referred, which lay behind the Covenant proposals but which failed at that time to gain the unqualified response of the United Reformed Church and then, subsequently, of our own Synod. I hope that the Reformed response to BEM, following the lines of God's Reign and Our Unity, may enable the achievement of unity on this issue where we in the Churches' Council for Covenanting failed.

Second, under paragraphs 101 to 104 in GS 661, Ministry and Priesthood, we comment in the FOAG report on the distinction drawn in BEM and ARCIC between the unique priesthood of Christ, the priesthood of the whole Church and the priesthood of the ordained ministers whose priesthood is derivatory from both and its service called out by Christ from the Church. In 103 the relation between the presidency of the eucharist and the eucharist seen as sacrifice is detected both in ARCIC and in BEM. Both these insights are germane not only to the process of unity among the churches of our own nation but, perhaps even more urgently, within the Church of England itself. I believe that they provide for us an agenda to which we must properly address ourselves to in the Church of England.

Thirdly, what GS 661 has to say about the BEM contribution on the diaconate - and this is to be found in the BEM, page 27, paragraph 31, and the comment with it - to see the diaconate as a vital and self-authenticating order in the threefold ministry and its congruence with our own report, GS 281, and the Anglican/Reformed dialogue in paragraphs 91 to 97, will, I hope, gain an echo in our present need to clarify our own minds upon this matter, to which there seems to be considerable reluctance in our own Synod to address ourselves. It is my hope that the present proposal to ordain women

to the diaconate will enable our Church to gain valuable experience in the practice of the diaconate by a large body of people, as an order in its own right and for its own sake, without, as the draft measure puts it, making it lawful for a woman to be ordained to the office of priest. Experience in such an order is necessary for the Church. The opportunity is there, and experience takes time as well as concentration of effort.

Fourthly, GS 661 reflects the growing need, expressed in the aftermath of the large number of failed unity schemes in which Anglicans have been involved, for a commonly accepted doctrine of the Church as a framework within which the doctrines of the sacraments, ministry, creeds and authority can be drawn together. As Mrs Mayland has pointed out - and I am happy to concur with a great deal of what she says - ARCIC sees *koinonia* as a unifying concept. BEM sees "the people of God" as its main ecclesiastical theme but balances it and complements it with other models to be found in the New Testament, namely, the body of Christ, in relation to baptism, the community of the new covenant, in relation to the eucharist. I could have hoped that some of the other New Testament models, such as the bride of Christ and the house of God, with its cognates of the word *oikos*, had received mention and treatment. But I must not be churlish. I am happy that there is an ecclesiology which is detectable.

Nevertheless, as a member of the now defunct Council for Covenanting, I am grateful for such careful consideration on the issue of ecclesiology, by both BEM and ARCIC, for fundamentally I believe, as I said at the time, that the Covenant proposals failed for lack of an agreed doctrine of the Church which was not exclusive in its definition or its effects. The purpose of the Church, as Mrs Mayland has pointed out to us, is to bring about the unity of all mankind under God. This is the concept which will maintain us on the road to unity of all Christians, but at the same time impel us outwards for the reconciliation of broken relationships among all mankind.

I hope that the Synod will accept both the report and the contingent motions that will be moved later.

Miss R C Howard (York): This is an absolutely splendid report - and it is not very often that I feel that about Synod reports. I did notice with anxiety its number - 661 - and wondered what would have happened if it had been five further on, but I see that the number of the beast has been assigned to the Appointment of Bishops memorandum. What I specially liked about this was the way in which it demonstrated the value of the BEM and ARCIC overlap, which we could see so well in eucharist and ministry, and



astonishingly, I must say, the degree of consistency. This really gives one heart. How much, therefore, we really miss the overlap in the matter of authority. How much it would have been helped if we had had a balance, one of a wider ecumenical constituency, which would have enabled us also to set this in its full context. That is why I very much hope that the Faith and Order Commission can be encouraged, cajoled, kicked in the pants, if necessary, to pursue with as much rapidity as possible these other two splendid things which have been on the back burner for long enough, in any case, common expression of apostolic faith and common structures of decision making. I am not sure which would include one which, even in the rather dim ages when I was a member of that august body, was being talked about, that is, the differing sense of magisterium, the teaching office held by the churches. So I want to address myself to this question of authority.

In the case of ARCIC, I thought, at the time when ARCIC Authority I came out, and I remain of the same opinion, that there were a number of illegitimate jumps. You know the sort of thing. You are following an argument and you suddenly see that someone has left a little gap and has assumed that there is a bridge over it, when you know perfectly well that that person has not constructed the bridge except in imagination. I felt at the time, and indeed I made a sharp remark about the whole of Authority I, as someone involved, that they might have argued for the necessity of a universal primate; they had not really argued for it, they had just assumed it. It was a reasonable assumption but the arguments had not been made. What I welcome enormously in this document is that they really have not fudged that issue. They have looked very hard at it and have said a number of things fairly trenchantly, thing which need saying. I say that not in a spirit of ancient anti-Popery but really because, if we have led certain people up the garden path ecumenically which we have been accused of doing, we have no need to balance things by leading the Roman Catholics up the garden path.

Although sophisticated theologians will understand exactly those balancing things that are put in, I am not sure that a number of ordinary Roman Catholics, including priests and, dare I say it, even some Bishops will not be so set in their ways of understanding the term 'universal primate' that they may not take an apparent acceptance by Anglicans of it in the terms in which they are familiar with it. We owe it to them to make clear that we are not talking about this. I am not talking about an individual but about the style with which, over a long period, the primacy and the magisterium of the primacy has been exercised. The Roman Catholic magisterium exercised by the Pope is exercised in a way which neither we nor the Orthodox

nor the other great Protestant churches are familiar with. It is not our style and it is not the way we do it. It is there that serious conversation and an attempt at understanding needs to take place. Maybe one of the things that we need is to study ecumenically the way in which we understand the magisterium, the teaching office of the Church, more than we have done. This, of course, should include a hard look at the *sensus fidelium* which, I am glad to say, both ARCIC and our own report do.

I now want to turn to the question of authority as we perceive it as Anglicans, because this is also rightly pressed on us - what I call "the authority process". At the end of paragraph 252, it says, "The question is, through what persons or institutions is Christ's authority now mediated in the universal Church?". The following paragraph contains the comment, "Having recognized that inherent authority it is our task to discover structures through which the authority can be most adequately expressed and acknowledged." The whole question of ecumenical structures of authority is obviously enormously difficult, but I want to suggest that Anglicans need to reflect not simply on structures of authority, not simply on persons who exercise authority, not simply on institutions - yes, we need to reflect on that and I am entirely one with that as far as synods and so on are concerned - but it is also a matter of what I want to call "the authority process", the process whereby we not only exercise authority and experience authority but by which we come to decisions which we recognise as authoritative - and that is not only through institutions and structures.

That is why certain suggestions which are made are important, suggestions, that is to say, as to how we are to explore the way in which we do this. The Anglican Communion as a whole and the Church of England itself need an exploration of our authority process. Sometimes conversation suggests that we are tending to see Anglicanism's way of doing things as haphazard and accidental - "we just happen to do it that way" - or simply as historically conditioned. All that may be partly the truth but I do not believe it to be profound truth. Might we not explore the way in which we actually exercise authority and the way in which we discover what we regard as authoritative?

My belief is that we do not do it by accident. There is a deep instinctive process at work which we would do well to reflect upon, discover and explicate, to see if there may not be a distinctive way of achieving consensus, which is abroad among us, whatever its malfunctions, which has something of value for us and even for the world at large, may we add humbly. It is partly instinctual, and that is what comes out when you look at what happens over liturgy. OK, it is a matter for sitting long hours, weary and

dreary, working out forms of words, but in the end it is the *sensus fidelium*, the acceptance of the liturgy, in all sorts of odd ways, the continuing attachment to the old Prayer Book, the way in which we say that we learn what Anglicans really believe by looking at the way in which we worship - all that is part of the process and we would do well to explore and explicate it. I also notice that, by this working away at issues, there is a certain forbearance. Again, it is a seeing of authoritative decision or formulation. It may be, to an extent that we have not yet articulated, that there is a coherence and integrity about the way in which we do these things which could be of value ecumenically and which it would be well to discuss ecumenically. When we debated this matter in York, the then Bishop of Durham said, "What degree of diversity is to be tolerable without breach of communion?" This, he said, was the problem. This is it: the degree of diversity which does not cause you to break communion. What are we to make of the fact that no Anglican province has broken communion with those who have ordained women as priests? What does this say about our understanding of the nature of authority? Is it saying that this is a second order question, and does the demand for a decision on this whole question by a universal council mean that only such a council can decide whether it is a first or second order question, that if it is a first order question it must be decided by a universal council and if it is a second order question it may or may not be so decided? Or is it asking for advice on both?

I am not saying that I know what the answer is but I am thinking that these are the sort of questions. Is it or is it not fundamental to faith? Do Anglicans simply let the debate simmer and see what comes out? Or is there perhaps merit in the suggestion from Archbishop Ted Scott (?), who wrote that in a world of rapid communication we think more in terms of the possibility of achieving a universal consensus, and that this means that we should be seeking to make universal judgments about possible courses of action before they have been tried and tested in some particular context. "I wonder," he says, "if this is how developments can or should take place. I wonder too, given the realities of today's world, if waiting for a universal consensus does not mean ruling out any action. In the early Church many things were tried in one area and then either approved or rejected for catholic use. Perhaps today we need again to consider this as a valid way of action."

I merely want to ask if that and a whole lot of other things are not now the ways we should be exploring, as we come together to discover the forms of authority exercised among us and how they should be exercised in the future.

Canon W A Bretherton (Liverpool): In this debate we are invited to note omissions, over-emphases, inadequate treatment.

First of all, an over-emphasis. Those who have worked so hard to produce the ARCIC and Lima reports have obviously been thrilled by the amount of convergence, even consensus, which they have discovered as they have researched into the common roots of our faith. At times, Lima, in particular, seems to get carried away with the enthusiasm generated by its work. For instance, is realist language used about sacraments? We are used to the realistic language of Scripture which teaches both that baptism saves us and that we are also saved through faith. These two aspects are also balanced in Lima, but at times the realist aspect is carried to extremes. For instance, "God bestows on all baptised persons the anointing and promise of the Holy Spirit". Does he really? On all baptised people? On eucharist, Lima really goes to town. "Eucharist is a great thanksgiving for everything accomplished in creation, redemption and sanctification, for everything accomplished by God now in the Church and in the world. The eucharist is a great sacrifice of praise by which the Church speaks on behalf of the whole creation." This sort of eucharist was, I think, first popularised by the Taizé community. Such exuberance reminds me of an article entitled My Life is Full of Eucharists and written by the Bishop of Warrington, himself a great devotee of the eucharist but protesting now against having eucharist with everything. He received a tremendous postbag as a result of that article from people who sympathised with his protest against this trivialising of the eucharist. I expect that we may also get a popular backlash against a parallel fashion for putting everything into eucharist, just as the pantheists put God into everything until they cease to know him at all as the High and Holy One who inhabits eternity, so we can lose sight of the eucharist's true significance by piling everything into it.

I regret the exuberance of Lima on this matter because I want to preserve the eucharist as a high and holy act, a specific experience of Calvary love, to melt our hardness of heart and to release fountains of gratitude, to overflow into ministry in the world.

ARCIC, Lima and FOAG all enthuse over the doctrine of anamnesis, popularised by Dix (?) and others 50 years ago. Unfortunately, its alleged roots in patristic and Jewish thought are doubtful in the extreme. Lampe's (?) Patristic Greek Lexicon defines anamnesis as "recollection, reminding, commemorating" - nothing like the sort of objective "making present" now canvassed. Bible usage is governed by the "once for all-ness" of Calvary,



depicted so clearly in Hebrews 10, "Jesus, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down" - in the sense of completed work. "By one offering he has perfected for ever them that are thus consecrated." Old fashioned Roman Catholic thinking took this point on board yet still spoke of Christ being offered again on every eucharistic altar; modern Roman Catholic thinkers have jumped at the suggested interpretation of anamnesis as letting them off this logical hook but, as Canon John Tiller wrote, "The commissioners have exposed their work to the danger of standing or falling by an expression of contemporary theology which has no roots in traditional thinking."

For myself, I do believe in the objective presence of Christ in the eucharist but it does not depend on our anamnesis. The offering of Calvary is made effective in the present whenever the Holy Spirit applies its benefits to the redemption of believers and through them to the world at large.

Back to Lima. There may be a translation problem when it says, "The ordained ministry is constitutive for the life and witness of the Church." "Constitutive"? No life or witness without the ordained ministry? That seems a rather unecumenical statement. Is it not the Holy Spirit who constitutes the life of the Church and Spirit-filled Christians - all of them - who bear its witness?

I am glad that Lima stresses the supervisory role of the episcopacy of the ordained; that seems to me healthier than the word "representative" which so easily becomes "substitute", bolstering the "leave it to the vicar" mentality. FOAG says, "Christian ministers are, particularly when presiding at the eucharist, representative of the whole Church in fulfilling its priestly vocation of self-offering to God as a living sacrifice." But in point of fact self-offering, detailed in the New Testament as "faith, prayer, praise, giving to the poor, martyrdom and the fruit of evangelism" can only be offered in person, not through a representative. ARCIC still tries to see the ordained minister as a sacrificer because, in reciting the words of Christ at the Last Supper, and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts, he is seen to stand in sacramental relationship to what Christ did in offering his own sacrifice.

John Teilhard (?), a member of ARCIC, thinks otherwise in his own writings. "The minister does not stand in sacramental relation to what Christ did on the Cross but to what Christ did at the Supper. The distinction is vital. On the Cross he offered himself as sacrifice to God. At the Supper he offered himself to his people." The Anglican Reformers were clear on this point. Whitgift, while prepared to retain the word 'priest' in use, said

that it was only to signify presbyter or elder. He writes, "As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for sacrificer, so will use now alter that signification to make it to be taken for minister of the gospel." Similarly Hooker: "Sacrifice is now no part of the Church's ministry".

This radical distinction between Reformed presbyter and Roman Catholic sacrificer cannot be written off as merely the stuff of outdated controversy, for it reflects a radical distinction in the New Testament between elder and Old Testament priest. Julian Charley (?), another member of ARCIC, writes, "I guess in the end we shall see the New Testament writers were wise to avoid priestly terms for the ordained which have caused such unhappy confusion." Lima missed this vital point but ARCIC actually leaves the door open for it. It says, "The ordained belong to a different realm of the gifts of the Spirit, a different realm, that is, from the priesthood of all believers." If only the distinct realm of the ordained were defined as eldership, supervision, I would be content.

On the question of primacy, I do not follow ARCIC's dogmatism about the universal Christian community needing a universal, visible primate. A Christian community differs from other communities at this very point, because its head is the invisible Christ, who has many vicars. Here I quote a statement of a group of South American leaders and theologians: "The Nairobi concept of conciliarity, also accepted by the Eastern Orthodox Church, seems to be a much more promising model for any future united Church. In the Third World we no longer can view Europe as the centre of Christian civilisation or as the source of all wisdom. In many respects, in comparison with the vital Church growth in the Third World it fathers a decadent Church."

My final observation is one I feel more deeply about than any other because it touches evangelism, the cutting edge of the Church in its mission to the world. In its 1983 report, the Standing Committee rejoices that "a large measure of agreement has been reached in the main body of the text which, if accepted, will make quite clear that what unites us is far greater than that which still divides us." I am sure that we all rejoice in that but the further question remains: how is that agreed truth applied to secure the soul's eternal safety and present peace, that assured salvation upon which present peace and usefulness depend? We now urgently need to face the question of justification by grace alone, through faith alone, through Christ alone. On that note, I wish all power to the elbow of the new ARCIC and to whatever may succeed the Lima consultation.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon J S Habgood): Like others, I greatly welcome this report. I think that FOAG has done an extremely good piece of work, and I would like to pay tribute to the main draftsman of the report, Mary Tanner.

Despite the criticisms that we have heard from the last speaker, I believe that we, as members of the Church of England, should recognise how lucky we are, particularly in the BEM document, to have one which is so basically congenial to us. This does put upon us a responsibility to be especially sensitive towards those parts of the BEM report where the finger of criticism is directed towards us. If some of the things said about us are hard, then we have to face the fact that other churches are going to have to confront much harder choices than ourselves as they respond to this report.

I greatly welcome the things that were said by Christian Howard on the subject of authority, where I believe she dug very deep and helpfully into some of the further questions which are going to have to be faced. I am quite sure that as we look to the future our main problems are going to lie in this field, as to precisely what we mean by authority and how we exercise it. I hope that when we have our debate tomorrow morning we shall not have that debate forgetting what we have been thinking about today, because the whole question of authority in the Church at all levels has to be held together and not looked at in separate little bits. One particular question that we have all to face and shall be facing tomorrow is: how in all this does one assess the role of individuals? Let us realise that that is a question which bears just as hardly on the Pope as on an individual incumbent as on anybody else whom we may like to name. How does the style of authority in our Church express itself at the various levels?

Jean Mayland mentioned the crucial importance of the ecclesiological questions underlying these reports and it is really in response to what she said that I thought that it might be helpful to the Synod if I were to say a word or two about the new inter-church initiative which I have the privilege of chairing and which received some publicity quite recently. This is an initiative which is aimed to focus primarily on this question of ecclesiology and provide a setting in which a wide variety of churches can share at all levels their understanding of the Church. We see this as an essential part of the groundwork before one begins any further serious move towards unity.

This particular inter-church meeting came together by an invitation issued to the churches quite largely in my name but not by me acting as an individual: it was done under the umbrella of the British Council of Churches

and of the Roman Catholic Church, and the whole thing sprang from two sources, one of which was discussions in the British Council of Churches about its own future and the other discussions initiated by the Roman Catholics with leaders from various churches in the aftermath of the Pope's visit. These two streams of thinking converged in the belief that the churches together now have to tackle these fundamental ecclesiological questions. As a result of invitations to the churches, we have managed to get together representatives of a very wide selection of the churches in these islands; so we have strong Roman Catholic representation from the Conference of England and Wales, and Scotland, we have all the churches normally represented in the British Council of Churches and also, for the first time in such discussions, we have representatives of the Pentecostal movement and, in particular, the black Pentecostal churches. So there is a really quite extraordinary spectrum of Christian opinion which is proposing through its parent churches that we should begin an approximately two-year programme of study and reflection around these questions. Firstly, how do we see the nature and purpose of the Church, not just when we sit down alone but when we consider ourselves in relation to other churches around us? So much of our thinking about these matters has tended to be a rather solitary exercise: we define what we think the Church of England is. But the important thing is to define what we are as we see ourselves in relation to the Pentecostals, Roman Catholics or what have you. Secondly, to set this whole process of reflection within the context of an understanding of the mission of the Church - and this is where a report already mentioned, the Anglican/URC report, I believe will be particularly helpful, precisely because of its stress on the mission of the Church as the essential context for the discussion of all these things.

The hope is that in the early part of 1986 there can be discussion at local level, particularly in Lent 1986; and the aim is to relate such local discussion to programmes which we trust will be broadcast through local radio. We hope to have thousands of discussion groups all over the country whose opinions will then be co-ordinated on a questionnaire and eventually fed into the process, which will also be going on at national level as, through their national organs, churches try to express rather simply their own self-understanding. All this, we hope, will then be tied into the ARCIC and EEM process going on internationally. The process of reflection at all three levels will be brought together in a series of conferences, culminating in a major conference in the autumn of 1987. We hope that this large conference will enable us to see together what the next steps in unity should be.



Part of this will be helping the British Council of Churches to fashion itself into a more appropriate instrument for ecumenism in these islands. Part of it, we hope, will feed back into the churches as we look at our own multilateral and bilateral conversations.

I hope that that brief explanation of what this particular initiative is about will help the Synod to see how it integrates with the process that we are already engaged in. It is not a recipe for huge numbers of new meetings, neither is it some covert new unity scheme which someone is trying to slip in under the counter. It is something that will give us an opportunity from 1987 onwards to start the whole process of negotiating for unity again on a much more realistic basis.

Canon R C Craston (Manchester): I would like to highlight a sentence of fundamental importance in the report. It occurs on page 47, in the paragraph headed Ecclesiology. "Only an explicit common understanding of the nature of the Church and its role as a credible and effective sign, instrument and sacrament of salvation will provide a secure foundation for the reconciliation of churches." That is my text for what I wish to say. It is preceded by the statement that even if ecclesiology is not deemed central to the Christian faith - a point many would want to disagree with - it is certainly crucial if the subject in hand is the unity of the churches and, we might also say, if the subject in hand is an agreement among ourselves as Anglicans, as we work towards the unity of the churches. For it is now apparent, as Canon Boulton has reminded us and as the agenda set before us by the Archbishop of York would remind us, that basic to the disagreements among ourselves as well as with our partners in the Anglican/Methodist scheme and the Covenant proposals was the failure to agree on the doctrine of the Church. A search for agreement on priesthood, episcopacy, ordination drives us back to an understanding of the Church.

Lest we think that this is a peculiarly English problem, I quote from the report of the Anglican/Reformed International Commission, "Among the most pervasive and powerful of all the factors which combine to paralyse the movement towards unity is a false understanding of the nature of the Church and God's calling to the Church." I would add to that a quotation which is, I think, even more relevant to this debate. It is from a paper by Dr Gary Bennett. He says, "A particular Church's sacramental practice, understanding of ministry and exercise of authority are almost certainly related to some model or general conception of the Church." He notes, as we have noted, that neither Lima nor ARCIC has an agreed statement on the doctrine of the Church, and the sections devoted to ecclesiology have a

provisional and tentative character about them. This is a judgment with which the FOAG apparently agrees, as it calls for further explanation.

Dr Bennett goes on to recognise in that paper that, stemming from the Reformation era, there have been two disparate models of the Church, both of which, I would say, are rooted in the New Testament. There is a Protestant ecclesiology emphasising the calling out of a local, believing community as the Word is preached and men and women respond in faith to the offer of justification in Christ, as a result of which they are personally related to God. The full company of such across the world is known only to God, its boundaries invisible to men. The classic Catholic ecclesiology emphasises the historic and visible nature of the Church, a worldwide society founded by Christ, and both the sacrament and instrument of his presence in the world. The visible institution requires true order to validate the structures of ministry and to preserve the Church's identity within the apostolic tradition.

I have, of course, merely offered there some headlines appropriate to the two ecclesiologies.

The Lima document, particularly, may be seen as a determined effort to recognise, hold together and reconcile the Catholic and Protestant ecclesiologies, not simply by identifying and concentrating on common features and pushing awkward and conflicting features to the background, from which they will eventually emerge to jeopardise later movements in the stages of development in unity, but by seeking to reintegrate the two ecclesiologies because they need each other. It is my submission that we in the Church of England need to pursue that same process. Our different traditions need to move out of entrenched positions and, in a spirit of mutual trust, we need to look afresh at our approaches to the doctrine of the Church. We must do this if we are to talk to other churches with a more united voice than hitherto. We need to do it if we are to take seriously the third Lima question about the practical implications of the report for our own Church's life, including our educational task - and that is directly relevant to the final motion on Thursday afternoon about references to the dioceses.

The process must start here. The buck stops here. That obliges us not just to reflect the divisions in the dioceses, still less merely to contend for them here, but to give a lead in the reconciliation of those divisions and in the development of an internal ecumenism.

Advocacy of that task carries an obligation to suggest some possible steps. Tentatively, may I indicate how the tradition that I know best may move forward?

Evangelicals, I believe, need a deeper understanding of the Church as a continuing, historic and worldwide community, visibly present as a sign of Christ's presence and work and, because it is a human as well as a divine institution, defined by its sacraments and ordered in life according to an accepted tradition. That is not to be at the expense of an emphasis that comes more easily to them, of a Spirit-filled community of those who have heard the Word and entered into a living relationship with God through Christ, but complementary to it. They can recognise that their negative reaction in the nineteenth century to the Oxford Movement resulted in an almost exclusive emphasis on the Church as an invisible society and a definition of the local church in near-Congregationalist terms. It is worth recalling, in passing, that a Protestant ecclesiology since Reformation times has not been able to cope with the problem of secession and multiplication of denominations and sects has occurred; and although there may be a mixture of causes for the haemorrhage of Anglicans from evangelical parishes to the house church movement and other independent churches, one cause may well be inadequate teaching of the Church.

What would be the implications of greater attention to Catholic order in the Church? One would be a deeper commitment to a unity of the Church that is observable by the world and thus, as Jesus prayed, a convincing stimulus to faith, that they all may be one that the world may believe. The Anglican/Reformed Commission report recognises that some - and I think that Evangelicals may be among them - regard concern for unity as deflecting attention from the more urgent business of evangelism, but goes on to affirm that multiplication of members is not, according to the New Testament, the sole criterion by which priorities are to be judged. The Church is the sign and first fruits of the reconciliation of all things in Christ. Reconciliation to unity touches the credibility of the Church.

Another implication would be the recognition that the Church Local is not a single congregation but a fellowship of churches in an area in communion with the bishop. That is taking episcopacy seriously, as an effective sign of belonging to the Church Catholic and as a focus of unity within it. If we thus take, as I believe we must, the office of bishop as not merely one of function - that is, of pastoring, teaching and guarding the faith - but also as one of sign - a sacrament of unity - must we not also recognise the whole ordained ministry authorised by him on behalf of the Church and of Christ as having more than just functional character?

In the book Growing into Union, two Catholics and two Evangelicals - one of each, the Bishop of London and Canon Buchanan, is in this Synod - there is recognised the ontological nature of the ordained ministry, if it may

be so called: "All ministerial oversight embodies an authority which stems from Christ as head of the Church and witnesses to the lordship over the Church, including the ministers themselves." And again, "The view of ministry which sees it purely in terms of the delegation by the Church of certain functions disregards the authority of the ministry to act in the name of Christ as head of the Church for its edification."

The ordained ministry, I believe, is not only to do certain things but to be something for Christ, as a sign of his authority and ministry.

A further implication of greater attention to the nature of the Church as a visible, historic community would be a higher doctrine of the sacraments than is apparent in some evangelical parishes. The theology of baptism, whatever we do about its practice, requires us to relate it directly to justification. As the FOAG report says, the justification of the believer is inseparable in reality from his or her sacramental incorporation into the fellowship of the Church. Understanding of the eucharist must include the recognition that it is as the one body partakes of the one bread that the Church establishes its identity. Not in so-called "family services", however useful for fringe contacts, nor even in Morning and Evening Prayer, however valuable as part of the diet of worship, but in the sacrament of our redemption is the Church identified as the Body of Christ in the world.

This really adds up to a plea for a reformed catholicism, the goal, surely, of all Anglicans. Indeed, it is a plea for a serious commitment to covenant theology, the framework of God's dealings with man in Old and New Testaments, in which visible commitment to the people of God, marked by sacramental initiation - circumcision in the Old, baptism in the New - and sacramental continuation - Passover in the Old, eucharist in the New - must go with inward experience of grace and faith commitment to the covenant Lord.

These inadequate comments can only indicate something of an agenda for Evangelicals as I see it. May I be allowed to say even more briefly how I think Catholics can contribute to the exploration of ecclesiology? Open dialogue on certain matters touching the order of the Church would be welcomed. One would be on the proposition that the order of the Church, however highly to be prized, has a provisional character about it, in that the Church itself points forward beyond itself, points eschatologically to the Kingdom. Someone has described the Church as the scaffolding for the Kingdom. Its order, therefore, must be strong, durable but adaptable, capable of being modified as ministry and mission demand. Another matter for concern would be the recognition that apostolic succession is to be defined in terms of the Church continuing in loyalty to the apostolic faith, witness, fellowship and ministry, the historic succession of the



episcopacy being just the sign and not the essence of apostolicity.

A further concern would focus on the Church visible as a mixed community, wheat and tares growing together, and what this means for the efficacy of the sacraments and the place of the Word in creating faith: Lastly, there is the development of an understanding of the ordained priesthood that recognises it as a gift of the ascended High Priest, to serve and to enable the priesthood of the whole Church, and yet avoids an unacceptable distinction between it and the rest of the Church as the kingdom of priests.

The need to respond to Lima and ARCIC, within a limited timescale - for we have to respond to ACC 7 - presents an urgent challenge and a unique opportunity to discover consensus among ourselves. May we not fail for want of will or effort or love and trust, as brethren in Christ.

Revd Professor H Chadwick (Universities): As I had the honour of addressing the Synod briefly on the subject of EEM and ARCIC in July 1983, I shall not repeat anything of what I tried to say then but make a few remarks about the rather complex notion of reception, which may need rather more teasing out than the FOAG report was able to give it in paragraphs 223 to 231.

We take it, I think, that it is a technical term for that process by which in the Church of God we digest and assimilate a definition of doctrine in the making of which we ourselves may perhaps not have participated except indirectly. And yet if the definition presented to us, perhaps received from those who have faithfully transmitted to us the faith, if that definition which is presented to us truly belongs to the authentic deposit of faith or to what the Church sees that it needs for the safeguarding or the clarifying of that, then our receiving has a positive, vital effect. It is in that sense, I take it, that reception is distinct from the submission of obedience to duly constituted authority. It is totally unlike my normal response to the tax inspector's demands or even to my respect for the highway code. It implies not a passive acquiescence but an active exercise of the trained, critical judgment; it is a consent of the believing mind and heart which, perhaps slowly but surely, comes to see that through that definition, whether it was of a synod or a primate, the authentic, living voice of faith has been spoken in the Church to the Church by God.

The doctrine of reception, therefore, is quite distinct from a political theory of who exactly gets on to the governing body of the Church. That has a little bearing on what Mrs Mayland was saying to us. Nor is it a doctrine that excludes lay initiative. We all know very well what an enormous amount in the history of Christian thought has been owed to people who were not

clergy, at all times, In the Orthodox Communion, after all, it is rather unusual for a theologian actually to be in Holy Orders at all.

Part of our own Anglican heritage of faith, expressed in our venerable formularies, tells us that the decisions of authority in matters of faith derive their force from the expression they give to the explicit or implicit faith of the apostolic tradition of which Holy Scripture is the primary witness; but it is often a gradual process, and that is illustrated in the report from FOAG by historical examples: the developments which in the ancient Church gave us a threefold ministry, the baptismal confession of faith, our New Testament canon, the Nicene creed, the Chalcedonian definition - and, of course, if there had been a lot more academics on it, a lot more examples from canon law, liturgical usage or even the Lord's Day.

Both the gospel and the Apostle Paul give us good ground to affirm that in the Church of our crucified Master authority is given always in love and for edification not for domination over the souls of men and, therefore, even the highest power in the Church - and when one is talking about authority one cannot help also talking about power; there is no point in being mealy-mouthed about it - the highest power in the Church is nevertheless always restrained, it must be restrained, by the requirement that it is and is seen to be a service to the Word of God and also by the evident requirement that, whatever rules of discipline are made, they are and are seen to be for the good order of the Church.

Therefore, reception in our FOAG report is an important idea because it meshes in most intimately with the ecclesiology of koinonia, that is to say, of the universal communion of local churches standing in conciliarity with each other and in the tradition of the faith of the ages. I confess that I warmed very greatly to what Christian Howard had to say to us about conciliarity and on the often inarticulate way in which a consensus is formed; that is surely true. It is very difficult to describe exactly how it works but we know that it emerges. But if you are in a situation where communions are divided, then loving grunts are not enough to get you home and dry; you need to put it into words and it may be an embarrassing fact and you know that your words are insufficient - some of the insufficiencies have been eloquently pointed out already by more than one speaker; and you may be sure that those who worked in the engine room with soot on their faces, trying to produce these documents, knew that they could have been done better but that this was the best they could possibly do on the day.

Reception, therefore, meshes very closely with the conciliarity/koinonia idea. It does not imply, of course, that the consent first gives authority, validity to a true definition. Obviously, if the Spirit of God assisted the definition of, for example, the Council of Nicea in giving us the Nicene creed, the Church was protected from being led into error and, by the same Spirit, the faithful were, and will be, enabled to discern that. What is frankly excluded by the doctrine of reception is the notion, to put it in lapidary and biting terms, that the Holy Spirit has no other function in the Church than to guarantee the correctness of synods and primates on solemn occasions.

ARCIC does not propose that we should see only in external forms of office and correct canon law a reliable source of teaching authority taken apart from the content of authentic teaching in Scripture and sound tradition. There is a point in the second statement on authority, ARCIC paragraph 29 - a section which FOAG quotes in paragraph 228 of its report - where the Anglicans enter the caveat that the definition to be accepted should be "manifestly a legitimate interpretation of biblical faith and in line with orthodox tradition". The caveat, I am sure, expresses something about which we Anglicans feel deeply, only perhaps a misleading impression could be conveyed that the caveat is one that Roman Catholic theologians would be less keen to make. It is, therefore, of some interest that when the new Roman code of canon law comes to tell us exactly what is required for a definition of doctrine to have validity, "manifestly" is one of the words that it uses - 749 (3). There too the content of the truth proclaimed is that which gives force to the authority declaring it. If I may turn St Augustine upside down, we acknowledge the authority of the Church to judge controversies of faith because we are moved by the gospel to do so.

These considerations, I believe, have a profound bearing on our trust that God keeps his Church from catastrophic error.

It has been observed that ARCIC avoided using that unclear term, infallibility, which FOAG described as "confused and confusing"; but the debate is not whether there is or is not an inspired oracle but whether and where there is reliability of teaching in the Church that, in the short run, but above all in the long run, keeps the gospel from being corrupted in the Church. However, whatever organ of ministry we name, it will be a subordinate, serving authority, ministerial to the Word of God, a charism never given as an end in itself but as a means to protect God's intention.

There are many points about the authority statement which most of us read with a certain folk memory because so much of our own English history in these islands is bound up with the Church of England and its dissent from the See of Rome, and so much of our own past is associated with memories of the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth and the Armada and the Gordon Riots and what happened in Liverpool in 1909, so to speak. This is a very natural thing, that we should find it hard, as it were, to absorb. We do not want to forget.

I would, therefore, like to conclude with a story of a minister of the kirk in the Orkneys who used to have to go to his church on horseback and to have to cross a stream. On one occasion he could not get across because it was in spate; the horse shied and would not cross. The following Sunday, the stream was at its normal level and the horse still refused to cross it. The minister simply said to his horse, "Your memory is much better than your judgment."

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Rev J A Baker): I would just like to take up two of the points that have been made in the last two speeches.

The process of reception for BEM is a unique phenomenon, I think, in the history of the Christian Church because it is something that is being carried out at all levels of churches all over the world, in every continent and culture and in every great Christian tradition. The laity are participating in it as well as the clergy. The collation and interpretation of that reception is a massive task which the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches is grappling with and to achieve which it will need an enormous amount of help. From that worldwide response will, I am sure, come, as we have already heard in this debate this afternoon, a very clear request for an understanding of the Church which will provide the framework within which our ideas of baptism, eucharist and ministry can be properly understood and co-ordinated. Our own report which we are considering today has, as one of its proposals, one that we shall be voting on later in the week, the request that the Faith and Order Commission should give very close attention to this ecclesiological question.

We have heard from Canon Craston and others this afternoon some very valuable suggestions about this which I for one am most grateful to have heard. The reason why I feel this gratitude is because the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council is already engaged in the first stages of this ecclesiological enterprise. We have heard several references today to the consultation on proclaiming a common apostolic faith and also the structures of decision making. But there is another branch of this enterprise, which is known as the unity of the Church and the renewal of human community.



That is the group on which I have the honour to serve at the present time. It is addressing itself to the very problems which have been highlighted in our debate this afternoon. It cannot be said that it has yet got very far with what is perhaps the key and most difficult of all questions, because it is tackling the whole basis on which our different understandings of the Church can bring us into visible unity, agreement in faith and in eucharistic fellowship. But there is already a massive and, I think, theologically impressive input from many traditions: the Orthodox, the Reformed, the Lutherans, the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics have already, in our consultations, made very significant documentary contributions. So one can hope that by the time we have responded to BEM and ARCIC and the questions they raise there will be another tide of this worldwide consultation about unity which will flow together with our responses and help us all.

However, the point that I want to make about this contribution is one that I feel we need to take on board in this country if we are to make any progress in our own domestic concerns. I said just now that the title of the World Council enterprise was the unity of the Church and the renewal of human community. The two things are utterly inseparable as far as the Faith and Order Commission is concerned. We were reminded earlier by Mrs Mayland that the Church exists to serve all God's children in the human family and to serve, I believe, their unity and renewal. The Church needs its own unity and renewal in order to fulfil that mission. The Archbishop of York asked us to be conscious of ourselves not just in ourselves, looking in on what we are as Anglicans, but in our relation to other traditions and other churches. The Faith and Order Commission would ask us to look at ourselves in relation to all human beings and the human community in which we live and its own desperate needs, and to ask what kind of Church we need to be and what we can contribute from our resources and traditions towards that relationship. Anything which comes in the way of guidance or inspiration for Church unity from that perspective is going to be a very challenging and almost revolutionary thing. It may make some of our discussions about order and sacraments and so on look very limited and narrow. But if we think about it, I believe that it holds out the strongest and best hopes for real unity because, even looking out from your Church to another Church and at other churches is not necessarily going to provide that inner transformation which will lead to unity; because contemplation of your relationship to another tradition may very well lead to the situation where we say, "Well, we're doing all right; they're doing all right. Let's just shake hands and carry on." Yet the perils and demands and needs of the world for God's salvation are such that only a genuine unity of the Spirit and

unity of structure and decision and action by all Christians can meet the challenge of God's demand there; and it is as we see ourselves in relation to God's world that we shall be driven by the Spirit into a deep and permanent unity.

Canon A R Heawood (Ely): Mr Chairman, would you now accept a motion for limitation of speeches?

The Chairman: I would accept a motion for the limitation of speeches to ten minutes.

The motion was put and carried.

Canon C O Buchanan (Southwell): I only want to say one word about the ARCIC report. This series of ARCIC reports represents a very considerable achievement. Fifteen years ago it was rather unthinkable that we should have agreed statements from an Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission. Personally, I like them in descending order of appearance - I think that the eucharist one is the best and the authority one the worst - and the only point on which I would stay there is to ask how acceptable they are to the Church of Rome. It really is not of very great interest whether I can align myself with them unless we know that they actually carry the judgment of Rome. There have been various attempts to get the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith off the hook as not actually being a very authoritative Roman statement in their virtual condemnation of the whole enterprise or, at least, of the results of it. I do have difficulty in relating to that when I do not know whether it carries the other side with it or not. At various points, it seems to me, particularly on the eucharist, Cranmer himself could have signed the statement and those who burned him certainly could not have signed it. So I welcome it but I wonder whether they do.

I want to refer more to the Lima statement because it seems to be methodologically different. There has been a real attempt to find a common statement in the Anglican/Roman discussion. It seems to me that Lima is less than a common statement. I want to say this because I hear a certain amount of euphoria about it. We have had quite a bit of painting on cosmic canvasses this afternoon, with a lot of romantic stuff about what it means for the whole world and so on. But when you get down to it, the problem is this: how could you ever disagree with it? The statement on baptism, to which I am particularly going to refer, has a highly inclusive character to it, and it sometimes does not even attempt to resolve the mutually opposed points that it sets out. It is not, therefore, an exclusive statement but a highly inclusive one, and the problem is not, therefore, whether you agree with it - because you can agree with it - but how you would ever be

able to falsify it or disqualify it from being a statement of the faith received down the ages and in which we see our own faith. It is there, but it is there along with a whole lot of things that we do not agree with, all set alongside each other.

Let me give an instance of the baptismal material. Someone has already raised the question as to whether the sacrament of baptism of itself brings the gift of the Holy Spirit, regeneration and so on. There are a lot of very strong statements of this sort and then, just slipped in - and I welcome it - is another statement which says, "The necessity of faith for the reception of the salvation embodied and set forth in baptism is acknowledged by all churches." That could undermine everything previously said about baptism, but the two are not brought to resolution. They are very hard to state when they are really enmeshed together, but here they are left in virtual juxtaposition without the matter being talked through.

Then there is the question of infant and adult baptism. It seems to me that this statement is asking quite a lot of those who do not think that infant baptism is baptism. It is asking them to think that it is, which seems to me actually to undermine their case. On the other hand, it asks them on a basis which I find incredibly thin - page 4 in the Lima report; it is the statement that I am interested in, much more than the FOAG report - "while the possibility that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic age cannot be excluded..." That seems to me to be a very cautious statement indeed on which, if you please, the Baptists are being asked to recognise that the baptism of infants is a perfectly valid and good process. The two are set down beside each other but they are not brought to resolution.

Then there is the question of a post-baptismal anointing or laying on of hands. Here I do have one word from the FOAG report. "The Lima text is not decisive on the question of the relationship of baptism, confirmation, chrismation and first communion." No, it is not decisive. It is nicely blurred. After all these strong statements about baptism in relation to the gift of the Holy Spirit, on page 6, paragraph 14, we get this, "Different actions have become associated with the giving of the Spirit. For some, it is the water of life itself. For others, it is the anointing with chrism and/or imposition of hands which many churches call confirmation. For still others, it is all three." Further on, it says, "Some churches consider that Christian initiation is not complete without the sealing of the baptised with the gift of the Holy Spirit." That statement says that the baptised do not have the gift of the Holy Spirit until they are sealed in some other way. Everything that has been said earlier about the gift of the Spirit in relation to baptism is arguably taken away by that later one;

and they are not brought to resolution.

There is a further question as to the admission of the baptised to communion. This one is left in the italic notes and commentary at the side, and it is not as strongly done as it was in earlier World Council statements. It is a question to which we are addressing ourselves in this Church of England quite soon and it is perhaps the place where they raise the question for us, as the Archbishop of York said, and do not leave it quite in this position of "You can do it this way or you can do it that way, and when you have done it one way or the other way will you recognise that two ways are the ways in which Christians do things and align yourself and agree that that is the true faith?"

But then there is the question which bears very heavily on us, namely, the question of indiscriminate baptism. I wonder if Anglicans who are busy getting euphoric about the Lima text have actually read this, in paragraph 10. "The latter" - that is, the people who practise the baptism of infants - "must guard themselves against the practice of apparently indiscriminate baptism." That is certainly a question that is being posed for us and is one which is brought out in the question of two opposite views in the FOAG report. Here I quote from paragraph 45: "... baptismal discipline may be so 'over-discriminating' that those requesting baptism are required to provide unreasonable evidence of the authenticity of their faith" - like going to church or something of that sort. "So called 'indiscriminate baptism' reflects a view of the Church as a 'mixed community'; a more rigorous policy emphasises the 'gathered' nature of the Church." This is rather like the way in which the Lima report sets out two things alongside each other and does not really resolve them. But, if anything, the Lima report is pressing us to answer this question, and I do hope that the Anglican Church will look at it.

Neither do I like FOAG's way of describing it. I do not like it because it is back to front methodologically. What we really need to do is to decide what sort of church we are and what that means for baptism, rather than discover what sort of baptism we have and work out what that means for our views.

But the real question we have to ask ourselves is how we become a missionary church. I am not interested in being a mixed community for its own sake or a gathered church for its own sake. There are nice ways to say these phrases and pejorative ways to say them. But the OK word is: how can we be a missionary church? Have we a mission to an unbelieving nation or world, or have we actually got a crypto-believing nation which is really all



Church all along? That is the sort of Church of England question that I hope the Lima text will address us to.

I am not going to vote against any of the motions on Thursday. That is why I wanted to speak today. I would have been putting down amendments if I could not take them. But I do hope that we will not get over-euphoric as though somehow as though some unitary, commanding, univocal statement was being made from Lima which would unite Christians simply by their looking at it. That is not the case. The closer you look, the more it seems to me to be putting things in juxtaposition without resolution.

Dean of Bristol (Very Revd A H Dammers): As a member of FOAG, I would like to add my words to the tribute already paid to our indefatigable secretary, Mary Tanner, and add a word of praise for our chairman whose skill and experience somehow managed to maintain the momentum when a panel of very articulate theologians were scrutinising, paragraph by paragraph, these two documents.

Of the hundreds of points of detail which our report raises, I would like to select just one general point for comment, one which is given a great deal of prominence in our report and one which I was interested to note was selected by The Guardian correspondent as the most significant in the whole of this week's General Synod agenda. I refer to the final paragraph on the Lima text in the Summary on page 105: "Finally, we underline what we said in paragraph 149 that the Church of England needs to recommit itself to the 'goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship'. To this end we should like to see the Church of England join enthusiastically with other churches in Britain, in search for a common understanding of the nature and purpose of the Church. In this the Lima Text and the Final Report will provide important theological insights." The words "goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship" are quoted there from the Lima report, and paragraph 149 includes a reference to the work of the General Synod: "In the past the ecumenical movement was assisted by many pioneering Anglican initiatives. Today we recognise that, for whatever reasons, Anglicans in many countries have often been the cause of breakdown in union schemes... In England the refusal of the Church Assembly and the General Synod to give adequate majorities to Anglican-Methodist unity was more recently followed by an inadequate majority of votes in the General Synod in support of the Covenant Proposals..... members of the Church of England need to ask themselves how sincere, and if sincere, how important is our desire to seek 'visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship'? Have we, perhaps implicitly, surrendered this goal for something less?"

This paragraph refers to many pioneering Anglican initiatives. I would like to refer to one of these which interests me a great deal, and that is the resolution passed by the first Conference on Faith and Order convened by the British Council of Churches at Nottingham in 1964. It was chaired by a bishop of the Church of England, and the main resolutions that were accepted by that conference were proposed by a parish priest of our Church and seconded by a layman of our Church. I would like to quote key words from those resolutions, in which we said, "We believe that we should offer obedience to God in a commitment as decisive as this."

I believe that the Lima report gives us an opportunity, perhaps the last in this century, for our Church of England to regain the ecumenical initiative in this country, as a church which claims to be both catholic and apostolic, Protestant and Reformed; and a great deal depends on the General Synod. The goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship will demand of us considerable sacrifices, including, as I believe, far-reaching reforms in the voting procedures of this body. Much - perhaps too much - depends on the forthcoming review of these procedures by the Standing Committee which has been promised us. I have fears that the proposals will not be nearly radical enough. What is now needed is a move of profound penitence for past failures, of humble assurance of God's forgiveness and an enthusiastically fresh commitment to this goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship.

Perhaps I might encapsulate what I have been trying to say by referring to something that Professor Gordon Rupp, Methodist scholar and ecumenist, once remarked when we were receiving a series of excellent reports on the Anglican-Methodist scheme. He observed, "What we now need is not another report but an explosion."

Dr E. L. Kendall (Canterbury): A few minutes ago the Bishop of Salisbury drew our attention to the fact that matters of such importance as we have been discussing this afternoon will demand a decision and the unity of all Christian people. This debate has been going on now for two and a half hours, and I cannot help but note that no layman has been called and before myself two lay women. I think it is exceedingly important that matters of theological concern should not be assumed to be the exclusive preserve of those in orders.

The point of substance I wish to make is that in hoping that this report will be warmly welcomed by the Synod will be an indication of the fact that Synod, and through the Synod the Church of England, intends to steel its will and to wring its imagination to follow through the concrete steps which are proposed in page 100 and the following pages of this report.

I want to draw specific attention to one of them which is mentioned in paragraph 271 on page 106 when it is hoped that encouragement will be given to the sharing of facilities for theological education. That refers back in a little more detail to the ninth point of paragraph 263 on page 100, where it is recommended that the Roman Catholic Church and our own Church enter into agreement to share facilities for theological education with the hope that all future priests of each communion should have attended some course taught by a professor of the other communion. Arrangements should also be made where possible for temporary exchange of students.

A point I want to make is that I hope our Churches will explore, with imagination, a whole variety of possibilities of doing this at local level.

May I just mention very briefly one enterprise in which I have been engaged for some years; as the only Anglican member of a small ecumenical group in France, in Lille, where all the members except myself are either Roman Catholics or French Protestants, and in order to respond to the needs of the Anglican theological seminary in Mauritius, I have managed to get the support of my Roman Catholic and Protestant friends to send French theological literature to them. So that this has been the kind of enterprise which would be a practical application of both the Lima and the Arcic reports.

Secondly, I hope that in this matter of shared theological enterprises we shall take very seriously enterprises other than those at the level of what we call theological colleges or, rather, seminaries. I mean those places where people are undertaking theological study exclusively with the intention of ordination at the end of it. I want to remind Synod that our own Church colleges of higher education have a particular role to play in the question of shared theological facilities.

Times have moved since my undergraduate days when non-Roman Catholics were referred to as sysmatics. By the time I was a young teacher we had become separated brethren. Now we are beloved in Christ, and something of the same progress has been made in our theological endeavours.

It has been my privilege for the last twenty years to be head of the Department of Divinity, now called Religious Studies, in the first college of higher education which the Church of



England established this century, and it was my ecumenical hope and vision when I first took on this job that we should be able to receive among our students Roman Catholic students who would be studying our religious studies courses, and not just mathematics or French or something. I remember my delight when we accepted the first Roman Catholic student into our course, and she had to get permission of her parish priest to do so. Within another five years or so it became common practice for Roman Catholic students to come and take our religious studies courses. I have now had so many of them that I have lost count. We have now reached the point where during the current academic year I have among my mature students a Roman Catholic graduate, who was a graduate in law, who was a practising solicitor and who has given up her practice in order to join the novitiate of one of the most prestigious of Roman Catholic orders. While she is doing her postulancy she is at the same time taking a full year's course of private study which I have arranged for her at the request of the Mother Provincial of her order, because, she said, "If she comes and does a course of theological study with you, Dr Kendall, we feel she will be able to enter more felicitously into the life of prayer and theology on which she hopes to embark."

The third point I should like to make is that I hope that our General Synod Board of Education will see this as a challenge to facilitate educational as well as theological enterprises between our two communions. We have in the last few years established a number of ecumenically run schools, Roman Catholic and Anglican, and I hope that our Board of Education will be able to promote the kind of exchanges in such a way that more

of these ecumenical schools may be established in the country. I hope, too, that our Board of Education will see it as a challenge to implement the recommendations of the report we have before us at parish level in a great variety of different ways. I hope that they will use their ingenuity and goodwill to see that, maybe, some of the funds from the closed colleges may be used for research and resort projects for the exchange of theological facilities right across our two communions and not only in the seminaries.

I hope we shall see this as a matter of consistency so that what we do between our two communions will be consistent with what we are doing right across the ecumenical spectrum. May I just remark that in the same year that I received my first Roman Catholic student to do our religious studies course I received three Salvationist students wearing their Salvationist uniforms.

The Rev. Brother Bernard (Religious Communities): In welcoming as everybody else seems to have done this afternoon the convergence which these documents bring us to, and the clarification of those things which still remain unresolved, I cannot help asking myself what will motivate us and our fellow Christians actually to change, for we come in this chamber cheerfully enough to the fences before we refuse them, and we Anglicans see ourselves as the tolerant ones, the experienced ones, in living together in groups which differ in charity and mutual understanding. What about those who do not come to this chamber and who exhalt in other virtues than those which some of us here might stand for? I should like to share, if I may, some experience on a mission in Belfast which I conducted in a Church of Ireland parish in the autumn.

It was a less partisan parish than some I understand to be in that province, more broadly Anglican, and I found quite a few moments when I was taken by surprise at the prejudices I inadvertently touched on. I found it necessary to re-examine my own prejudices in that situation. I was surprised further outside that parish when members of the Church of Ireland spoke in such terms as "Unless Mr Paisley speaks for us, who is going to speak for us?". Even more so when I went to a Roman Catholic monastery on the so-called peace line and saw the window through which a stray bullet had killed a young Redemptress in 1922 and felt underneath the hospitality and graciousness of my host what it feels like to be in a ghetto which seems to be being besieged; whether they felt themselves or whether they just reflected what their neighbours felt. I was confronted by a group of Roman Catholics and Protestants of various sorts, earnest Christian men, who said to me as of writ "You need to repent". I asked myself what does it mean to repent, for I believe that the only motivation for change in our spiritual direction and understanding of the scriptures of the Church in terms of the Gospel must come from a proper understanding and a true, deep repentance. But is it possible, I ask, to repent of what my forbears did? However much I may disagree with what they did, and however much I may try to understand their motivation, it is very difficult for me to take responsibility for their choices. I ask myself repent into what, because if it is a changing of direction and a changing of attitudes, I must find the new attitude to which I am concerned. The reason I resisted the pressure of the group I referred to is that I suspect if I acknowledge our faults and declared myself repentant, they saw the corollary was that we should all leave at once in shame.

I believe that these reports in basing us in the Gospel and in Baptism show that a death of sin which Baptism represents is the prelude to a resurrection into the justified life of Koinonia in the Church. I ask myself what is the expression of that Koinonia; what is the new resurrection like to which we are moving? I think the documents very fully answer it. But when I think of parishioners and people one meets who are on the periphery of the Church, it is quite clear that their nationalistic sentiments or their deeply held convictions about the way things should be are more important to them than their baptismal faith and their allegiance to Jesus Christ.

If we are to get change we have to get conversion. We have to teach the contents of these documents in such a way that they motivate repentance and faith so that people may move forward into the heritage, into the promised land that these documents represent.

On this same mission one of the sisters had come from South Africa and she was very aware of her Christian faith as a sign of a new humanity. She said in South Africa although there was so much data that argued against the new humanity, still when she went to church on a Sunday because she was in an area where there were mixed congregations of different divided races, she had a reinforcement of the hope of the new humanity in Christ which could be greater than cultural and sociological divisions. The poignancy of her situation now in Northern Ireland was when she went to church on Sunday far from her hope of a new humanity in Christ being reinforced, it was in fact the contrary that was reinforced because she was only too aware that at Sunday worship Christians were most divided.



We have to find a way to implement these documents in spreading the faith again. Which of the ordinary congregations you and I know, Mr Chairman, would understand Baptism in the terms that this document understands it? We have to teach more and we have to bring people to repentance, for otherwise I see no hope of these documents being more than something academic which does not actually move us towards God.

A Member: On a point of order; will you accept a motion for the closure?

The Chairman: Yes, I am prepared to put that to the House  
The motion was put and carried

The Chairman: I ask the Bishop of Chichester to reply.

The Bishop of Chichester: This has been the kind of debate that one really wants to read and reflect upon rather than to respond to in any great detail immediately. I am sure you will not expect me to comment on all the individual speeches which have been made.

I do want to refer to two particular ones first of all, and to that which Canon Bretherton said in relation to the anamnesis in the Eucharist where it seemed to me he was treating us as really putting far too much weight on this. I should like to draw attention to the fact that paragraph 64 in the report before us begins by saying: "However, anamnesis on its own cannot take all the weight in healing past division on the eucharist and sacrifice..." We then go on to spell that out and to suggest other things that need to be taken into account. Then again it seemed to me that Canon Buchanan in what he had to say about Lima generally and about Baptism in particular was

really overlooking the fact that Lima is, as I said at the beginning, a convergence document and not a consensus document. It does not set out to suggest that agreement has been reached on all these things. What it is doing is setting out the discussion of these between a range of different theological traditions pointing out where there seems to be movement and convergence among them to some sort of agreement which will recognise how far differences can be contained within a major agreement. Also a clear recognition of the fact that a large number of differences still remain for further discussion and further resolution. Much of what he said about Baptism Confirmation, for example, in Lima is no more than the range of differences which the report sets out as existing among ourselves. In FOAG we also felt, picking up another point he made, that we really wanted to be rather careful about the use of this word "indiscriminate" in relation to Baptism. That is why we have put it in quotation marks wherever it appears, because we were quite sure that there are a lot of people who others would accuse of practising indiscriminate Baptism who would assert they are practising Baptism with a good deal of care, and I think these terms do need to be used very carefully and with a great deal of consideration.

If I could pick up next a question which was asked - what will motivate us to change? That is a very good question and one that anybody who has been engaged in this sort of areas for thirty years asks with some weariness. Thinking, for example, that the Malta report in 1968 and the Lambeth Conference in 1978 suggested that one important and helpful way of growing together is to have common liturgical forms and a common lectionary, and then the Synod - ently, of course, refusing to

have a common lectionary. One has simply to go on saying these things. The Malta Report again referred to a number of things that Dr Kendall was talking about - theological interchange, the sharing of theological training, and so on. These things I would say are beginning to happen. They do happen in various places in small ways. I can think of this happening between particular Anglican theological college and a particular Roman Catholic theological college where they are beginning to study the history of the Reformation together. That is an important point in the whole business of what was called the healing of members. We have to go on saying them, and every time a document is produced these things have to be repeated. It is like little drops of water on a stone, and I think that is really the only way in which this is going to operate in the end.

If I may now turn to the larger question of authority, I want to emphasise the quotation we give in paragraph 224, a quotation from the old report on the Convocations and the Laity:

"Theology justifies and history demonstrates that the ultimate authority and right of collective action lie with the whole body of the Church and that the co-operation of clergy and laity in church government and discipline belongs to the true idea of the Church." I was particularly grateful for Dr Chadwick's speech on reception in relation to that. I think we do need to realise that different forms of authority are appropriate in different circumstances, and we have only to think of the range of things, for example, with which this Synod deals in the course of its business, from very mundane down to earth things to do with the appointment to office, the Benefices Measure, and when we get

into argument with the Church Commissioners about parsonages, and so on, from that to the sort of debates we have over the revision of the eucharist, liturgy, sacraments, and so on. It is not the same sort of authority in relation to all these. In many of these sort of material things it is absolutely right and necessary that there should be a clear decision at a particular moment by a majority. In many of the other things it has to be a much longer process, and a much more diffuse process, before we can say that the Church really has come to a mind and has decided on these matters. Also in this whole process we have to think of the authority which attaches to individuals, and I remember a very remarkable paper by Charles Williams saying "operates again in very different ways, and in a discussion you have an exchange of authority almost between different people, as a person speaks with a particular kind of authority from his experience, another from his technical knowledge, and so on." In this whole operation, to pick up two of Charles Williams' favourite words, there is "exchange" and "co-inherence", and this has to be seen in that context. That leads on to the other point of the doctrine of the Church which many speakers mentioned very rightly. I think those responsible for ARCIC and BEM would themselves be the first to admit that there is lacking an explicit ecclesiology behind them. ARCIC at a later stage tried to supply something by talking about Koinonia, but they would recognise I think that this was just the beginning.

When we begin to talk about the doctrine of the Church we are brought up against this phrase, which was quoted I think by the Dean of Bristol, "the goal of visible unity". But there again



what exactly do we mean by "visible unity" ? My thoughts go back in fact to some of the controversies over the Anglican-Methodist Unity Scheme where we had accepted the idea of organic union as something at which we all ought to aim, and some, it will be remembered, were bitterly attacked by Archbishop Fisher for this. He put forward his own picture of the kind of unity we would see in England which was that there would be a notice board outside every church and chapel which said "Church of England" and underneath some would say in brackets "Methodist" and others would say in brackets "Baptist" and it was thought that it would all somehow be brought under one umbrella of Church of England with everybody having bishops. What sort of unity really is that ?

All these things, whether we are talking about authority or the doctrine of the Church or the goal of visible unity, are things which need a very great deal of common exploration. I think we have to see the BEM and ARCIC documents along with other international dialogues as essential elements in this process which is not going to be hurried, but which we have to press along; we have to resolve to put our whole being into, and that is why I think it is so important that we give our wholehearted consent to the resolutions which will be proposed on Thursday, because this is the one means before us at this moment pushing this whole thing on another important stage.

The Chairman: The Bishop has moved that this report be received.

The motion was put and carried

THURSDAY 14 FEBRUARY 1985

THE CHAIR

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Rev M E Adie) took the Chair at 10.00 a.m.

REVISED WORDING OF MOTION

The Secretary-General: The Bishop of Birmingham has given me a revised wording for the motion that he wants to move this afternoon, and we will put it into members' hands as soon as possible. It is important that members have time to consider the wording of amendments and, in the circumstances, although it is difficult for us, we will accept amendments up until 12.30. We will then get a notice paper out as quickly as possible.

Mr C J Whitmey (Hereford): On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I refer to the tenth notice paper, item 58, debate on part of Warnock. I do not wish to put the debate in jeopardy but under which Standing Order is it proper for the Synod to debate the question, 'This Synod approves that part of Document A in the format produced of a report by a subordinate body which', etcetera, when, firstly Document A in extenso has not been circulated to members; secondly, 'that part' appears to be two parts; thirdly, there is no reference in a circulated part to an uncirculated part; fourthly, the matters under debate may or may not be closely associated or interrelated to matters referred to in parts not circulated?

Chairman, you may wish to exercise your right to consult the Registrar or reserve the question for the Presidents and announce the result later.

The Chairman: Mr Whitmey has raised a slightly complicated matter of order. I would advise him to get in touch with the Registrar in order to sort out the matter, and it will be dealt with in that way.

TOWARDS A CHURCH OF ENGLAND RESPONSE TO BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY  
and ARCIC (GS 661)

(Resumed Debate)

The Chairman: On Tuesday we had a fairly relaxed debate; today we have to work through a series of motions. We should be able to deal with some of these fairly briskly, while others will need rather more extended consideration. For example, if the Synod approves of the first of the motions before us we ought to be able to deal fairly quickly with the next two. Different motions deal with different documents and, therefore, the speeches made under particular resolutions will need to be restricted to those particular matters.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Rev E W Kemp): I beg to move:

'That this Synod, to the extent described in this Report, recognises in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry the faith of the Church through the ages.'

I assume that the Synod will not wish me to make another lengthy introductory speech, in the light of our very full discussion of this report and these two documents on Tuesday.

All that I would wish to emphasise is the words 'to the extent described in this Report'. That relates to pages 17 to 45 and, in particular, if it will help members of the Synod, to paragraphs 55, 79 and 117. Those are the three paragraphs which summarise at the end of each section the qualifications that the report would wish to make to what is said.

Rev'd Canon Dr G V Bennett (Universities): This motion and the next recall our debate to the two essential things about the Lima statement, each in its way a breakthrough in ecumenical thinking. The first essential is the notion that there is to be found a tradition behind the traditions, that is, it is possible to go behind the entrenched denominational patterns of theology and church order and to be renewed by being conformed to the one Church, which is more complete than any of its parts. Denominational Christianity is full of negativism: we define ourselves by what we are not. When churches divide, they do so in a spirit of protest. These points of negative affirmation assume a disproportionate place in their confession and in the way they tell their story to successive generations. The traditions are often unbalanced expressions of faith. It is not unknown for those who claim to be reformed to have whole areas in their church life which are, in fact, wholly unreformed. Lima, with great theological patience, has tried to discover a theology which it describes as the faith of the Church through the ages, a church order which is a common, positive tradition.

So often in the past church unity schemes have been based on the lowest common denominator between two existing denominations, and the result is weakness. We get unity by understatement. That is why often liberal Christians have been able to offer themselves as great ecumenists and accuse others of blocking the way forward. Lima, however, turns decisively from this approach and reflects the contribution of the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Evangelical Protestant theologians who wrote the text. They sought a genuine convergence of doctrine, sacramental teaching and ecclesiology. Let us be clear: they have raised the doctrinal profile much higher than that with which some Anglicans are comfortable.

Not all tensions have been solved. Canon Buchanan has been right to argue

that occasionally two unreconciled positions are placed side by side. But more important is what Canon Colin Craston most helpfully described as the search for a reformed catholicism. Convergence is seen emerging out of the interaction of the two principles of catholicism and reform. Of course, it is a catholicism which is structured and stable, yet capable of growth and development; and it is a reform which is not a system in itself but what catholicism always needs, a principle of vigilance, criticism and witness to see that the Christian community is true to itself and its Lord.

The second essential new teaching of Lima is that unity can only come when the participants are already in a process of changing themselves. In the past so many schemes seemed to expect nobody to make any change until some great service or ceremony on a certain day. All is concentrated on words, declarations, recognition. Different conceptions of the Church and of ministry, fundamental differences, remain but words are expected to cover all. Lima suggests, on the other hand, a real convergence by reform into a common pattern. It challenges us all now, now, to look at our practices and our patterns, to see where they need change.

We Anglicans, as the Archbishop of York said on Tuesday, may congratulate ourselves that the common pattern which Lima proposes is something congenial to us. This stress on a common tradition is an idea very characteristic of Anglican writers since the Reformation. But FOAG points out that Lima is as much a challenge to us as we say that we have the threefold ministry. What have we done with it? We may urgently look at our use of episcopacy which, by the standards of Lima, is bureaucratic, impersonal and often unrelated to real Christian communities. Why will we do nothing about reforming the diaconate? Why do we go on putting off this question into the distant future? There is a movement throughout the churches of the world to find a distinctive ministry of deacons, and the Anglican/Reformed report has criticised us trenchantly for having a ministry that we seem not to know what to do with. This Synod is continually debating all kinds of innovations. Alas, it is resistant and unwilling to face up to fundamental self-reform.

I hope that we will adopt Lima gratefully, not in words but in deeds and begin within ourselves the needful process of change that we may be ready to unite when the time comes.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod requests the Faith and Order Advisory Group, the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England to act upon the recommendations outlined in paragraphs 268 and 269.'



Canon Bennett said most of what I intended to say in introduction of this item. Perhaps I may draw the Synod's attention to pages 59 and 60, the part of the report with which this resolution is mainly concerned, and to the two paragraphs numbered there. These are the two summary paragraphs at the end which pick out certain points for immediate consideration by us. One of them is the need for a further study of priesthood among ourselves. In a sense, we shall come back to this, I suppose, on the ARCIC resolutions but I may perhaps repeat what I said on Tuesday, that FOAG is already engaged in this particular study, going into rather more detail in exploring our own differences about priesthood and what it is in this area that seems to cause us so much domestic trouble.

As regards the practice of episcopacy and the diaconate, to which Canon Bennett has already referred, some dioceses are already beginning to try to explore this business of the diaconate.

Paragraph 269 ties up very closely indeed with what the Archbishop of York told us on Tuesday about the plans for the next two years for this exploration among all our churches in this country of the doctrine of the Church.

Rev W T Whiffen (Oxford): I am happy to express appreciation of the previous speech by my colleague, Canon Bennett, from Oxford University. What he has said about seeing a tradition behind denominational traditions is exceedingly important.

Paragraph 268 of the FOAG report refers to two challenges facing the Church of England. The first is the challenge to discover a new understanding of ministry and priesthood. I would refer members of the Synod to two recent debates on this matter, the first in the Convocation of Canterbury in November, 1983. This particular debate was based on an understanding of the formularies of the Church of England. I had the privilege of being called, and I tried to persuade the Convocation that it was time not only to look back to the formularies of the Church of England but also to look out and on to those formulations of doctrine which are being made today in such places as Lima and ARCIC, but the Convocation of Canterbury based its debate on the Church of England formularies. Nearly a year later the Convocation of York had a debate, in October 1984, I think, in which the basis of the motion did not refer directly to the formularies of the Church of England; it was a debate on the nature of priesthood and the motion took into account both ARCIC and Lima. Of course, you could say that the Convocation of York itself is a living formulation of our doctrine in the Church of England, so that it was not necessary to refer specifically to the formularies, but I think that the basis of the York debate was an advance on that of the debate in the Convocation of Canterbury.

Today we are asked in this Synod in this motion to take into account, in our consideration of Church of England doctrine, the doctrinal understanding of the Lima text and the brackets of the Final Report of ARCIC. In this particular motion Lima is the major consideration and ARCIC comes in, as it were, in support; it is in brackets in paragraph 268 of the report. So it is important to see what is actually happening if we pass this motion. We are shifting gradually from a looking back to our historic formularies to a more modern, coherent view of looking out to other formulations of doctrine which are being made today. I for one would urge the Synod to pass the resolution with this understanding.

I do not want at this stage to enter into the merits or demerits of the actual debates on ministry and priesthood, as we shall come to those in due course. I would like, however, to refer the Synod to the second section of paragraph 268 which really, with respect, should be the second and third sections, because it is dealing in that particular second section with both the episcopacy and the diaconate; it would have been simpler if the threefold order of ministry had been covered in a threefold section of that paragraph. We are also being asked to encourage the House of Bishops and the Standing Committee to consider what steps can be taken to bring the Church of England's practice of episcopacy into closer relationship with the theology of episcopacy set out in ecumenical texts. This, presumably, is the Lima text that we are referring to in 268.

I am just handing over responsibility for ministry in a local ecumenical where we have had joint confirmations for the past eight years. I would refer the Synod to page 50 of the FOAG report, sections 128 and 129, where joint confirmation is mentioned. I would like to share with the Synod the exciting thing about joint confirmation but also the rather sad thing, that we are able to have our confirmations ecumenically only when our bishop is able and free to come. This does mean a restriction on when we can present people for confirmation. In an ordinary parish, if a confirmation candidate is ready outside the time that the bishop is coming to that parish, it is possible to arrange to take the candidate to a neighbouring parish; that is not so easy in an ecumenical parish where the confirmation service is an admission into the membership not just of the Church of England but also of the Methodist Church in our case and of the United Reformed Church. This therefore needs to be looked at. In our case, we have discovered a pattern of confirmation which includes the laying on of hands with the bishop and the local ministers, Methodist and Reformed, and also includes the part of the confirmation that is important to the United Reformed Church, the right hand of fellowship. They see that confirmation very much as being

received into the adult membership of the church and into its decision-making body, the local congregation. So I hope that the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops will look carefully at this joint confirmation.

However, paragraph 129 is rather sadder because it is pointing to the fact that we have in the Church of England got into the habit, or perhaps the tradition, of using confirmation as a way of admitting into our fellowship those full members of the Methodist, Reformed and other churches who have not had episcopal confirmation, and making it necessary for that to take place. The suggestion from FOAG, based on Lima, is that it may be asked 'how far Anglicans themselves are responsible for causing confirmation to be perceived as a ceremony conferring admittance to a particular denomination through their custom of using the service of confirmation as a means of admitting into their Communion' these people. It goes on to ask whether it would not be preferable to use a distinct ceremony other than confirmation for this purpose. I hope that this will be taken very seriously and some way found.

It is pointed out in paragraph 129, as has already been pointed out to me by my United Reformed colleague in Woughton, that in our Covenant proposals we were ready to go in and accept non-Anglican members in full standing in their own church as full participants in our fellowship, without the need for confirmation. If we can do that in theory in the Covenant proposals, why can we not do it now? FOAG points out that now the Roman Catholic Church allows the administration of confirmation by presbyters - interesting word - albeit with the use of episcopally consecrated chrism.

I will not delay the Synod further, except to point out that there is a lot of work to be done on this question of episcopacy. Lima shows the way forward. I hope that the Synod will support the resolution before it.

Canon M M Wolfe (Liverpool): I join with many others in voicing appreciation of both this report of the Faith and Order Advisory Group and the resolutions before us now. I note that paragraph 269 of the report, to which this motion refers, speaks of the Church of England joining 'enthusiastically with other churches in Britain, in search for a common understanding of the nature and purpose of the Church'. As the Bishop of Chichester has said, the proposed programme of the churches interpreting themselves, each to the other, leading to a series of meetings in 1987, about which the Archbishop of York spoke on Tuesday, should help us in this task. This search for mutual understanding is in the vital area of doctrinal ecumenism, and we will surely wish to commit ourselves to that.

However, I am always a little wary about any resolution which may suggest that, important though it is, doctrinal ecumenism on its own is enough. In the

first place, such an exercise is likely to involve comparatively few people; and, in the second, this exercise might so easily offer an excuse for doing little else. It has been said that the Lima text is one which does not limit itself just to the level of theological discussion; it is one which reflects a deep concern for the needs of the world, one which beckons the Church to unite, not for itself but for the family of mankind. Oikoumene, as we know, implies not just one Church but one world, uniting people across the barriers of race, sex, culture and, yes, other faiths, to one another and to the one God. My fear is that doctrinal ecumenism - 'unite to learn' - is inadequate by itself. Alongside it and at the same time there needs to be a search for and an implementation of common action by the churches in the community, often described as social ecumenism - 'unite to serve', 'unite to evangelise'. If as Christians we are to meet the needs of the world within our communities we need one another as churches, for the task entrusted by God to us is too great for one church to go it alone. I believe that the learning of truth together, the quest for a common understanding, is not only enriched but is made credible when the churches seek to do the truth together. Learning and serving belong to one another.

In this connection, the last three lines of paragraph 271 of the report are equally appropriate for a BEM response as they are for an ARCIC response, in encouraging 'joint meetings of local hierarchies and the establishing of local covenants'. But I note that this recommendation is applied only to ARCIC in the later item on our agenda, item 13. Local covenants between Anglicans, Roman Catholics and the Free churches really do offer the opportunity for action together, and anybody who has been involved in such a covenant, as with a local ecumenical project, knows that for real growth in unity and mutual understanding to take place between Christians of different traditions doctrinal ecumenism needs to be accompanied by social ecumenism, by common action in the community. Unity and mission, we are always saying, go together; and we need to act on it.

To which, of course, should be added the third area of sharing, spiritual ecumenism - 'unite to pray' - undergirding the other two, for without this all our efforts will falter: learning, doing and praying, not in any order but as part of the whole.

I hope that these two reports before us will help congregations at local level to realise that each and every Christian has a particular vocation at this time to be committed to the unity of Christ's Church and to make that commitment a priority. Behind all our talking lies the uncomfortable question of whether we really want unity. Is it really a priority in our local church programmes? This is why I speak of our response as a vocation,



not an optional extra because it is good for others to see the churches working together. If God really is calling us to this task then we must obey. I hope that our House of Bishops will continue to recommend and encourage the formation of local covenants in the community between the churches.

Mr C P Williamson (Rochester): I had not intended to intervene in this debate but I feel that I must. There is an urgency about the matters which we are discussing. I was taught, when I was being instructed how to conduct industrial relations, that one of the recipes for failure was to put a date by which something had to be done, because both sides could see that if they did not want to do anything they only had to hang on until that date. I am frightened by the date of 1987 because I fear that the Church will say that we cannot do anything until we have had this discussion.

I want also to react to Dr Bennett's intervention in the matter of the diaconate and express the hope that it will be possible to identify the market for the deacon's work, the state of being a servant, and a market for mission, the state of being sent. What we need is a rediscovery of the meaning of that outmoded word 'parson', the person who represents the church in a locality, in a division of society. We need to examine those ministries that we have allowed to grow for ecclesiastical convenience for their utility in a world which is desperate for someone to whom it can turn for ministry, the dispensing of the grace of God to his world, whether in word or in sacrament or in social action. I believe that the world outside, if it really understood the word, would be saying, "Give us more parsons."

The Archdeacon of the East Riding (Ven M E Vickers): I would like to support very strongly what was said by Canon Wolfe and to point it up in just one particular, especially what he said about social and spiritual ecumenism; and to make some reference to the relevance in this connection of the matter of structures of common decision-making. The Bishop of Chichester has already referred us to section 117, which points up the looking forward of the group 'to the development of these aspects in Faith and Order's project on common structures of decision-making', and the importance of this, in the light of what Canon Wolfe said, is emphasised elsewhere in this report, for example, on pages 47 and 48, where it speaks of attempts to reconcile the churches being 'hopelessly inadequate if they are undertaken merely at the level of doctrinal or institutional agreements', or again, on the next page, endorsing the Lund principle, where it says that 'A greater sharing in life and mission is needed to support the growing theological agreement.'

I seem to recall that one of the lessons of the Covenant proposals, as those of us who had to speak about it at the level of dioceses and deaneries

found, was that again and again we were called to what I term the 'pay-packet' question, about making decisions on the ground in order that we might reach the position where wider decision-making structures might be brought into being. It seems to me important, as we look forward to what the ultimate and wider report will have to say about structures for decision-making at a national or international level, to say that there is a need for sympathy by such bodies as the House of Bishops where local groups of churches and Christians seek, by the decisions that they make, to build up the common action in life, witness and mission which will provide the all-important support for moving towards the wider sharing in belief and understanding which we have been discussing.

The Bishop of Chichester, in reply: May I just say first of all that the explicit reference to these matters in the ARCIC resolutions was appropriate because practical steps forward are something spoken of in the ARCIC report itself and, therefore, needed to be drawn out specifically. May I just remind the Synod that this whole operation of the Lima and ARCIC reports is one part of what the Church of England embarked on after the failure of the Covenant and that there is an important other part, the work of the Bishop of Derby's working group, dealt with at the last group of sessions and now in the hands of the revision committee. That side of it deals very much with the points that have been made by both Canon Wolfe and the Archdeacon of the East Riding. I understand also that the whole subject of mission is a very large part of the inter-church initiative that we have been hearing about from the Archbishop of York, so I hope that they will accept that their concerns have already been taken in hand in this way.

Since the Synod has already indicated that it does not wish to embark on a discussion of the problems of joint confirmation, may I just refer to the phrase 'ecumenical texts', which Mr Whiffen seemed to interpret as meaning just Lima and ARCIC. When we put this in the report, we had in mind also what is being said about episcopacy in the other international dialogues which are taking place. Certainly, we would hope that any consideration of the relation of the theology of episcopacy to our present practice would take account of those as well as of these two.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod commends paragraph 267 to the attention of the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC.'

This paragraph, and the resolution, picks up a certain number of the points made on Tuesday but, of course, is particularly concerned with encouraging

the Faith and Order Commission to press ahead with its discussion of ecclesiology and of the process of decision-making. A good deal of emphasis was put on these by various speakers on Tuesday. I do not think that I need say any more about it.

Mr R Fawcett (Durham): When I first read this report and saw paragraph 267 in which the most strongly worded recommendation is the one just referred to, about decision-making, my eyes alighted on the word 'common' and I had pictures of the WCC telling us how to make our decisions, such as how to appoint bishops or how to appoint clergy to parishes. I therefore looked for the arguments in the document in favour of this recommendation and came to paragraph 116 in which it says, 'The ministry section points to the need for right structures of the Church, structures that can witness to personal, collegial and communal aspects of ministry.' Being a layman, I struggled with these words and what they meant to me. The 'personal' aspect of ministry meant that my vicar should do a good pastoral job, which he does; 'collegial' means that he should go to the deanery chapter, which he does not; and 'communal' means that he should get on with the PCC. Well, he is trying. This is what the words meant to me and I felt that the arguments had not been made. I therefore listened with interest to the debate on Tuesday and understood that the reason for the concern of the Faith and Order Advisory Group arose really from the discussions on authority arising from ARCIC. My question to the mover, therefore, is: have I got it right?

The Bishop of Chichester, in reply: Yes and no. Yes, in that it concerns authority, no, in that it does not simply arise from the discussion of authority in ARCIC but from a much broader concern of all the churches about the problems of authority.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod recognises that:

- (a) the Windsor Statement on the Eucharist together with its Elucidation (The Final Report pp. 12-25) is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England;
- (b) the Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination together with its Elucidation (The Final Report pp. 30-45) is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England and provides a firm basis upon which to move towards the reconciliation of the ministries of our two communions;
- (c) the Venice Statement on Authority I together with its Elucidation and Authority II (The Final Report pp. 52-98) record sufficient convergence on the nature of authority in the Church for our communions together to explore further the structures of authority and the exercise of collegiality and primacy in the Church.'

At the beginning of what is obviously going to be a rather more substantial discussion of this resolution, all I wish to do is to emphasise the difference between the language of (a) and (b) and the language of (c). I can perhaps put it briefly by saying that the statements on the eucharist and the ministry, we hoped, could be regarded as having laid foundations on which we can build in coming together, whereas the statements on authority are much more in the nature of clearing the ground and marking out paths that we have to explore together. That is really the best I can do in explaining why, in one case, we think it is important to say 'consonant with' the doctrine of the Church of England and, in the other case, we say 'record sufficient convergence' for us to go ahead with discussions in this way. Members may be interested to know that some eight or nine other provinces of the Anglican Communion have already passed this resolution in this form, appropriate to their own description.

Canon R C Craston (Manchester): Mr Chairman, you have not indicated whether you want to consider (a), (b) and (c) in order. I wish to speak to (c). Is that in order?

The Chairman: I think that you should speak to any aspect of this item. It will be open, if people so wish, to suggest that when it comes to voting we should divide the motion, but at the moment I think that the debate should take place on the whole of the item.

Canon R C Craston: Thank you.

That the ARCIC texts represent convergence on the nature of authority in the Church we may generally agree. That they offer sufficient convergence for further exploration may be granted. But it would be folly to conceal deep concern among Anglicans about some aspects of the way in which they seem to be pointing. A major problem whenever the word 'authority' is discussed is the different uses to which it is put. We can be talking about standards of belief, what we can believe, or the way the Church is governed, the process and forum of decision-making. The different uses cannot be contained in watertight compartments; they act upon each other. There may be at one end of the spectrum the creation and development of personal faith as the Holy Spirit applies the word of the gospel. In operation there, we have the authority of the word of God contained in Scripture and witnessed to in the Church. At the other end of the spectrum could be a synod agreeing on its budget for the coming year. There too authority is being exercised. Throughout the rest of the spectrum may be synods, bishops' conferences and other bodies, attempting to apply principles of the Christian faith to new and contemporary issues of belief, morals and practical policies in society.



For almost 40 years, that is, since the first Lambeth Conference after the war, it has seemed increasingly appropriate to speak of Anglicanism as committed to the concept of 'dispersed authority'. That applies to the realm of both belief and government of the Church. While, as the FOAG report says in paragraph 233, a 'unique and supreme place is occupied by the Bible', the authority of Scripture operates as it is interpreted. So Lambeth 1948 saw tradition, the Creeds, the ministry of word and sacrament, the witness of the saints and the consensus fidelium as providing the context in which the Bible is interpreted from generation to generation. The authority of the Bible in actual, living experience is the Bible as interpreted.

In the practical exercise of authority in the Church, the realm of decision-making, of church government, we have seen since Lambeth 1948 a developing tradition of dispersed authority such as the Lambeth fathers then could hardly have anticipated. In addition to the Lambeth Conference there is now the Anglican Consultative Council which, for the first time, has brought clergy and laity into the leadership of the Communion; there is the Primates' Meeting, a sort of worldwide House of Bishops; and we have considerable development in the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury, particularly over the last ten to fifteen years - perhaps I should say even over the past five, for the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury is developing quite rapidly. Those of us who have the privilege of representing the Church of England on the ACC cannot but be much impressed by the developing tradition in our Communion of dispersed authority.

Paragraph 177 of the report affirms that the Anglican view of a living tradition helps us to receive new insights which have not previously been part of our experience and yet are, we believe, consonant with the faith of Anglicans. That admirably describes what has happened in the exercise of authority. We are, therefore, open to continuing development. However, I would want to maintain as strongly as possible that development in response to Rome must not reverse or jeopardise the development of dispersed authority. My concern revolves round a universal primacy and collegiality.

As far as universal primacy is concerned, we can recognise the value and role of one chief pastor as a focus of unity. That the Archbishop of Canterbury is so recognised across the Communion is cause for thanksgiving. But there is a tremendous difference between his authority, role and style and the authority, role and style of the papacy, not least as exercised at present. As for collegiality, the vital question is what the word means. May I quote from what the Anglican Consultative Council's sixth meeting said last July. 'ACC 5' - that was in 1981 - 'recognising the use made of the

terms "collegiality" and "conciliarity" in recent Roman Catholic discussions asked that a study be done which might encourage their use within Anglicanism. We do not find, however, that the interpretation and use of these words within Roman Catholicism are helpful to Anglican self-understanding. It is better, we believe, to speak in terms with which we are more familiar, of a Church which is both episcopally led and synodically or by councils and conventions governed. The point we wish to stress is that the Church is the whole people of God and we believe that the best forms of Church governance should reflect this, with laity, bishops and other clergy participating together and playing their proper roles according to office, authorisation and training. Within the whole body bishops are the personal symbols of continuity and unity for the Church and leaders of apostolic ministry and teaching of the faith. The basic ecclesial unity of the Church is the diocese where the bishop in council is responsible for the maintenance of the Church in apostolic faith and practice. The bishop in council concept is expressed in synodical government where the bishop deliberates with the clergy and laity on all significant issues. As we have already recognised, however, Anglicanism is not a collection of independent dioceses. Their co-ordination and fellowship find expression in provincial synods or conventions, in the ACC and in House of Bishops' meetings, Primates' Meetings and Lambeth Conferences. It is in the context of meetings of bishops that one might properly employ the word "collegiality" within Anglicanism, recognising its ancient usage. In Anglican governance, bishops often play a vital role, meeting and acting together collegially. As the servants of the whole people of God, however, the bishops never act without reference to the means of governance of the whole people'. Perhaps we are a little bit strong in our affirmation there; perhaps we should have said "never should act". 'It is with this in mind that the the Archbishop of Canterbury has asked the archbishops to bring their dioceses with them to Lambeth 1988.'

FOAG backs up that sort of approach in its own quotation on page 86 from the forerunner of this Synod, the Church Assembly: 'Theology justifies and history demonstrates that the ultimate authority and right of collective action lie with the whole body of the Church and that the co-operation of clergy and laity in church government and discipline belongs to the true idea of the Church'. In relation to section (c) then of this item and also items 14 and 15, we must send a strong signal to our Roman brethren that there are at present unresolved issues between us on primacy and collegiality and that any conclusive Anglican judgment by 1988 and the Lambeth Conference is hardly possible. ACC meets again in March 1987 and there is no time between then and 1988 to offer guidance to the provinces and receive back and assess their response.

Mr O W H Clark (Southwark): I would like to join wholeheartedly with all those who have expressed appreciation of the FOAG document as a whole. I regard it as one of the most remarkable and welcome ever to have come before this Synod, and nothing that I say in criticism of it now will deter me from voting wholeheartedly for it and for its recommendations.

My criticisms centre exclusively on paragraph (c) of this resolution and certain omissions and weaknesses, as I believe, in the commentary on the authority section. I concentrate on that because it embraces the area of the greatest sensitivity and prejudice, as my own Protestant undershirt will doubtless reveal to the discomfort perhaps of some of my more papalistic friends. Of course, the authority section differs from the rest in that it focuses on norms rather than on present agreements and, of course, some problems are not going to be solved until we have actually, positively and visibly lived together for a while. None of that, however, excuses, for example, that which has already been referred to, the total inadequacy of FOAG's treatment of the place of the laity in the understanding and exercise of authority.

The ARCIC co-chairman affirmed as long ago as 1976 'the Roman Catholic Church has much to learn from the Anglican synodical tradition of involving the laity in the life and mission of the Church'. Apart, however, from a couple of innocuous paragraphs belatedly introduced in 1981, the point was hardly pursued by ARCIC, save in terms of the receptive and assenting role of the laity upon which FOAG comment in their paragraph 224. But the role of the laity is not exhausted by reflection, reception and assent, and that sounds far too like the pyramidal concept of authority with the Pope at the apex and the laity at the base, grovelling around in total submission or harmlessly occupied in hunting, shooting and fishing and such other discreet diversions as safely ensure no active and effectual contact with the decision-taking processes of the Church. As Mrs Mayland properly indicated on Tuesday, it simply will not do to treat so faintly this aspect of the layman's role. But then one has to say that, apart from one deaconess, FOAG is a wholly clerical body in its membership, as indeed was the Anglican element of ARCIC I.

Furthermore, if you look at all the current inter-church discussions listed in *Anglicans in Dialogue* and now taking place, only one lay name is included among the many Church of England members.

It may be that since Vatican II the Roman Catholic Church in this country is more dispersed and more local than it used to be, but its recognition of the lay place in church government is at a level which is not pre-1970 and

Lord Hodson but pre-1870 and Henry Hoare. It was really the height of irony that in the Partners in Mission debate in York we should have been told, no doubt truly and certainly charmingly, of all our imperfections as a Synod by a lay partner who was a Roman Catholic. How many of the laity are going to be present as members of the Pope's Synod this coming autumn? Apart from a few and media men?

Certainly, as the Bishop of Chichester and, I think, Professor Chadwick have said, there are different forms of authority for different situations and circumstances. That is, after all, what our Article 6 and Article 7 procedures, imperfect though they are, are designed to ensure. But it is a fact today, thank goodness, that in the general policy decisions of the Church of England the lay voice is now given an appropriate place at every level. There is a serious difference between our churches on this point and the laity will expect to find it more worthily and more robustly treated in the final response of the Church of England to this paper.

An equally serious omission, I suggest, is FOAG's treatment, or non-treatment, of the Marian doctrines. As Professor Chadwick suggested last time, they may not rank high in the Roman Catholic hierarchy of truths, but they have a major place in the hierarchy of objections of many ordinary Church of England members. As pious opinions they could perhaps be interpreted in an evangelical sense, to quote Professor Chadwick again, but we are not talking about pious opinions or differences of emphasis, we are talking about formally promulgating dogmas with no basis in recorded historical fact, and the only two to have been promulgated by a Bishop of Rome apart from sin. And of all this there is no substantial treatment in the FOAG report. Some Roman Catholics may indeed claim that these dogmas are not universally binding but that, as I understand it, is not the view of the Holy Office. And whatever our hopes may be, we do have to start with Rome as it is, just as they have to start with us as we are.

The same is true of the official Roman claim that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ on earth. It was the Bishop of Oxford, I think, in a fairly recent book review who pointed out that that claim presents greater difficulty than that of infallibility - and the claim still stands. There is no explicit treatment of it in FOAG or ARCIC.

If we are to converge, we must at least commence. How much more frank was the action of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1897 in their official reply, Saeptius officio, neglected by FOAG, to the papal letter, Apostolicae curae. They concluded with the words, 'That error, which is inveterate in the Roman Communion as substituting the visible head for the invisible Christ, will rob the good words of our brother, the Pope, of any



fruit of peace.' It is pleasing and it is proper to avoid the polarised language of past polemics, to search behind ancient controversies and formulae, to seek the tradition behind the traditions, to see not whether things are Anglican but whether they are true. But this is not achieved by silences nor by postulating over-much some golden age in the Church's past when all was clarity, harmony and uniformity. That is no more true of doctrine than it is of liturgy, Hippolytus notwithstanding. Professor Macquarrie says somewhere that the quest for historical ministry is as hopeless as the quest for the historical Jesus. It does not help, to minimise positions and difficulties. The divine efficacy of the sacraments duly administered is more than a matter of tradition in the Church of England. The sustained opposition of the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church to the ordination of women is more than a mere reservation. The transparent poverty of the case made in the two ARCIC documents for a universal primacy necessarily based on Rome is more than a matter of unease. We need stronger and firmer words. So, in regard to infallibility, it is neither sufficient nor straightforward to talk of a surviving uncertainty, when what we are pointing to is a basic chasm, if not a conflict, between the fact of the decisions of 1854 and 1870 and the assertion in ARCIC which we are invited to welcome and which we should love to be able to welcome, that in the Roman Catholic understanding of teaching authority there is no power to create new truths or add to the faith.

Nor do FOAG or ARCIC take any note of the increase in the papal claims since 1870. It was as recently as November 1964, in the decree Ad Lumen Gentium, that it was laid down: religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking ex cathedra, that is, it must be shown in such a way that his supreme magisterium is acknowledged with reverence and the judgments made by him sincerely adhered to, according to his manifest mind and will. Or, as Cardinal Ratzinger would put it, 'the pastoral magisterium of the Church has declared itself': 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est'. That sort of thing is quite intolerable to many Church of England lay ears, and it needs to be said openly and not in code.

Of course, we have to be equally frank in our own answers, as the Cardinal fairly asks of us, and it will not do simply to rest on 'We've got a dispersed authority; we speak with many voices!'

Whilst I believe these criticisms to be deserved, none of them diminishes my support for the quality and substance of the document as a whole. I hope that the criticisms may suggest that even the good may be made better and, in a few important places, must be made better if the document is to receive the imprimatur and Nihil obstat of the Church of England.

Revd J K Oliver (Exeter): Like the two previous speakers, I want to speak fairly critically of paragraph (c), but I ought perhaps to make my position in relation to the Roman Catholic Church clear. I think I know that Church. I love that Church. I respect it. I admire it. I suppose that if I were somewhere where there were no Anglican presence, I would belong to it. I do not believe that I have a Protestant undershirt like Mr Clark although I must say that in this climate I rather wish I had. (My friends might say that I had, really.) But I am very uneasy about the section on authority. I would certainly want to echo what Mr Clark has said about the place of the laity. I do not think that that has been taken seriously.

ARCIC has taken seriously the question of the relationship between universal primacy, collegiality and consensus fidelium. There was a good deal of coding but I am quite prepared to accept that that is the way it has to be at the moment. There are a lot of loose ends. I am certainly glad that the language of 12(c) is more tentative than that of 12(a) or (b). What really worries me is the failure of ARCIC to go behind the structures of authority with which it deals very adequately to the nature of Christian truth, what it is ultimately that has authority and is to be proclaimed and received. We are, in fact, back where we were yesterday morning. My plea is for the importance of facing this issue, which seems to have been ignored, not even to have been recognised in terms of code in ARCIC II.

Can I give one or two brief quotations? Yesterday the Bishop of Winchester warned us against too firmly divining truth. In the 1981 report, Believing in the Church, the present Bishop of Salisbury, writing about the development of doctrine, said, "There can be no infallible guarantees that any particular development is of permanent validity. We have to live with our provisionality." Or go back nearly 50 years to Michael Ramsey and The Gospel and the Catholic Church: "The Church never fully apprehends the truth. Dimly it understands what it teaches. Its teaching office is perilous since its grasp of truth is tentative, fragmentary and fallible." Now compare that characteristically Anglican attitude with the ARCIC Final Report, particularly pages 92 and 93, paragraphs 25 and 26, which I do not want to read in extenso but which end up with the claim that 'through both these agencies the Church can make a decisive judgment in matters of faith and so exclude error'. We are in a totally different world. The contrast between the Anglican and the Roman Catholic concepts of the nature of Christian truth is very sharp. To use the sort of categories which Canon Houlden used yesterday, the Anglican is Platonist, personalist and open, the Roman Catholic is Aristotelian, propositionalist and closed.

The text of ARCIC at this point is not convergent, it is actually divergent. In seemingly ignoring this crucial problem, the Anglican members of ARCIC have done us a considerable disservice. I would plead that it be taken very seriously indeed in discussions which lie ahead. Not only have they done us a disservice, they have done a disservice to many members of the Roman Catholic Church. The Bishop of Chichester, in his introduction to the debate on Tuesday, referred to the response of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith and pointed out that it was not the only Roman Catholic reaction, that there are those in the Roman Catholic Church who welcomed ARCIC on authority. They welcomed it as it stands. I believe that there are those in the Roman Catholic Church, not a few, who would have welcomed it also even if it had taken seriously the Anglican position on the nature of Christian truth. I have a nasty feeling that our Anglican members on ARCIC have sold out on this point which is one of considerable difficulty and real controversy in the Roman Catholic Church.

I say this because of the experiences that I have had over the past six years of exchanges with people from the French Church, parochial clergy and theologians, as a result of the twinning which has existed between Exeter and the diocese of Bayeux/Lisieux. We have found ourselves in very close agreement about a great many things; it has been an extraordinary experience, stimulating and rewarding. Over the question of authority - and I do not mean just who decides but also what is decided and what is taught - I have often found that they are very close indeed to us. They have been locked in conflict with Cardinal Ratzinger, for example, over the substance of catechetical instruction. There are many Roman Catholics who would actually welcome a more Anglican approach to this question of the nature of Christian truth, and not just to how authority is structured.

I would beg those members of the Commission who represent us to define more clearly, describe more adequately and defend much more robustly this characteristically Anglican attitude. It is not good enough to leave ARCIC where it stands at present, particularly in this matter.

The Chairman: Perhaps you would like to speak in general terms at this stage, Prebendary Pearce, and then move your amendments formally when we reach that point.

Prebendary J Pearce (London): I refer to paragraphs (a) and (b) of the motion and also my amendments on the sixth notice paper. I speak to both.

We are all grateful for the work of the Commission and for the Faith and Order Group's report which is a quite remarkable document, produced so very quickly. Nevertheless, I submit that the Group are wrong and that the motion

before us is inaccurate. We have convergence on matters of eucharist and ministry but we do not yet have a statement which is consonant in substance with the faith of the Church of England. There is much ground gained, many misunderstandings are done away; but there remain serious differences between our two communities. We must have good hope that agreement may yet be obtained. We need to remember that the past history of the Church of England has been ecumenically disastrous because we did not make sure of adequate agreement among ourselves at the early stages. In our relationships with the Roman Communion, we must try to ensure that we do get things right at each stage, even if the progress is slower than we would hope. It may, therefore, be the more sure.

Why then do I talk about convergence on matters of eucharist and ministry rather than consonance? There are three issues which remain unresolved in the ARCIC papers. The first is the matter of the eucharistic offering. Dr John Stott in his response to ARCIC on behalf of the Church of England Evangelical Council says this: 'If Christ's self-offering was unique and unrepeatable, how can the Church "enter into the movement of his self-offering"? Again, how can the Church enter into the movement of Christ's self-offering sacramentally if it did not do so historically?' Of course we respond to his self-offering for us, but to do this is a quite different idea. Indeed, to quote John Stott again, 'to participate in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice and to participate in the offering of it are concepts which move in opposite directions'. Certainly, the Church of England formularies speak only of a responsive offering.

The second unresolved point concerns the real presence. Could I compare ARCIC with Richard Hooker, who has been quoted probably too often already in these debates. ARCIC states that the bread and the wine become Christ's body and blood. There is a radical change in the inner reality of the elements. But Hooker said, 'The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' or as Cranmer said in his answer 'Figuratively he is in the bread and wine and spiritually he is in them that worthily eat the bread and wine'. This conflict must be resolved and, I am quite certain, could be resolved, if we are to go forward.

The third point on which we are not yet agreed concerns the ministry. There are many very useful statements in the ARCIC agreement but there is not yet an agreement on the nature of priesthood. We are told that the ministry of ordained priests is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood, but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit. What does that really mean? It is clear that further work needs to be done on the doctrine



of the ministry. It really does seem to me remarkable that the FOAG document states unequivocally on page 78 that all Anglicans would accept some distinction between the common priesthood and the priesthood of the ordained ministry. I am not sure that that is right. We would all accept some distinction between the ministry of the priest and that of the laity but we all share, laity and priests, in one common priesthood.

It is for these reasons amongst others that I hope that the Synod will be cautious today and accept my amendments and then vote for the motion only if it is amended. Consonance has not yet been reached, but we must hope that it will be very soon. There is convergence and for that we are thankful. Let us assert this with grateful hearts. We are moving together but we are not yet fully agreed.

May I conclude with a plea? As we go forward, do not leave some of us behind. We want to come with you. If we seem a little slow, wait for us. Then we shall all arrive together.

The Dean of Bristol (Very Revd A H Dammers): I wish to speak as others have on section (c) and refer to paragraphs 215 and 216 on page 82 of the FOAG report because I believe that these are crucial and give us a way through some of the difficulties which have been mentioned today, particularly paragraph 216 where an attempt is made very briefly, no doubt, to root our doctrine and practice of authority firmly in the biblical perception of the nature of God's own authority as revealed in Jesus Christ. I would just like to quote that. 'We believe' - this is what FOAG says - 'that had the Commission' - that is, the ARCIC Commission - 'drawn out at the outset some of the characteristics which belong to Christ's own authority, these might have permeated and strengthened all that followed. Amongst such characteristics we would emphasise the doctrine of God as at once powerful and yet giving his children freedom to challenge him; of God who in Christ took the form of a servant and suffered, thereby demonstrating power as of the powerless in worldly terms (it is the power of the crucified that is lodged in the Church); and of God whose authority is exercised in enabling his creatures to respond freely. Any exercise of authority in the Church must be informed both by an understanding of the nature and being of God as revealed in Christ crucified and risen, and also by an acknowledgement of the fact that Christ's authority is mediated through the authorities of the Church which are "subject to the limitations and sinfulness of human nature".'

I believe that that is well said and is the starting point - a starting point, at any rate - for further discussions between our two communions on authority. I want to express the hope that in these further discussions for which (c) calls we should have a firm root in a biblical understanding of the way in

which God himself in practice exercises authority in his world and in his Church. I believe that to this understanding the Englishness of our Church of England has a very important contribution to make. The English down the centuries have been pioneers in the dispersal of authority and the liberation of the people from the tyranny of any arbitrary authority.

Canon C O Buchanan (Southwell): I wish to be brief and I wish to make a speech that leads to a point of order. I was myself ready to vote for this package as it stood, but with some discomfort; as that discomfort has now been spelt out very firmly by persons, as it were, from the top, bottom and centre of the Church of England and with great weight, and as I do not think these speeches have been refuted, I believe that we are reaching the point where we would benefit considerably if the motion were divided and we were able to vote separately on (c).

I am very grateful to Mr Clark for his very strong anti-Roman polemics. I hope that all that is heard in the right places. But I do not wish myself to discuss the matters of substance. I have my own position on those and I had thought that I might try to do something in the diocesan synod later on rather than in this Synod. But I have asked myself what would be the effect of passing (a) and (b) and discarding (c), and I think that it would give a signal without stopping a process; that might be sheer gain to this Synod and to our Church of England response to ARCIC's Final Report. If (c) were eliminated, nevertheless the whole Final Report would be referred to the dioceses under item 13, that is, if item 16 were duly passed, but the only positive things would be said about the two previous statements and the Venice statement would simply not be referred to, with these specific, hopeful comments attached to it. Even if (c) stood, and stood by a narrow majority - and it might make sense to take a count in such a case - that also would issue a warning that this General Synod had not got a consensus behind (c) but indeed attached a certain question mark to it, which would be an invitation for dioceses also to look more carefully at it when it came down to them.

It would help, therefore, if we spotlighted this, which would then, no doubt, come through in the reference document to the dioceses. If I may, therefore, pass from a speech to a point of order, under Standing Order 26, Mr Chairman, would you please use your discretion to divide this motion between (a) and (b) and (c)?

The Chairman: Canon Buchanan cannot make a speech and then pass to a point of order. However, benevolent as always, I can assure him that we will take such a point of order when we come to vote on the motion. The debate continues on item 12.

Revd Professor H Chadwick (Universities): I would like to begin by saying how grateful I am for the points which have been made and, perhaps more than that, for the manner in which they have been made. I would like, however, to speak in defence of the report of which some criticisms have been offered, both the ARCIC report and the report of the Faith and Order Advisory Group.

I would like first to take a point about the word 'code'. It is a loaded word. It suggests gobbledygook - at any rate, to me. I do not think that it is a fair word. The subject is one which has been beset by the wreckage of emotional slogans, and the attempt has been made to, as it were, bore a hole in the old rusty bomb and put some steam into it to get the explosive out. What has been done is that an attempt has been made to state with the maximum of clarity that the subject allows precisely what the question to be resolved is. If you then find that the question is not stated in the familiar landmarks, that is not to code it, or to put it into cipher, it is to say that behind all the problematic, emotive, polemical language of the past FOAG believe that this or, at any rate, somewhere near it is the question to which we actually need to address our minds.

The language that has been used in this debate suggests that there are those in the Church of England who still feel that the controversy with our brothers and sisters in the Church of Roman allegiance has to be conducted in the language of 1550. I happen to be a passionate admirer of John Fox and his great book on the Acts and Monuments. It is a long book to read; it will take you about two and a half months if you spend about two hours a day. But what a great monument of the statement of the feeling of the Church of England of that age, of the Pope as the very scarlet woman of Babylon, as Antichrist and therefore the great enemy: you really cannot have too long a spoon to sup with such a lady. I ought to say that the identification of the Bishop of Rome as Antichrist is a lot older than the Reformation and Martin Luther. The first Englishman to state it eloquently was that great Catholic Bishop of Lincoln, Grossetete, who thought the Curia somewhat obstructive to the gospel in some of its ways of proceeding. I might remind the Synod that, of course, in the Reformation age the memory of Julius II or Alexander Borgia was very vivid in the mind, that the papacy of the fifteenth century was in many respects a most unedifying institution. You may recall the paradox that the noblest defence of Alexander Borgia was written by Mandell Creighton, and that our Anglican Bishop Crichton wrote this defence to incur the unmitigated fury of the Roman Catholic Acton, who thought that anybody who could defend a Borgia pope really needed his head examined.

ARCIC did not begin from there. Nor did FOAG begin from there. It began with a simple attempt to ask where we are now.

I would like to direct your thoughts to some of the points made by Prebendary Pearce. I was grateful for the way in which he made them. The sacrament of our redemption is given to us by Our Lord and the first meaning of that sacred act is the memorial of his sacrifice for our salvation, his Resurrection for our vindication. If one reads, say, a great classic of Roman Catholic statement on the subject, the Moehle Symbolik one sees there that the first and primary significance of the eucharistic celebration is that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. The Lord's Supper, we know - the Apostle Paul was at great pains to tell the Corinthians so - is not just a meal and it is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one for another. We know that to all who rightly believe and with faith receive it, the bread we break is a partaking of the body of Christ and the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. So our venerable formulary tells us. That is surely what we mean by the reality, the truth, of the presence of the Lord and the reality of the participation in his offering and the benefits of his passion.

It has been a classic of Anglican criticism of the Council of Trent that the Council of Trent, especially in its anathemas, or some of them, put School doctrines in place of articles of faith. It is a School doctrine, I think, that the real presence of the body and blood of Christ has to be interpreted in figurative and metaphorical language. It is an article of faith that the Lord is truly present. We do not at all want to say that the presence of Christ, the radical change, is a matter of physics and chemistry. We do not want to affirm that the Lord who comes to his people in time and space is circumscribed by the necessities and limitations of time and space - hence all our problems about freezing a particular moment of consecration and so on - but we who receive are at a particular point in time and space.

Our Church has very rightly rejected in round terms the notion that the sacrifice of Our Lord on Calvary offered expiation only for original sin and that for our actual sins we have to turn to each independent celebration of the Lord's Supper. That view, roundly and rightly rejected, was held by one or two rather imprudent theologians of the sixteenth century, but you will not find it in the documents of Trent and the Roman Catholic theologians of today do not believe at all (I am not saying that you could not find one in the back of beyond but it is not the general, consensus view) that we are speaking of a destruction of the victim. A massive shift in Roman Catholic



practice has, after all, taken place in the last 25 years. At the Reformation our forefathers hated the late Mediaeval practice, and surely they were right to feel as they did, whereby the celebrant alone communicated and a passive congregation said their prayers at the back of the church while an isolated priest offered propitiation on behalf of the praying people, with somebody to ring a bell to tell one to put aside the News of the World, because the consecration was about to take place. On a much older view, the elements were consecrated in the morning to be adored at Benediction in the evening. I suspect that not all of us are quite aware that Benediction is now a very rare service indeed and that we would have to go quite a long way to find one. I am not saying that you could not find one, but it is essentially a minority interest, like certain composers.

Among our Roman Catholic brethren the eucharist is now a community act at which there is very great participation by the congregation. They make their communion and in many parishes they receive in both kinds.

I beg leave to say nothing on priesthood because everything on the subject that needs to be said is in print in the FOAG report. I think that the answer to Prebendary Pearce is in print in the report, of which he was so generous as to take so favourable a view in his opening remarks.

May I conclude by making a remark about Mr Oliver and the nature of truth? That is to say, it will be about the nature of truth and not about Mr Oliver. All theologians oscillate between confidence and diffidence when they are trying to formulate truth about God. The negative way is the first thing that the theologian has to learn: how much you do not know, how you see through a glass darkly. Then at the end of the negative way you ask what we can affirm? Are we simply consigned to an absolute silence, follow Wittgenstein and say, "Of that of which one cannot speak one can only be silent"? Then this question will arise - and it was, after all, one of the major questions underlying that great debate yesterday morning - are there any circumstances whatever in which teaching can be identified by the mind of the Church as being in any way outside what is officially thought by the Church. I had the impression yesterday morning that there were a very large number of people in this assembly who thought that the answer to that question could conceivably be yes. That is the crunch.

Prebendary J Pearce (London): I beg to move as an amendment:

'In item 12(a) leave out the words "is consonant in substance with" and insert "convergent with".'

The Chairman: I will ask the Bishop of Chichester to comment on the debate.

The Bishop of Chichester: There is not very much for me to add to what Professor Chadwick has already said. It seemed to me, listening to Prebendary Pearce, and acknowledging the very kind terms in which he spoke of the report, that he had nevertheless not taken any account of the fact that the points that he was making about the eucharistic statement were all made when it first appeared, were made in the comments that the Church of England made about it and are discussed in the Elucidations by ARCIC. The view of FOAG was that although the points were very real points in relation to the original text, if we now read them in the light of the Elucidations we can be satisfied.

May I draw the attention of the Synod to paragraph 185 of the report? 'It is in the light of the biblical concept of anamnesis that we understand the assertion that "(Christ's members) ... enter into the movement of his self-offering". This phrase has been seen as problematic by some and attention was drawn to it in the earlier response of the Church of England. We understand that the words of the Windsor Statement and the Elucidation imply a solidarity of Christ with his Church and the Christians in Christ whereby in our whole Christian life we participate in his self-offering to the Father, sacramentally expressed in the eucharist.'

With regard to the other point about the presence, this again is dealt with in paragraphs 190 and 191. Towards the bottom of page 72, the word 'become' is very carefully discussed in terms of what it can mean and what it cannot mean. I would hope that the anxieties of people about that would have been very adequately answered there.

If I may turn over the page to the conclusion of that section, this conclusion, of course, points out that the Windsor Statement, the eucharistic statement, was concentrating on the two main points about which there has been disagreement in the past, and FOAG, which I may perhaps emphasise again is a very representative body, covering a very wide spectrum of Anglican tradition and opinion, says without dissent, 'In the light of the understandings above we believe that the Windsor Statement together with its Elucidation has reached agreement on the two essential points where Anglicans and Roman Catholics have diverged in the past': these two things. The importance of this, as I said at the beginning, of being able to say that this is consonant with the faith of the Church of England is that we lay a foundation stone for building; this, if it is agreed by the whole Anglican Communion, becomes along with the ministry statement the essential thing which will enable us to move forward in the direction of eucharistic sharing and the Roman Catholic Church to reconsider its attitude to our ministry. I therefore hope that the amendment will not be accepted.

The Chairman: I wonder whether, Prebendary Pearce, in moving the amendment you would leave out the word 'is', in the interests of grammar? As it stands, it is replacing 'is consonant in substance with' by 'convergent with'.

The Dean of Rochester (Very Revd J R Arnold): I had not intended to speak in this debate until I saw Prebendary Pearce's amendment. Then I thought that I was against it until I listened to him speaking, and I must say that I found myself very much sympathising with what he said, and especially with those for whom he speaks. I am, like all of us, very liable to temptation, and I found myself really tempted to go with him, even if at a slower pace, because we all want to go together; we know that there is no point in moving towards wider reunion at the cost of internal schism. I was particularly attracted by the prospect of that journey because I would go on a journey with anyone, even in a slow coach, who reveres Cranmer and Hooker and even Fox; I would join a slow boat to China for two and a half months and read Fox.

However, I am going to resist the temptation and I hope that the Synod will too. This particular form of words in the main motion is common to all the provinces of the Anglican Communion. Everywhere all over the world people are debating this form of words, and incidentally so are the Roman Catholic bishops' conferences. While we are at perfect liberty and have the right to break ranks, even on a form of words, I hope that we will not because I think that we would be holding up unnecessarily the process of establishing a common mind on matters which have been before us really for a very long time.

When we come to (b), the second of the points on which we have considerable agreement, the way ahead is very long indeed, and it is a way which changes its nature because we move over from discussion to negotiations, and members of ARCIC II and others will take the road to Rome and no wise man would go to Rome with his hands tied behind his back. The term 'consonant in substance with' is a very carefully and well chosen phrase; it has the hallmarks of being shaped and polished, and it means what it says. It does not mean total agreement in every detail and emphasis.

If I may use terminology which is very Anglican, which is very dear to me and is found in the Articles, the Prayer Book and Hooker, it is sufficient for the end to which it tendeth. It is not infallible, it is not perfect; it is enough. In this matter I believe that enough is enough. BEM and ARCIC through the grace of God have got the ecumenical movement going again.

I am not going to slow it up by going into the theological substance of the argument because I think that the General Synod has now gone beyond the point of theological discussion to the point where we take decisions. These decisions are of the kind that a driver takes in travelling. Do we keep our foot on the accelerator, just a little way down, not right down on the floor, or do we put on the brakes? I hope that we will not put on the brakes although I also hope that, at the end of a very long road, Prebendary Pearce and his friends will be with us.

Revd E G Stride(London): The danger with the ecumenical movement is that it radiates euphoria, and euphoria is dangerous to the long-term interests, it seems to me, of the unity of the Church of England. I support what Prebendary Pearce has said because I do not myself find that the handling of what was done at the Reformation and revival of, as I believe, the true religion of the Church of England is being carried out effectively and properly. I appreciated very much what Professor Chadwick said; I always do appreciate what he says because he is such a good speaker. But I would rather we did something to make clear that we are not all content, by a long way, with the definitions of ministry and so on in these reports. On that account, I shall support Prebendary Pearce in his amendments and I hope that other people will do so also because this reflects the realities of our situation in the Church of England better than might otherwise be the case.

Canon T R Christie (Peterborough): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

The amendment was put and lost.

Prebendary J Pearce (London): I beg to move as an amendment:

'In item 12(b) leave out the words "consonant in substance with" and insert "convergent with".'

The Bishop of Chichester, in comment: I would draw attention to the fact that the phrase which Prebendary Pearce referred to was again something which caused a good deal of concern at the early stage and, in the light of that concern, was discussed by ARCICI in the Elucidations. Perhaps I may draw attention to the sections of the FOAG report about this, paragraphs 203 to 207 and, in particular, 205, where the phrase itself is specifically referred to. 'Some, believing that in the eucharist all the faithful are united with Christ sacramentally in his self-offering and so share in his royal priesthood, welcome the further suggestion of the Canterbury Statement that there is a sense in which the minister who presides, and only that minister, acts in a priestly way in "reciting again the words of



Christ at the Last Supper and distributing ... the holy gifts", thereby relating in a different way to the priesthood of Christ. They see this view reflected in the later statement that the ministry of the ordained is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit. While other Anglicans have criticised this statement - its meaning is far from clear - all would accept some distinction between the common priesthood and the priesthood of the ordained ministry in the sense that the latter is not simply a delegation "from below". The paragraph goes on to refer to the Lutheran-Roman Catholic statement as supporting that view.

I can only say that we in FOAG believe and have tried to set out here our reasons for believing that the further discussion and elucidation of the phrase, while leaving it something that we would on the whole prefer not to be there, shows it to be something which should not be regarded as destroying the consonance of the ministry statement with the doctrine of the Church of England.

Canon D Rhymes (Southwark): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Canon C O Buchanan (Southwell): On a point of order, Mr Chairman, under Standing Order 26 will you please use your discretion, with the consent of Synod, to divide this motion?

The Chairman: Would the Bishop like to indicate his mind on that?

The Bishop of Chichester: I am perfectly happy with that so long as I can reply to (c).

The Chairman: It has been proposed that the votes on this item be taken separately on paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). This requires my consent and that of the Synod. It has mine. Has it the general consent of the Synod?  
(Agreed)

The Chairman: Bishop, would you like to reply to each section individually before I put them to the vote?

The Bishop of Chichester: I do not want to say anything more about (a) and (b), but I do want to say something about (c).

Paragraph (a) was put and carried.

Paragraph (b) was put and carried.

Paragraph (c)

The Bishop of Chichester, in reply: In view of the number of speeches that related to this, I must say something about it. Mr Clark's speech, with its sharp attack wrapped in warm approval, reminded me rather of the comment on Pusey's *Irenicum*, that it was an olive branch discharged from a catapult. The points that have been made in criticism of the authority statement are all perfectly good and valid. The question that the Synod really now has to decide is whether the right way of dealing with them is to refuse to pass this motion or not. I would like to suggest to the Synod that if we really want to proceed in this matter of the exploration of authority the right way is indeed for us to pass the motion as it stands. I would like to say to the Synod that everything that has been said this morning will be heard by ARCIC II. The Anglican co-chairman of ARCIC II has been present throughout Tuesday afternoon's debate and the debate this morning, as also have been two other members and the secretary. A full record of all the discussion will be sent to ARCIC II.

As I said at the beginning, the language of this motion was deliberately chosen to be different from the other two because, quite clearly, the statements are different in their character.

In mild defence of FOAG I would just add that, as I think was recognised earlier on, we had to work a good deal against pressure of time in producing this report. We started at the beginning with the first two statements and we felt it important to give a lot of our time to those which were the things of which it was hoped that we would be able to say that they were consonant with Anglican doctrine; we had much less time to give to something which was admittedly only in a very tentative form. Nothing that has been said in this debate in criticism of ARCIC II, as far as I can see, would be excluded by the resolution. I think that the right way to deal with them, the right way to put up markers for this further discussion on authority, is by passing this resolution with the knowledge that all that has been said will be considered seriously by the body that has to carry on this discussion rather than just refusing to say that there is any basis here on which to carry on the discussion.

The wording of the resolution, I would suggest, does not commit the Synod very far. All it says is that the statements record sufficient convergence 'for our communions together to explore further the structures of authority and the exercise of collegiality and primacy'. Here again I must remind the Synod of the point which I made on Tuesday that this is a bilateral dialogue, and in all the bilateral dialogues the greater amount of attention tends to

be given to those questions which have loomed largest in the history of divergence between the churches. Nobody can pretend that in relation to the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church and discussions on authority the great thing that looms over everything else is not the papacy and all the dogmatic statements in relation to it. I do not think that there is any intention on anybody's part to minimise the problems relating to that, the problems of whether the Roman Catholic Church itself can get round the definitions of Vatican I, whether it can somehow get round the problem of the way in which the definitions of the two Marian dogmas were made, let alone the content of those dogmas, or that we have any wish not to press on the Roman Church the whole question of the place of the laity. I do wish, however, that those speaking on that point could have given some recognition to the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is moving, however slowly, in that field. The great pastoral council at Liverpool was a significant landmark in that. The development of pastoral councils in most dioceses again is a pointer. We obviously would like them to go very much further, but there is the beginning of a movement there and I am sure that we can encourage all this much more by saying that there is enough here to warrant our going on talking together than by just flatly turning down this resolution.

Mr T G Penny (Exeter): On a point of order, Mr Chairman, will you take a count by houses on this vote?

The Chairman: A division by houses?

Mr T G Penny: I asked for a count, Mr Chairman.

The Chairman: I do not think that there is such a thing as a count by houses. If there is any uncertainty about the vote, I will ask for a count of the whole Synod.

Prebendary M J Seward (London): I am not sure whether, under the Standing Orders of the Synod, there is any means other than by a division by houses that abstentions can be recorded. In both the two earlier cases, it was quite clear that members of all three houses were abstaining. In a matter of this kind, many people would feel that the most they can do, if they wish to register some degree of dissent, is to abstain. Is there any possibility of that?

The Chairman: I would like to count abstentions if there is any uncertainty. I do not think that there is anything in the Standing Orders which prevents the Chairman from asking for the abstentions to be counted.

Prebendary M J Seward: Would it be possible, Mr Chairman, for abstentions from the previous two votes to be counted?

The Chairman: No, not at this stage. We are dealing with 12(c). I would like to put 12(c) to the vote.

That is very clearly carried. Would people like a count? I think that it would be wiser, in the circumstances, in view of the anxiety, that we should have a count of the hands.

The motion was put and carried, 238 voting for, 38 against and 25 abstaining.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod affirms that the Final Report offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete steps towards the reconciliation of our Churches and proposes that such steps should include those listed in paragraph 271 of the Report.'

Paragraph 271 of the report lists a number of things, some of which were mentioned in various speeches on Tuesday, where some move forward might be made and also certain things which need to be carefully considered as part of the movement forward. Some of them will obviously need to be handled with a good deal of delicacy in the light of past experience, notably the question of eucharistic sharing and the whole business of Apostolicae Curae, whether it should be bypassed or faced head-on or quite how it is to be dealt with. However, what the Synod is being asked to say here is that the Final Report of ARCIC really offers us now a basis for going forward and facing these things, as ARCIC II will have to do. I would like to emphasise the end of paragraph 271 because here are a lot of things which are not to be left to ARCIC II, which ought to be faced by all of us in our own localities. Dr Kendall on Tuesday spoke particularly about the whole question of joint educational facilities and so on, and there is the meeting of local hierarchies, establishing of local covenants and so on.

Canon D Rhymes (Southwark): The report speaks of 'the degree of eucharistic sharing which can be appropriately supported by the theological agreements'. I hope that with, of course, tact and diplomacy it will also be mentioned how far eucharistic sharing is a matter of theological agreement and how far it is a matter on which there are widespread differences in points of view in the whole Roman Catholic community. I say this because my experience of eucharistic sharing has been utterly different in different parts of the world. I have been invited to concelebrate with Roman Catholic priests in both America and Holland on more than one occasion. I have certainly been invited to partake of communion in France on more than one occasion. I have never been invited to concelebrate or to partake in communion in England. I wonder, therefore, how far eucharistic sharing is also bound up with questions of political and national feelings, and all the rest of it. I would like that investigated.



The other question I would like to ask is for clarification of how we may live together while holding different views on the ordination of women to the priesthood. As members will know, I have many times asked the question in General Synod whether the Roman Catholic Church regards this as a matter of faith and doctrine, divino jure, or whether it is a matter of tradition and practice and discipline. We have never had any kind of explicit answer. I have asked Roman Catholic priests individually. One of them, someone of some importance, actually said, 'Well, of course, we don't actually want to make it a matter of faith and doctrine because there may come a time when we have to consider this matter ourselves in our own Church.' If this is so, it is quite interesting to know it. In other words, one is not saying something because one is leaving the way open. If, on the other hand, one does not wish to leave the way open, it is very difficult to understand why one should not be quite explicit about the matter. Since I consider it a matter of some substance for many people in the Church of England with regard to their view as to whether to proceed finally towards the ordination of women, it would be very desirable for us to exercise some real degree of pressure on the Roman Catholic Church to be a little more explicit on this matter.

The Bishop of Chichester, in reply: I understand that both the questions put by Canon Rhymes are on the agenda of ARCIC II. I would only say about eucharistic sharing that we must all of us be familiar with the situation that he has described. It is one that requires of us a great deal of sensitivity and courtesy in the matter, in the way in which we approach other people, not pushing ourselves, as it were.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod invites the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops to consider how best to help the Church of England to reflect upon those challenges which the Final Report presents to the exercise and understanding of authority in the Church of England referred to in paragraphs 251-254.'

I hope that members have looked at paragraphs 251 to 254. This whole question of authority which we have spent a lot of time on this morning puts questions to us as well as to Rome, and they are set out particularly in paragraphs 252 to 254. I hope that we shall not think that the probing and questioning is all going to be one way.

Canon R T Greenacre (Chichester): In the notes which I had scribbled in preparation for this debate, I had said, 'It is notorious that the hardest

problems and the gravest challenges in the Final Report concern the nature and exercise of authority.' It is hardly necessary for me to develop this; the whole of this morning's debate so far has illustrated it. All I would say is that if ARCIC I seems to narrow down the whole limit of its existing disagreement to one small point, the necessity or otherwise of the reception by the faithful of an infallible pronouncement, and if this house seems to find the narrowness of that gap difficult to accept, then two points need to be made. We think perhaps that the gap must be much wider than ARCIC found it. Is it perhaps because it is always difficult to absorb and digest the results of a commission that has lived together, prayed together, worked together for 11 or 12 years, and wrestled with it, and we are expected in a rather short time to catch up with all its work? We need a certain amount of trust and confidence in its work and an effort to try to enter sympathetically into the process by which its members have narrowed down these gaps.

Secondly, in the relationship between the Bishop of Rome and the other bishops of the universal college there is the problem that ARCIC has been describing an ideal relationship which will demand very radical changes in the theology of authority and the structures of authority in both our churches. The first point I would like to make here is that we must not underestimate the challenges made to the Roman Catholic Church by the report, for if we are invited in some sense to take the papacy, a reformed papacy, into our system, the Roman Catholic Church is similarly invited, and invited explicitly, by the report to assimilate synodical government with a role in decision-making for the laity and room for 'multiple dispersed authority'. Nor must we minimise the risk inherent in the exercise of circulating the Final Report of ARCIC and indeed the Lima report to every single episcopal conference of the Roman Catholic Church in the whole world. Even if some of these conferences are only very marginally affected by Anglicanism, they have now a chance - one might say a lever, a handle, the first real chance since Vatican II - to give their views on some of the still very much unresolved and very sensitive issues in the relationship between the universal primate and the universal college of bishops. A courageous book like Jean Teilhard's The Bishop of Rome will be exercising considerable influence on this issue which for Roman Catholics is not just of relevance to their ecumenical relations but relevant to their own internal life.

The challenges and risks involved for us Anglicans are spelt out in paragraphs 251 to 254 of FOAC's admirable report. In supporting this motion, I would like to make briefly three observations about those paragraphs.

First, we cannot - at least, we ought not - to separate this motion from the following one. Authority in the Church of England and authority in the Anglican Communion are necessarily inter-related, and there is a pressing need for the reflection of the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops, called for in this motion, and the reflection of ACC, called for in the next motion, to be co-ordinated very closely and at every stage. Secondly, Anglicanism has an authority problem partly because classical Anglicanism, until the nineteenth century, looked to the past with its confident assurance of the sufficiency of appealing to Scripture, as interpreted by tradition, especially that of the first five centuries, with the help of reason, on the hidden assumption that there would be no questions of such startling and unprecedented novelty that could not be resolved by that appeal to the past. So seventeenth-century Anglican divines could accuse papists and puritans alike of being what James I called 'novelists', by which he meant not writers of novels but introducers of newfangled novelties in doctrine, instead of being satisfied with the purest antiquity. Newman's articulation of the theory of development, however, was disturbingly new; it was new for both Roman Catholics and Anglicans.

With our clearer historical perspective on doctrine today, both churches take the idea of development of doctrine almost for granted. Indeed the FOAG report speaks of the Anglican view of the living tradition - already referred to by Canon Craston earlier in the debate. But if we accept the development of doctrine, do we not also need to accept the notion of a magisterium, some kind of present-day authority to check the consonance of the developments with the historic faith? Do we not also need to go on to ask what kind of magisterium has a national church or one communion among many? This challenge is put to us not only through our dialogue with Rome but also by issues internal to our own life and to the life of our Synod and our debates here.

Lastly, a peculiarly English difficulty, as paragraph 254 points out, is 'the role played in the Church of England, both past and present, by state authority', problems raised by the establishment and also by the royal supremacy. The Committee on Roman Catholic Relations has already spent some time reflecting on this issue. I hope that the Standing Committee and the House of Bishops will be in touch over this issue with the work of this committee. Moreover, that committee, when it meets with its Roman Catholic counterparts, constitutes the English Anglican-Roman Catholic Committee, commonly known as English ARC. The time has now come when English ARC can consider serenely and honestly what are seen on both sides to be the real problems, obstacles and psychological hurts in the

difficulties raised by establishment and royal supremacy. English ARC has, I believe, an important work to do in this field and it is highly relevant to the process of reflection for which this motion calls. Ever since the publication of its study guide to ARCIC, for example, it has been monitoring the reports of ARCIC study groups all over the country. The answers that are coming in should not be without interest to the whole process of the Church of England's response to ARCIC.

May I end by paying a tribute to the work of our Anglican co-chairman of English ARC, John Trillo, Bishop of Chelmsford, who this year retires from the great work that he has done as co-chairman.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chichester: I beg to move:

'That this Synod invites the Anglican Consultative Council to think how it can assist the Anglican Communion to reflect upon matters in the text relating to collegiality and primacy.'

ACC has the responsibility for collating and eventually presenting to the Lambeth Conference the various replies. It therefore seems an appropriate body itself to consider how the Communion as a whole can carry these matters forward. This is in a sense a reinforcement of what we have said in passing the motion on authority.

Canon R C Craston (Manchester):

I ask Synod's indulgence in rising again. May I ask for a clarification from the Bishop of Chichester? Does this motion envisage that the ACC carries on this process beyond 1988? Because as the next meeting of ACC is in March 1987, at that meeting it will collate the responses from the provinces but will not have time to feed back, I think, to the provinces any guidance in time for receiving back their responses in 1988. If that is so, it would appear that in 1988 the Lambeth Conference cannot give a definitive answer from Anglicanism on the matter of authority.

The Bishop of Chichester, in reply: This must be in the hands of the ACC itself to determine. I had certainly not myself envisaged that the Lambeth Conference of 1988 would be able to give - perhaps I have misunderstood what Canon Craston meant by 'decisive' - a decision on authority because I assume that that is an area in which discussion will be going ahead for quite a long time. As far as I know, ARCIC II, for example, is not expecting to report to Lambeth 1988 and will be going on beyond it; and it will be ARCIC II that is mainly concerned with this.

The motion was put and carried.



The Archdeacon of West Ham (Ven P S Dawes)(Chelmsford): I beg to move:

'That motions 9, 12 and 13 be referred to the Diocesan Synods for their consideration and that they report back to the General Synod by 30th September 1986.'

The Dean of Carlisle (Very Rev J H Churchill): We have listened attentively and worked through these important decisions this morning, following on our long discussion on Tuesday afternoon, because we are very aware that we are debating important things; but we have been in danger of talking about 1987 and 1988 and beyond. What we now have to do is something for the next 18 months. It is going to be very important that we convey some of the urgency of this debate to our dioceses and the other churches around us in the next 18 months. In many ways, this is perhaps the most important motion that we are considering this morning, and we must pass it with some real meaning behind it. Having a little experience of talking about ARCIC in the past year and a half since Mary Tanner talked so well about it to our Diocesan Synod, I am very conscious of the need to stir imagination on this. We learn by our mistakes. I would say particularly that we do not just want to give resumes, we want to give quotations and very good excerpts from these reports. I hope that after next July we shall get some very good quotations from these debates, ones that we have not taken down already. Some very good points have been made this morning. It is very obvious, for instance, that we have got things to say about baptism, taking this business about indiscriminate baptism and the need to live together with the different views on baptism.

This is perhaps one of the points that the Synod has not altogether taken in from the Lima report, that what that report is telling is how to live together with different views. This is one thing that we have got to get across in discussions with both local churches and amongst us Anglicans.

The other most obvious one is, of course, the question of ministry and authority, which we have just been discussing this morning and which are very fresh in our minds. I know that some people will be able to quote, word for word, those splendid things that Mr Clark said. But I would ask members to pay attention to the eucharist because, in both baptism and ministry, you are talking about 'them', other people, but in eucharist we are talking about where we start now, where the congregation is this week. I would ask people to give considerable attention to some of those questions.

Prebendary Pearce raised some important questions but these have been dealt with by very good points in the debate. Some traditions have placed a special emphasis, ARCIC said, on the association of Christ's presence with the consecrated elements; others have emphasised Christ's presence in the

heart of the believer through reception by faith. We have had this in the Synod this morning. In the past, acute difficulties have arisen when one or other of these emphases has become exclusive. In the opinion of the Commission, neither emphasis is incompatible with the eucharistic faith, provided that the complementary movement emphasised by the other tradition is not denied. Here is a very important quotation that one can use. It takes us on to some of those points that Lima is making about the eucharist, because Lima is pointing us at the world. This takes us back to the important point at the beginning of Tuesday afternoon's debate; this is concerned not just with the unity of the Church but with the unity of the world. So we go on from that quotation that was made, that the Eucharist involves the believer in the central event of the world's history, to the Lima eucharist section, paragraph 20 - 'As participants in the eucharist, therefore, we prove inconsistent if we are not actively participating in this ongoing restoration of the world situation and the human condition. The eucharist shows that our behaviour is inconsistent in the face of God's reconciling presence in human history. We are placed under continual judgment by the positions of unjust relationships and the obstinacy of unjustified confessional opposition.' So, it says, the Christian faith is deepened by the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The eucharist should be celebrated frequently. Many differences of theology, liturgy and practice are connected - '

The Chairman: Mr Dean, we are really discussing at the moment the referring of these motions to diocesan synods. Long quotations are perhaps not quite germane to that.

The Dean of Carlisle: I am asking the Synod, when it does refer them to the dioceses, to point people to particular quotations and not just to talk in general terms, because the quotations will make people see that there are things for us to be getting on with now, rather than waiting until 1987.

The Bishop of London (Rt Rev and Rt Hon G D Leonard): I had not intended to speak in this debate as I had hoped that the chairman of the Business Subcommittee might have made some reference to the relationship of these resolutions, particularly 12(a) and (b) and 13, to Article 7.

The rewording of motion 12 (a) and (b) from what was recommended by the Faith and Order Advisory Group - that is, the alteration from 'faith of Anglicans' to 'faith of the Church of England' - would seem at first sight to bring 12(a) and (b) under the umbrella of Article 7, in that they refer specifically to the faith of the Church of England. Item 13 certainly refers

to the possible reconciliation of churches.

My concern is not in any way to hinder this process or make any difficulties at all but it would, I think, be unfortunate if the matter was referred to the dioceses without its being known whether it was likely to be declared at a later date as Article 7 business. Nothing would be worse than to refer to the dioceses and then later, because of some technicality which was raised, the whole thing would have to be gone through again.

Would the chairman of the Business Subcommittee say something about the relationship between 12(a) and (b) and 13, which refer either to the doctrine and faith of the Church of England specifically or union between churches, and Article 7?

Canon F Haslem (Chester): Could I make a plea that when these matters are referred to the dioceses they be accompanied by some short historical record of what has led to this referral? In the past, many matters have been referred from this Synod to dioceses and, quite honestly, people have had the utmost difficulty in pitching in at the level where we are sending it to them. It has been difficult for many of us to understand what has been taking place, leading to today's debate; it is more difficult for people who are not members of this Synod. I just plead that an explanatory leaflet be sent, identical in each diocese, giving a brief historical review of how this matter has come to be referred to them, together with a definition of the various terms, ARCIC and so on, which do need to be spelt out at diocesan level. Otherwise we may well get the kind of thing coming back to us which could reflect a debate on issues which have not been adequately understood.

The Archdeacon of West Ham, in reply: I would like to link together, to some extent, what the Dean of Carlisle said and what the last speaker has said. It usually falls to the Business Subcommittee, on behalf of the Standing Committee, to draft the documents that go down to the dioceses. We have heard what has been said by Canon Haslem. I am sure that we will try to do that as far as possible, so as to make it as easily understood as we can. That would be the aim of all of us, I am sure.

The Dean of Carlisle will forgive me if I have not quite taken the point that he made. I acknowledge the serious nature of it. One might make a comparison with, say, the Tiller report. When you get something of enormous size, involving three, four or five documents or, like the Tiller report, an enormous book, it is incredibly difficult, even in synodical government, to know how to handle such a mass. When we are asking deaneries to look at it as well as dioceses, it is not easy. I may add that I think Tiller is

due to report back at about the same time as this, which means that there is going to be an awful lot on the agendas of the dioceses and deaneries. what I took the Dean to be saying, to start with at any rate, was that those of us who are in dioceses must consider quickly how we are going to handle this, and give it prompt and sharp arrangement. I do not think anyone here would disagree with that.

I did meditate on whether to say something about Article 7. Because I am a truthful man and believe in open government, I will say that I decided not to because I hoped that if I whipped up in my usual brisk style and said, 'Let's pass this', we would all pass it and then we would have half an hour for the next business before lunch. Of course, what I am now dreading is that if I dry up in speaking there will be just 15 minutes left, we shall have to start the next bit of business and only just start it, and it will be very awkward. Moreover, I do not think that I can prolong all this for five minutes, so the poor Chairman will have to do something about that. But it is his problem, not mine.

Article 7 says that provision 'touching doctrinal formulae or the services or ceremonies of the Church of England or the administration of sacraments or sacred rites thereof shall before it is finally approved by the General Synod be referred to the House of Bishops and shall be submitted for such final approval in terms proposed by the House of Bishops and not otherwise'. There is no doubt in my mind, nor do the lawyers think that there is doubt, that this touches doctrinal formulae, even though there may be doubts about whether it actually changes the formulae. Therefore, it probably is Article 7 business but it is for the Standing Committee so to designate it. I have little doubt, said he hopefully, that the Standing Committee will so designate it at its next meeting, and this will give people time to take it on board, as well as giving the House of Bishops time in preparing the final report to Synod.

The motion was put and carried.

The Chairman: Members may remember that earlier Mr Whitmey raised a point of order of some complexity which I sidestepped by asking him to get in touch with the Registrar. I now resolve the matter by saying that Mr Whitmey has withdrawn his point of order - if there is a Standing Order allowing him to do that. Anyway, he has done it.