

The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations

CONTENTS

Membership	25
Introduction	25
Resolution #A—47: Amend Canon I, 1, Section 2(n,3)	26
Official Dialogues and Conversations	26
Resolution #A—48: Recognition of Dialogues and Conversations	27
Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue	27
Resolution #A—49: Dublin Agreed Statement	28
Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on the <i>Filioque</i> and the Nicene Creed	28
Resolution #A—50: <i>Filioque</i> and the Nicene Creed	32
Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue	33
The Anglican Centre in Rome	33
Resolution #A—51: The Friends of the Anglican Centre	34
Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on the <i>ARCIC Final Report</i>	34
Resolution #A—52: <i>ARCIC Final Report</i>	42
Anglican-Reformed Dialogue	43
Resolution #A—53: Anglican-Reformed Dialogue	43
Baptist-Episcopal Dialogue	43
Consultation on Church Union	44
Resolution #A—54: The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting	44
Resolution #A—55: COCU: Report of the Church Order Commission	45
Resolution #A—56: Use of COCU Liturgies	45
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue	46
Resolution #A—57: Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue	46
Participation in the National Council of Churches and in the World Council of Churches	47
Resolution #A—58: Changes in the National Council of Churches	48
Resolution #A—59: World Council of Churches	49
Resolution #A—60: Presiding Bishop's Ecumenical Leadership	49
Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on <i>Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry</i>	50
Resolution #A—61: <i>Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry</i>	54
Relations with Churches in Full Communion	54
Three-Year National Ecumenical Emphasis	55
Resolution #A—62: Three-Year National Ecumenical Emphasis	56
Financial Report	56
Objectives and Goals	56

Request for Budget Appropriation	57
Resolution #A—63: Request for Budget Appropriation	57
Appendix	58
List of Episcopal Representatives in Dialogues and Councils	58

MEMBERSHIP

Bishops

- The Rt. Rev. Edward W. Jones, *Chair*, Indianapolis, Indiana
- The Rt. Rev. James B. Brown, New Orleans, Louisiana
- The Rt. Rev. Frank S. Cervený, Jacksonville, Florida
- The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, Topeka, Kansas
- The Rt. Rev. James H. Ottley, Balboa, Republic of Panama
- The Rt. Rev. Harold B. Robinson, *Treasurer*, Buffalo, New York
- The Rt. Rev. Harry W. Shipp, Savannah, Georgia
- The Rt. Rev. C. Charles Vaché, Norfolk, Virginia

Presbyters

- The Very Rev. John H. Backus, Peoria, Illinois
- The Rev. John H. Bonner, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- The Rev. Canon John E. Kitagawa, Baltimore, Maryland
- The Rev. William B. Lawson, Lynn, Massachusetts
- The Rev. Eugene Y. Lowe, Princeton, New Jersey
- The Very Rev. William H. Petersen, Rochester, New York
- The Rev. Sally Suzanne Peterson, Des Moines, Iowa
- The Rev. Patricia Wilson-Kastner, New York, New York

Lay Persons

- Mrs. Lueta Bailey, Griffin, Georgia
- Dr. E. Rozanne Elder, Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Dr. William Franklin, *Secretary*, Collegeville, Minnesota
- Mrs. Phebe Hoff, *Vice-Chair*, Richmond, Virginia
- Dr. Lawrence C. Howard, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (*Resigned*)
- Mr. George McGonigle, Executive Council Liaison, Austin, Texas
- Miss Carol Ochoa, Cali, Colombia (*Resigned*)
- Mrs. Bette Winchester, Germantown, Tennessee

Adjunct

- The Rev. Henry A. Male, Jr., President, EDEO
- The Rev. Charles H. Long, Jr.

Assisting Staff

- The Rev. William A. Norgren, Ecumenical Officer
- The Rev. J. Robert Wright, Consultant to the Ecumenical Office

INTRODUCTION

The responsibilities of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations are described as follows in Canon I, 1, Section 2(n,3):

- To develop a comprehensive and coordinated policy and strategy between this Church and other Churches.
- To make recommendations to General Convention concerning interchurch cooperation and unity.

- To carry out such instructions on ecumenical matters as may be given it from time to time by the General Convention.
- To nominate persons to serve on the governing bodies of ecumenical organizations.

The resolutions and commentary which form the bulk of this report represent a triennium in which there has been much activity. From the several ecumenical dialogues have come such landmark documents as the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission *Final Report*, the *Dublin Agreed Statement* of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, *The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting* from the Consultation on Church Union, the Report of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission called *God's Reign and Our Unity*, and the report of the committee to evaluate the World Council of Churches Faith and Order statement *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*. In the process of response to and reception of these several documents, the Commission depends heavily on the work of the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO).

For the next triennium, the Commission is proposing a three-year ecumenical emphasis, culminating in a national consultation in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1886, 1888). In response to a specific request from the Presiding Bishop and from the Executive Council, the Commission will also undertake an evaluation of Episcopal Church participation in the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches.

The first resolution, to amend Canon I, 1, Section 2(n,3), reflects the Commission's awareness of the mounting expense of Commission meetings and the Commission's desire to keep such costs under control.

Resolution #A—47

Amend Canon I, 1, Section 2(n,3)

***Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That Canon I, 1, Section 2(n,3) be amended to read as follows:**

A Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, consisting of 24 18 members, (8 6 Bishops, 8 6 Presbyters or Deacons, and 8 6 Lay Persons). Its duties shall be to develop a comprehensive and coordinated policy and strategy on relations between this Church and other Churches, to make recommendations to General Convention concerning interchurch cooperation and unity, and to carry out such instructions on ecumenical matters as may be given it from time to time by the General Convention. It shall also nominate *for appointment by the Presiding Bishop* persons to serve on the governing bodies of ecumenical organizations to which this Church belongs by action of General Convention and to *participate in* major conferences convened by such organizations;

and be it further

***Resolved*, That, in order to facilitate reduction in the size of the Commission from 24 to 18 members, during the triennium of 1986-1988 the Commission shall consist of a maximum of 21 members (7 Bishops, 7 Presbyters or Deacons, and 7 Lay Persons).**

OFFICIAL DIALOGUES AND CONVERSATIONS

Nothing is more central to the work of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations than oversight of the several dialogues involving representatives of this Church

with representatives of other Churches. During this past triennium, because of an expanded schedule of meetings, the Commission was able to engage in extensive discussions with Episcopal and other representatives of other Churches in the Consultation on Church Union, the Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation, the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation, and the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue.

In mentioning the above major dialogues, it is important to note also the ongoing conversations with representatives of the Polish National Catholic Church; and in a less formal way, Episcopalians in North Carolina have for several years been in conversation with representatives of the Baptist tradition.

While formal action by the General Convention is not required for continuing these official dialogues and conversations, the Commission offers the following resolution, as a sign of this Church's continuing affirmation of the important work being done in dialogues between this Church and other Churches.

Resolution #A—48

Recognition of Dialogues and Conversations

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention of the Episcopal Church recognize the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation, the Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation, the Consultation on Church Union, and the Lutheran-Episcopal dialogue as the locus for official dialogue and conversation between this Church and each of these other participating Churches.

ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX DIALOGUE

Nowhere else do Anglicans and Orthodox, representing diverse national and ethnic roots, meet with such a common national identity and numerically balanced membership as in the United States. While paralleling the international Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, the U.S.A. Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation has a unique opportunity to work on its own agenda, based on the American church experience.

The Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation (AOTC) scheduled for 1982, and then postponed to 1983, released an agreed statement on Christian Initiation for study and response. Anglicans and Orthodox do not differ on the doctrine of Baptism, but their practices related to Christian Initiation are different. The Consultation hopes to work toward a popular publication introducing people to our diverse practices concerning the sacraments. The AOTC also produced a proposal for a periodic conference for Anglican and Orthodox bishops.

The AOTC in 1984 continued discussion of Christian Initiation, and began work on the Eucharist through an examination of the liturgies of the two churches. In 1985, AOTC reconsidered the 1983 statement on Christian Initiation in light of a response from the Commission's theological committee. It also prepared a response to the ARCIC *Final Report* statement on Authority in the Church in light of the official response of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the response proposed by the Commission to the 68th General Convention. With leadership from two new co-chairmen, Bishop Peter of New York (Orthodox Church in America) and Bishop David B. Reed of Kentucky, the Consultation plans to continue work on the sacraments, the proposal for meetings between bishops of the two churches, and a response to the Dublin and Moscow agreed statements of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission.

The international Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission (AOJDC) met in Odessa, Soviet Union in 1983 and in Dublin, Ireland in 1984 to complete work on the

Dublin Agreed Statement—containing sections on The Mystery of the Church; Faith in the Trinity, Prayer and Holiness; and Worship and Tradition. The Dublin Statement has been published with the 1976 Moscow Agreed Statement (*Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue, The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984*. Tuckahoe, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, \$3.95). They take their place along with other statements which challenge the Episcopal Church in its search for visible unity within the "one holy catholic and apostolic Church."

Resolution #A—49

Dublin Agreed Statement

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention commend the Dublin Agreed Statement (1984) of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, which has been received by the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, to the several dioceses and seminaries of this Church for study and response in conjunction with the Moscow Agreed Statement (1976).

REPORT OF THE
STANDING COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS
ON THE *FILIOQUE* AND THE NICENE CREED

What General Convention is Asked to Consider

It is important to make clear from the outset that discussions of the *filioque* ("and [from] the Son") as an addition to the Nicene Creed fall into two areas of consideration: (1) doctrinal, and (2) canonical. Both areas involve theology and history. On the doctrinal question, General Convention is not being asked to debate, since the legislative body of a national church within one communion of the divided Church does not represent a sufficient forum for determining fundamental creedal issues relative to the nature of God. It is instead the historical-canonical question concerning *filioque* which the General Convention is called upon to address.

In view of the liturgical and ecumenical climate of the present day, are American Anglicans to continue using the Nicene Creed as it has come down in the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer in its distinctive western form? Or are they to affirm and act on the principle enunciated by their forebears, namely, that on points of fundamental creedal doctrine, the teaching of the Anglican Communion agrees with that of the ancient ecumenical Church?

The ecumenical question before General Convention in this resolution, then, is not "Do we offend the Orthodox by retaining *filioque*?", or, "Do we distance ourselves from other western churches by removing it?", but, "As Anglicans, what is our guiding principle in theological matters?", and, on that basis, "What is our contribution to real ecumenical dialogue?"

Historical Background

The Nicene Creed was drafted by the first ecumenical council of the Church meeting in Nicaea (AD 325), amplified by the second ecumenical council meeting at Constantinople (AD 381), and promulgated by the fourth ecumenical council at Chalcedon (AD 451) with the following wording in paragraph three: "I believe in the Holy Spirit . . . who proceeds from the Father; who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified." The word *filioque* ("and [from] the Son") was inserted into the Latin version of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the late sixth century by the church in what

we know as Spain, apparently to strengthen catholic teaching against the prevalent Arian heresy. *Filioque* was subsequently championed by the western emperor Charlemagne (+814) and his ecclesiastical advisors throughout the Carolingian Empire. Significantly, the addition of *filioque* to the Creed was opposed by successive popes until it was finally inserted into the Roman rite, probably under Pope Benedict VIII (1012-1024) and possibly at the insistence of the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry II. From that time it became standard in the western church.

Framework for Discussion

Filioque has an ecumenical importance far beyond its small size. Because of the nature of the disputes between East and West about its place in the Creed, a variety of complicated questions and perspectives have focused on it. Orthodox Christians today generally regard its use in the Creed as a misrepresentation of the theology of the Fathers of the early councils, and its insertion into an ecumenical declaration by the Latin West as an unjustified usurpation of ecclesiastical authority. Today most western Christians admit that the Latin church did introduce *filioque* into the Creed on its own authority and that historically it represents a western innovation. They differ, however, on the value of that innovation and its significance for western theology of the Trinity.

Discussions of *filioque* fall, then, into two competences: (1) doctrinal, and (2) canonical. Theologically, *filioque* has undergirded a uniquely western theology of the relationship of the three divine persons and the relationship of human beings with God. Saint Augustine of Hippo (+430) provided the basis for this with such reflections as: "The Holy Spirit is the love of the Father and the Son by which they love one another, and the unity by which they are one. . . . It is the Holy Spirit, of whom He has given us, who makes us dwell in God and God in us. But that is the effect of love. The Holy Spirit himself therefore is true God, who is love."¹ Western theologians to our own day have echoed Augustine, arguing that "the operation or function of the Holy Spirit is precisely to promote a new and higher level of unity between Being and beings. . . ."²

Historically, no one disagrees that *filioque* was inserted without consultation or canonical authorization, and without the consent of the full Church, into a basic statement of Christian faith as promulgated by the second and fourth ecumenical councils.

The Orthodox have long objected to the *filioque* on both grounds, arguing (1) that it is "theologically inexact"³ and (2) that it puts at issue "whether the hypostatic existence of the persons of the Trinity could be reduced to their internal relations"⁴ and (3) that it is typical of an arrogant western penchant for altering received doctrine unilaterally and for positing doctrine uncanonically.

In discussions about the possible restoration of the original text of the Creed (as the Orthodox have repeatedly requested), most western Christians would identify several values competing for their attention. The peace of the Church is certainly one of the chief goods to be sought. One of the objectives of the ecumenical movement is the removal of all human obstacles which obstruct the peace and harmony to which Christ invites the Church. If the *filioque* is a human impediment to the peace of Christ's Church and its reunion, then it should be removed from the Creed.

At the same time it is axiomatic that the churches seek to preserve the integrity of vision of the faith which they believe God has given them. Specifically with respect to *filioque*, the Latin churches have tried through it to express an understanding of the

1. *De Trinitate*, 15.17.31.

2. John Macquarrie, *The Principles of Christian Theology*, p. 185.

3. Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Way*, p. 40.

4. John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, p. 94.

relationship of the persons of the Trinity to each other. The *filioque* is still asserted by some to express a necessary aspect of the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Son. Furthermore, such a theology informs the practical piety of western Christians, particularly through its hymnody over the centuries. There are those who fear that removal of the *filioque* would constitute a denial, or an apparent denial, of an important part of the Latin theological and liturgical heritage.

Anglican Perspective

In the years of the 16th-century Reformations, Anglicans accepted the Creed and the Augustinian theology of the double procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son as they had inherited it in the western tradition. Theologically, Anglican divines of the 16th and 17th centuries were aware of the differences between East and West, but they had almost no contact then with the living tradition of the Christian East. The procession of the Holy Spirit was not a doctrine at issue in the Reformations of the western churches, all of which accepted *filioque*, and Anglicans, as heirs of the Augustinian tradition, affirmed it and concentrated their attention on the many other points of doctrine and discipline disputed among Canterbury, Rome, and Geneva.

On the historical-canonical question now before General Convention, however, the classical Anglican divines clearly articulated a basic principle: that on points of fundamental creedal doctrine Anglican teaching must agree with the teaching of the early Church before its division into East and West; and that dogmatic innovation unauthorized by the full Church, whatever its antiquity, is unacceptable.

Specific Issues

One of the dimensions of the whole question of the presence of *filioque* in the Nicene Creed not often appreciated by westerners is the vital place of that Creed in Orthodox theology and liturgy. The Apostles' Creed used at Baptism in the West is not so used in the East; the Nicene Creed is the creed in general use. From the 6th century on, it has been in almost universal use in the liturgy of the Orthodox churches, whereas it did not become fully accepted into the Latin liturgy until the 11th century. It occupies a unique place in eastern liturgical life and is venerated as a central expression of the mind of the early Fathers of the Church. Even in those Latin churches where the Nicene Creed is venerated and used, it does not occupy this uniquely privileged place. Anyone who understands the place that the Nicene Creed holds in Orthodox life can appreciate better the intensity with which some Orthodox regard what they perceive as unwarranted tampering with the Creed by western Christians.

On the question of restoring the original wording of the Creed in the *Book of Common Prayer*, three distinct sets of issues can be identified:

1. *The question of authority:* The legitimate development of doctrine within the Church is not to be confused with the unilateral authorization of emendations to creedal declarations of faith promulgated by ecumenical councils. The question referred to General Convention by the Lambeth Conference reflects a concern to rectify between East and West a matter principally concerned with canonical history.
2. *Trinitarian doctrine:* The Orthodox insist that "proceeds from the Father" as a statement about the Holy Spirit properly represents the Father as the source of divine life; to assert "and from the Son" at least appears to introduce two principles of origin into the Trinity. At best this strikes them as confusing, at worst heretical. Western Christians argue that whether or not in its origin the *filioque* represented an attempt to defend Nicene orthodoxy against the Arians, it does serve as a way

of underscoring the active role of the Son in relationship to the Holy Spirit. Such a relationship cannot be relegated to an affirmation about a "mere" economic Trinity, but asserts something about the dynamic of the divine life itself. Even western Christians who would advocate removing *filioque* from the Creed in respect for the canonical principle would assert the value of the thought behind the term.

3. *Pastoral dimensions*: Regardless of the precise theological position one may take about *filioque*, it is clear that the emotional or affective significance of its presence in the Creed is far greater than one small word might indicate. To Orthodox, *filioque* seems to sum up the perceived arrogance and/or ignorance of the Latin churches; the depth of feeling among Orthodox on this matter would be hard to overestimate. At the same time, western Christians should be aware of the theological and canonical implications of retaining or removing *filioque* and restoring the Creed to its original text.

Legislative History

In the revision of the Prayer Book, the Standing Liturgical Commission proposed to the 1976 General Convention that *filioque* be removed from the contemporary language Nicene Creed in the eucharistic liturgy. The House of Bishops concurred, but the House of Deputies, wanting the form of the creeds to be consistent in Rites I and II, voted to retain *filioque*.

The 1979 General Convention received the request of the 1978 Lambeth Conference that restoration of the original wording be considered, and passed a resolution asking the Anglican members of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions to prepare explanatory material about the *filioque* "and be responsible for any necessary consultation with other Churches. . . ." The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations was requested to "make material available to enable and encourage the members of this Church to give serious attention to this issue in preparation for the next General Convention."

The House of Bishops' Theological Committee in 1981 recommended further study to the Standing Commission for the 1982 General Convention. It acknowledged that the *filioque* was not found in the original Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, and that this alone should justify its removal from the Creed as presently used. It asserted the value of both eastern and western Trinitarian theologies, but accepted the Orthodox criticism that, because the Creed had been emended without proper ecumenical authority, the original wording should be restored. At the same time it recommended that the Episcopal Church in the United States not act unilaterally but "in concert with the rest of the Anglican Communion and hopefully with the collaboration of other western Christian Churches." It recommended further study of the various dimensions of the question and expressed a hope for a deeper appreciation of each other's spirituality.

The 1982 General Convention asked the Executive Council to arrange for the study of the question by dioceses through the association of Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers and through the accredited seminaries, in each case involving Orthodox in the study as consultants when possible. It was further resolved the SCER coordinate responses and prepare a report for the next General Convention.⁵

What Others Are Proposing

In its report, the House of Bishops urged that the Episcopal Church not act in isolation from other churches in making a decision about the *filioque*. Certainly the responses of other churches, both within the Anglican Communion and other commun-

5. HD Resolution A-45A.

ions, is an important element of the decision-making process in which the Episcopal Church is engaged.

Churches in the Anglican Communion which have voted to restore the original wording to the Nicene Creed are: Burma, Canada, West Indies, South Africa (changed since 1979). One Church which has decided to retain *filioque* is Tanzania. Churches where the matter is still under discussion: England, Wales, Australia, U.S.A., New Zealand, Japan, Scotland, and Ireland.

Churches not in the Anglican Communion: The Church of Scotland has produced one of the most closely reasoned reports on the issue. It recognizes the historical and theological difficulties from various sides. It chooses to retain the *filioque* in the Creed as it uses it presently, without prejudice to the question, and advocates further dialogue, insisting that the western churches need to act together in this matter.

The World Alliance of Reformed Churches has not yet taken a formal position on the issue. The Chairman and Secretary of its Department of Theology suggested that the majority of the 147 member churches would probably adopt the position of the World Council of Churches Faith and Order Report; unilateral action, however, was not recommended.

The World Council of Churches, through its Faith and Order Commission, sponsored a consultation on the *filioque* in Geneva in 1978-1979. It called not merely for the removal of the *filioque* from the Creed, but for continued dialogue and appreciation of the theology of the Trinity as formulated in both West and East. The "Lima Liturgy" of the WCC, accordingly, uses a translation of the original text of the Creed (without *filioque*).

Conclusion

Restoration of the original text of the Nicene Creed (without *filioque*) in our liturgy would not imply rejection of the rich Augustinian and western theological tradition which has sought to articulate the relationship of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit within the Holy Trinity and human participation in God's love. In an era and nation in which contacts between eastern and western Christians are common, such restoration would instead be a practical affirmation of a longstanding and characteristically Anglican position that the unilateral arrogation of authority to determine fundamental creedal issues should not be considered normative, much less be allowed to continue as a barrier to fellowship and dialogue between Christian brothers and sisters. The use of the Nicene Creed without *filioque* would allow every person who professes the Creed to assert in a striking and catholic way "solidarity with the universal church"⁶ of Jesus Christ throughout the world and throughout the ages.

Resolution #A—50

Filioque and the Nicene Creed

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That in recognition of the Lambeth 1978 call for churches of the Anglican Communion to consider removing the *filioque* ("and [from] the Son") from the Nicene Creed, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church express its intention to restore in liturgical usage the original form of the Nicene Creed as promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon (i.e., without the *filioque*), provided that such restoration is endorsed and commended by the Lambeth Conference.

6. Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life*, p. 190.

ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation (ARC) has passed through a transitional period in the triennium. Leadership has changed in the delegations of both churches. The co-chairman for the Episcopal Church, the Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel, who has served faithfully and creatively, was succeeded in 1984 by the Rt. Rev. A. Theodore Eastman of Maryland. In 1985 the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Hartford, the Most Rev. John Whealon, became co-chairman for his church. The Roman Catholic team is almost all newly appointed, and there have been changes in the Episcopal team. With these changes, there has been some loss in momentum.

Before the changes, a document was issued, titled, "Images of God: Reflections on Christian Anthropology," (*Ecumenical Bulletin* 64, 1984) prepared as background for understanding the different teachings and practices of the churches as regards human sexuality, Christian marriage, the ordination of women, Marian doctrines and devotions, and the communion of saints. Now ARC is at work on reconciliation of ministries in the light of the new context established by the *Final Report*, the similarities and dissimilarities in the ordinals and eucharistic rites of the two churches, and a eucharistic canon which might be used in both churches. ARC expects to respond to requests from the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission II for study of stages of growth in reconciliation towards full communion and organic unity, and to study methods of decision-making in each church, particularly on ethical issues.

The 67th General Convention approved a joint commission of Episcopalians and Roman Catholics to develop a standard pattern for pastoral ministry to Episcopal-Roman Catholic marriages. The work of this group is not completed, and it will report to the 69th General Convention.

The most important event internationally was the beginning of the new Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission II (ARCIC II), initiated by the "Common Declaration" of Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Its responsibilities are "to examine, especially in the light of our respective judgments on the *Final Report*, the outstanding doctrinal differences which still separate us, with a view towards their eventual resolution; to study all that hinders the mutual recognition of the ministries of our Communion; and to recommend what practical steps will be necessary when, on the basis of our unity in faith, we are able to proceed to the restoration of full communion." The first two meetings of ARCIC II have focused on fundamental doctrinal principles concerning salvation, justification, and the role of the Church in God's plan for the redemption of the whole human race.

THE ANGLICAN CENTRE IN ROME

The Anglican Centre in Rome is celebrating its third decade of service to the Anglican Communion and the See of Rome as a means of continuing ecumenical dialogue. Under the aegis of the Anglican Consultative Council, it has provided a unique place of ecumenical enlightenment and shared experience for Anglicans and Roman Catholics alike in the prayerful search for oneness in the body of Christ.

The Centre's work has now reached a point of desirable expansion both of its conferences in Rome and through publications and contacts with the provinces and dioceses. To this end its council is forming a world-wide constituency of support under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be known as the Friends of the Anglican Centre.

The North American Committee of the Friends seeks the endorsements of General Convention as a way of bringing the Anglican Centre in Rome to the attention of the Episcopal Church, seeking the ecumenical interest and support of individuals, parishes, dioceses and theological institutions.

Resolution #A—51

The Friends of the Anglican Centre

***Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the General Convention endorse the program of The Friends of the Anglican Centre, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in its formation of a world-wide constituency of support.**

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS ON THE ARCIC FINAL REPORT

Introduction

Almost 450 years have elapsed since our Churches separated. Since then, hostility, prejudice, and misunderstanding have frequently marred our encounters. The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) has taken advantage of the better climate of opinion which has developed in this ecumenical century, and also has made a notable contribution to those better relations. We trust that the *Final Report* will stand as the first milestone in a process that will lead eventually to full communion between our Churches. The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (SCER) wishes to encourage the Episcopal Church to pursue this road. In a later section of this report, we shall propose some steps to be taken immediately to deepen our relationship to the Roman Catholic Church.

The *Final Report* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, \$2.95) contains three agreed statements on "Eucharistic Doctrine," "Ministry and Ordination," and "Authority in the Church (I and II)." In 1979 the General Convention of the Episcopal Church affirmed the first two agreed statements on "Eucharistic Doctrine" and "Ministry and Ordination":

***Resolved*, That this 66th General Convention of the Episcopal Church affirms that the documents on Eucharistic Doctrine and Ministry and Ordination provide a statement of the faith of this Church in the matters concerned and form a basis upon which to proceed in furthering the growth towards unity of the Episcopal Church with the Roman Catholic Church."**

It was in 1981 that the Anglican Consultative Council commended the completed *Final Report* of ARCIC to the churches of the Anglican Communion for study. It asked the provinces to respond to the following questions:

1. Whether the agreed statements on Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry, and Ordination, and Authority in the Church (I and II), together with Elucidations are consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans.
2. Whether the *Final Report* offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith.

Similar questions have been addressed to Episcopal Conferences of the Roman Catholic Church.

Because the General Convention affirmed the first two agreed statements in 1979, the main task of this report is to deal with "Authority in the Church (I and II)." So far there are no Elucidations appended to part II of "Authority in the Church," for this will be the responsibility of the new ARCIC II in light of the judgments of the two Churches on the *Final Report*. In preparation for this report, the SCER asked dioceses and seminaries to study "Authority in the Church (I and II)" and to respond to the two questions, and many did.

The first task of this report is to explain how we understand the two questions to which we are asked to respond. In the case of the first question, we understand "consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans" to mean, in the first place, that no part of the *Final Report* explicitly contradicts the faith of Anglicans. In the second place, consonance points to an agreement in faith which does not exclude diversity of expression and emphasis.

An affirmative response to the first question does not require a detailed comparison with the language of 16th century Anglican formularies. Consonance in faith does not mean identity of formulation. The method of the dialogue was "to get behind the opposed and entrenched positions of past controversies . . . [and to avoid] the vocabulary of past polemics, not with any intention of evading the real difficulties that provoked them, but because the emotive associations of such language have often obscured the truth" (FR, p. 66). For Roman Catholics to insist that the agreed statements conform to the language of the Council of Trent would, we believe, equally misunderstand ARCIC's methodology.

The second question is closely related to the first. It is clear that, if the Episcopal Church does not find the *Final Report* to be "consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans," it will have difficulty in agreeing that the Report "offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith." An affirmative answer to the second question is a declaration on the part of the Episcopal Church that sufficient agreement in the faith has been achieved to enable both Churches to take a next step in reconciliation, which will further change the relationship between them.

Appreciation and Evaluation

Any attempt to evaluate the *Final Report* from within the Anglican Communion must begin by appreciating what it has achieved. Several emphases of the document have been helpful.

1. First is the general Christocentric thrust of the document. In the agreed statement on "Eucharistic Doctrine," the focus on the once-for-all character of Christ's redemptive act, of which the Eucharist is a memorial (*anamnesis*), is a case in point (FR, pp. 13-14). In the agreed statement on "Ministry and Ordination," it is clear that "(a)ll Christian ministry . . . flows and takes its shape from this source," (the life and self-offering of Christ) (FR, p. 30). Similarly, in the agreed statement on "Authority in the Church (I and II)," it is clear that authority is ultimately Christ's. "To him God has given all authority in heaven and earth" (FR, p. 52). "This is Christian authority: when Christians so act and speak, men perceive the authoritative word of Christ" (FR, p. 53).
2. Second is the emphasis on the work of the Spirit in the Church, particularly in building *koinonia* (communion or fellowship). The relations between *koinonia* and ministry (FR, p. 31), and between *koinonia* and authority (FR, pp. 53, 86, 89, etc.), turned out to be particularly productive.

3. The concern for *koinonia* as underlying the development of both conciliar and primatial authority touches a responsive chord in many Anglican readers. It will be important to keep this concern central in future discussions. It sometimes became obscured in the *Final Report*.
4. The acceptance of Scripture as normative is especially significant for Anglicans. [". . . The Church's expression of that revelation must be tested by its consonance with Scripture" (FR, p. 70); "In times of crisis or when fundamental matters of faith are in question the Church can make judgments consonant with Scripture" (FR, p. 62); "Our intention has been to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching. . . ." (FR, p. 12); "Normative principles governing the purpose and function of the ministry are already present in the New Testament documents" (FR, p. 32)].
5. In this connection we are struck by the contribution of recent biblical criticism to the progress in each of the areas covered by the *Final Report*. The reappraisal made by scholars in both communions of the eucharistic *anamnesis*, of the variety of ministries described in the New Testament, and of the role of Peter in the New Testament, bear special mention. Although we agree with one of the observations of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to the effect that historical criticism does not have the last word in determining the authoritative interpretation of the scriptural word or of the tradition of the Church (BII/2), we would insist that the understandings and agreements of scholars must be heeded and used. Historical research often has an important first word to say in the process which has engaged us.
6. The affirmation of the mutual dependence of primacy and conciliarity puts the question of primatial authority in a context which has made Roman Catholic views of the Petrine office more intelligible to many Anglicans.
7. The agreement on authority is stated in terms of a theological model of convergence towards which both of our Churches may grow. It does not profess to describe the present state of either Church. In our minds this method marks a hopeful way forward.

We are convinced that the *Final Report* is sufficiently consonant in substance with the faith of this church regarding Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church (I and II) to justify both further conversation and also further steps to bring our communions into closer relationship. Nevertheless, the *Final Report* does raise some questions which need to be clarified; also some dangers on the path ahead need to be identified and avoided.

1. The agreed statement on "Eucharistic Doctrine" was accepted by the General Convention of 1979, in Denver, as embodying a recognizable statement of Anglican teaching regarding the Eucharist. It needs no further comment.
2. At the same time, the agreed statement on "Ministry and Ordination" was similarly acknowledged. It contains one ambiguous passage which we believe should be clarified. Of those who are ordained as priests, it is said, "Nevertheless their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit" (FR, p. 36). The phrase, "another realm of the gifts of the Spirit," is not clear; and to say, with the elucidation, that "the word priesthood is used by way of analogy when it is applied to the people of God and to the ordained ministry" cannot be helpful until the nature of the two analogues, and the difference and congruence between them,

is more fully explored. Anglicans believe that ordination to priesthood confers a special gift of the Spirit to enable a person to serve the community in priestly ministry (BCP, p. 856, 531-32). A priest is by ordination not constituted a superior kind of Christian or a more holy person. Hence we do not find the word "realm" helpful.*

3. The agreed statement on "Authority in the Church (I and II)" raises a number of serious questions for us.

a. The *Final Report* is insufficiently clear about what authority means. The fault is endemic to our age, but it needs to be faced in Anglican-Roman Catholic conversations for the sake of the whole ecumenical movement. It is true that "Authority in the Church (I)" begins by saying that all authority in heaven and earth is Christ's (FR, p. 52), and that "when Christians so act and speak, men perceive the authoritative word of Christ" (FR, p. 53). Yet the document quickly moves on to talk about the pastoral authority of the *bishop*, who in doctrine, discipline, and worship "can require the compliance necessary to maintain faith and charity in its daily life" (FR, p. 54). "Authority in the Church (II)" seems to imply that authority and power are equivalent terms. "Jurisdiction in the Church may be defined as the authority or power necessary for the exercise of an office" (FR, p. 88, emphasis added).

We regret an apparent tendency to equate authority and power, and to move so quickly to the *requiring* of compliance. Obviously, power is closely related to authority; yet the two are not identical. One needs only to point to Christ himself, who on his cross used no "power to require compliance," but whose authority there reaches its highest expression. The relation between power and authority in the Church needs to be clarified in some early future. Confusion between them may be found to underlie the suspicion many Anglicans have of papal *authority*, having confused it with papal *power*, which, some Anglicans think, was occasionally misused in time past in dealing with Anglicans. This suspicion is not really addressed in the *Final Report*.

b. A somewhat similar point can be made about the relation between primacy and conciliarity. The discussion of "Authority in the Church (I)" begins by asserting the interdependence of primatial and conciliar authority. "Although primacy and conciliarity are complementary elements of *episkope*, it has often happened that one has been emphasized at the expense of the other, even to the point of serious imbalance" (FR, p. 63). A primate, we are told, "exercises his ministry not in isolation but in collegial association with his brother bishops" (FR, p. 63) and "should exercise, and be seen to exercise, his ministry not in isolation but in collegial association with his brother bishops" (FR, p. 89).

This language is congenial to Anglicans. It makes contact with a concept which we know and accept, that a primate is "first among equals."

We are later given to understand that recognition of primacy "creates an expectation that on occasion he [the primate] will take an initiative in speaking to the Church" (FR, p. 63), and that "by virtue of his jurisdiction, given for the building up of the Church, the universal primate has the right in special cases to intervene in the affairs of a diocese and to receive appeals from the decisions of a diocesan bishop" (FR, p. 90). Is it not conceivable that such an action on the part of the universal primate might obscure or even erase the interdependence of primacy and conciliarity?

* For a more precise statement, see *The Ministry in the Church* (Roman Catholic/Lutheran Joint Commission), page 9, paragraph 20, and footnote 23.

Such interventions would have to be explicitly defined by finding agreements between our two Churches to insure the “moral limits” of its exercise (FR, p. 90). The *Final Report* acknowledges that Anglicans “are entitled to assurance that acknowledgment of the universal primacy of the bishop of Rome would not invoke the suppression of theological, liturgical, or other traditions which they value. . .” (FR, p. 91). The words of Paul VI, cited to provide that assurance, i.e., “There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church. . .” (FR, p. 91), leave undefined what constitutes legitimacy and worth in this context, and how it is to be determined and preserved.

The exact relation between primacy and conciliarity needs to be further explored. We expect and pray that such a process will instruct both the Churches as they participate in it together.

c. Some consulting bodies in the Episcopal Church raised the question whether the position taken in the *Final Report* with regard to the preservation of councils and primates from error is consistent with the position articulated in Article 21 of the Articles of Religion. The source of this question seems to lie in an apparent lack of clarity in the document itself. For example, the statement, “When the Church meets in ecumenical council its decisions on fundamental matters of faith exclude what is erroneous” (FR, p. 62), appears to conflict with the assertion that “neither general councils nor universal primates are invariably preserved from error” (FR, p. 94). The two propositions may in fact, as the *Final Report* assumes, be consistent, but at the very least they evince different practical attitudes towards the authority of councils and towards the issue of “guaranteed possession of . . . a gift of divine assistance” (FR, p. 96). There is an issue here which requires more careful analysis and explication.

d. We affirm the conclusion of the Commission that “the New Testament contains no explicit record of a transmission of Peter’s leadership; nor is the transmission of apostolic authority in general very clear” (FR, p. 83). We hold that in particular it is “the order of bishops who carry on the apostolic work. . .” (BCP, p. 510). Anglicans customarily consider the rise of the papacy under the category of historical development. Perhaps we can learn to see the universal primacy of Peter as providential for the welfare of the Church as a whole (cf. FR, p. 87). It is, indeed, “possible to think that the primacy of the bishop of Rome is not contrary to the New Testament and is part of God’s purposes regarding the Church’s unity” (FR, p. 84). Further clarification is needed, however, as to the Roman Catholic understanding of the role of providence in the development of the papacy.

e. Similar considerations apply to the vexed question of papal infallibility. The *Final Report* goes some distance in allaying Anglican apprehension about the arbitrary exercise of infallibility when it explains that the pope cannot make infallible decisions which “add to the content of revelation” (FR, p. 93), that such decisions “articulate, elucidate, or define matters of faith which the community believes at least implicitly” (FR, p. 93), and that a previous effort must have been made to “discover the mind of his fellow bishops and of the Church as a whole” (FR, p. 95). We would agree, of course, that any conciliar or papal statement, especially one made after such an effort to discover the mind of the Church, deserves the “attentive sympathy” (FR, p. 37) of Anglicans, even in our present estrangement. We agree also that Anglican churches themselves need a better process for making authoritative decisions in matters of faith. But it seems to us, as we understand the terms, that it goes far beyond Holy Scripture and the tradition

which we have received to hold that the Divine Redeemer has willed his Church to be endowed with the power to make infallible and irreformable judgments in defining faith or morals, and especially that the Roman pontiff enjoys this endowment by virtue of his office. We urge further exploration of the ideas surrounding the indefectibility of the Church—i.e., that the Church will not permanently separate itself from the truth—for we believe that the path to eventual agreement in this area lies along this road.

f. The acceptance of conciliar or papal definitions raises the question of reception. Regarding *conciliar* authority, the *Final Report* avoids two extreme positions: the view that a definition has no authority until accepted by the whole church and that a council is so evidently self-sufficient that its definitions owe nothing to reception (FR, p. 72). Anglicans should like to see the same criteria regarding reception applied to *both* papal and conciliar statements.

g. Discussion of papal infallibility also leads to the question of the Marian dogmas. We simply cite the report itself as indicating the question for further discussion: "For many Anglicans, the teaching authority of the bishop of Rome, independently of a council, is not recommended by the fact that through it, these Marian doctrines were proclaimed as dogma binding on the faithful. Anglicans would also ask whether in any future union between our two Churches, they would be required to subscribe to such dogmatic statements" (FR, p. 96).

To pose this question is not to deny that some Anglicans believe the Marian dogmas already *as doctrines*. Further work can and should be done to render them as intelligible as possible to the Anglican communion as a whole. To restate these doctrines as possible *theologoumena*, however, does not obviate the dogmatic issue. We would raise the question of the status of these dogmas in the hierarchy of truths recognized by the Roman Catholic Church.

h. The question about the authority of the laity in church councils should also be pressed. The *Final Report* once again begins bravely by acknowledging that laity *may* participate in councils. "In all these councils, whether of bishops only, or of bishops, clergy and laity, decisions are authoritative when they express the common faith and mind of the Church" (FR, p. 56). Nevertheless, the interest of the *Final Report* quickly shifts to the special role which *bishops* have in defining the faith. "But the *bishops* have a special responsibility for promoting truth and discerning error. . ." (FR, p. 61, emphasis added); ". . . The Church can make judgments. . . In discharging this responsibility *bishops* share in a special gift of Christ to his Church. . ." (FR, p. 62, emphasis added; etc.). We recognize that this focus was inevitable at this stage of the dialogue.

The development of the role of the laity in the councils of the Church, however, involving the sharing by lay men and women in the governance of the Church, has become one of the hallmarks and glories of Anglicanism. The practice of the Episcopal Church in the United States from the beginning has included laity with a decisive voice and vote in diocesan, provincial, and General Conventions. This synodical structure has gradually commended itself throughout Anglicanism, and should not be lost. The role of the laity which has developed in our communion seems to involve considerably more than that envisioned in the *Final Report* for the place of the laity, even in the elucidations: ". . . that all the members of the Church share in the discovery of God's will, that the *sensus fidelium* is a vital element in the comprehension of God's truth. . . , and that all bear witness to God's compassion for mankind and his concern for justice in the world" (FR, p. 73). Particularly in view of the increased attention currently being given to the

ministry and vocation of the laity in both our Churches by reason of their Baptism, we urge careful consideration of this matter in future conversations.

This comment in no way denies the special role of bishops as expressed in the *Final Report*, but we believe that that role should be set in the context of a more explicit understanding of the place of the laity in the Church of the future.

i. The most difficult matter discussed in the *Final Report* is that of the ordinary immediate universal jurisdiction of the pope. Anglicans have always objected to jurisdiction so defined. In this instance, too, the *Final Report* acts to mitigate Anglican apprehensions by its assertion that a universal primate should use this jurisdiction "to serve the faith and unity of the whole church," and that it is exercised "in collegial association with brother bishops" (FR, p. 89). It is also properly noted that "the universal primate is not the source from which diocesan bishops derive their authority" (FR, p. 90). Nevertheless, the bottom line turns out to be that "the universal primate has the right in special cases to intervene in the affairs of a diocese and to receive appeals from the decision of a diocesan bishop" (FR, p. 90). Responsibility for preserving the Church from fundamental error belongs to the whole church, we read, but "it may be exercised on its behalf by a universal primate" (FR, p. 94). "It is not the arbitrary power of one man over the freedom of others, but a necessity if the bishop is to serve his flock as its Shepherd" (FR, p. 89). "The exercise of authority in the Church need not have the effect of stifling the freedom of the Spirit to inspire other agencies and individuals" (FR, p. 94). These statements are surely true when such authority is exercised under the power of the Holy Spirit.

Yet the history of the Church suggests that papal power has from time to time been exercised arbitrarily and that authority in the Church, misused, *can* stifle freedom of the Spirit. The danger of the misuse of power can be limited and contained by some system of checks and balances. If Anglicans grant the need for universal primacy, as so eloquently argued in the *Final Report*, as a sign and agency of catholic unity, some such system of restraints needs to be explored lest primacy be exercised heteronomously, to the detriment, rather than to the welfare, of the body of Christ.**

Questions to Anglicans

Having already offered questions as a contribution to the future direction of dialogue in ARCIC II, we wish now to focus upon certain points for future theological reflection within the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion.

From the statement of our 1979 General Convention on "The Visible Unity We Seek," the Episcopal Church is already on record as affirming that some form of collegiality, conciliarity, authority, and primacy will need to be "present and active in the diocese with its parishes as well as nationally, regionally, and universally." The statement also said, "We do not yet see the shape" of those structures at the present time. We therefore believe the ARCIC *Final Report* now calls us to look carefully at two urgent questions: 1) the limits of doctrinal diversity or comprehensiveness that are compatible with an authentic and credible ecclesial unity, and 2) the process of authority by which decisions about faith and action should be taken for the sake of the Church's mission.

** See the 1984 Dublin Agreed Statement on Wider Leadership within the Church from the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, particularly the position of special "seniority" accorded to the see of Constantinople as well as to the see of Rome, and the position of seniority that has come to be accorded to the ancient see of Canterbury in the Anglican Communion.

Anglicans have of course been discussing these questions among themselves for many years, even centuries, but they confront us now with new urgency for two reasons: our old answers to them seem even less clear or compelling than before, and our current ecumenical dialogues (especially the *Final Report*) demand that we now proceed to discuss and answer these questions no longer in the abstract but in the hope, even in the distinct possibility, that our Church may be visibly one, in full communion, with other churches in the foreseeable future. For these reasons, therefore, the traditional Anglican concept of "dispersed authority" (Lambeth 1948) needs further elucidation. We are now being asked to give a direct answer to the questions: How are decisions reached, what people finally decide for the Anglican Communion, and how should this be done in the coming great church of the future that we believe to be God's will? Which interpretations of Scripture and tradition are faithful and acceptable and which are not? The *Final Report*, as well as the reports coming from many other of our ecumenical dialogues today, ask that we specify how we as Anglicans decide what we believe and what we should do, and that we describe our position in relation to other churches facing the same problem and with whom we hope to reach a common mind about God's will for the Church's mission and a common strategy for effecting it.

Wider Questions of Authority

If the *Final Report* raises issues which can require Anglicans to reconsider their practice where questions of ecclesial authority are concerned, it also raises a series of larger questions which must, in the end, be faced by all Christian bodies in the contemporary world. Is there—in the Christian or any other community—a difference between authority and the legal power to compel obedience or to punish dissent? And if so, is it not the case that legal power may be exercised without authority—or that authority may be exercised apart from the compulsions of power? Again: where questions of faith and morals are concerned, is there a place in the life of the Church for discussion, disagreement, and dissent? This is not a question about whether such phenomena exist (they clearly do exist), but about whether they have a legitimate role in the Church's discernment of the "mind" by which it is joined in *koinonia* with Christ.

The *Final Report* as well as other recent ecumenical statements on the subject of authority raises and deals with the crucial issue (of which infallibility is one clearly defined instance) whether there is an antecedently available "correct answer" for every issue which engages or confronts the Church—an answer which can be more or less automatically "discovered" by resort to certain institutional procedures. For example, in the *Final Report* it is said that "Anglicans do not accept the guaranteed possession of such a gift of divine assistance in judgment necessarily attached to the office of the bishop of Rome by virtue of which his formal decisions can be known to be wholly assured before their reception by the faithful" (FR, p. 96). In the ecumenical movement a great deal depends, however, on further and more thorough exploration of this sort of issue. If, in principle, we "already know," then plurality of opinion and practice and debate may, in certain circumstances, be tolerable contingencies, but apart from the function of raising questions for authority to settle, they have no licit role in the Church's uncovering or articulation of the truth by which it lives.

If, by contrast, it is not necessarily the case that we "already know," then—despite the embarrassment which may be occasioned for a Church by the appearance of uncertainty and the absence of a "united front"—disagreement and debate may turn out to be vehicles by which the Holy Spirit brings the Church to itself and opens the way to a grasp of truth which corrects and deepens the initial positions of all parties to a discussion. To address issues such as these, however, it is necessary to go beyond the present scope

of the treatment of authority in the *Final Report* and to ask about the differing shapes that authority can take, about the relationships among them, and, indeed, about the proper function of authority itself.

Next Concrete Steps

As we have indicated, the General Convention has already affirmed that the documents on "Eucharistic Doctrine" and "Ministry and Ordination" provide a statement of the faith of this Church in the matters concerned. In spite of certain ambiguities and difficulties to which we have referred, we conclude that the *Final Report* as a whole is consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans and offers a sufficient basis for taking a further concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith. We recognize the wisdom of the concept of unity by stages. We should establish the direction of our pilgrimage and then move step by step as we pursue a goal which we do not yet see or even fully understand. By design, ARCIC did not suggest what those next steps might be. Nevertheless, diocesan responses to our request for study of the *Final Report* repeatedly suggested certain appropriate next steps. In light of this response, we recommend these steps:

1. Support of ARCIC II as it continues the dialogue, taking into account the wider ecumenical discussions.
2. Priority be given to the development of common mission strategies including the sharing of facilities, personnel, worship, and educational resources.
3. Upon adoption of the agreed statements on "Eucharistic Doctrine" and "Ministry and Ordination," a change in Eucharistic discipline.
4. Upon sufficient agreement in faith, mutual ecclesial recognition, recognition of orders and ministry, and initiation of full communion.

We believe that God's will for the mission and unity of the Church is being revealed to us through the *Final Report*. We rejoice over the agreement that has been reached in a relatively short time after centuries of estrangement. We believe we should now press on with hope toward the fulfillment of God's will for the Church in our times.

Resolution #A—52 *ARCIC Final Report*

Whereas, the 67th General Convention received with appreciation the *Final Report* of ARCIC and directed the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to organize a study of this Report throughout the Church and to report to the 68th General Convention; and

Whereas, the 66th General Convention approved the first two sections of the *Final Report* of ARCIC, namely the agreed statements on Eucharistic Doctrine and on Ministry and Ordination as providing a "statement of the faith of this Church in the matters concerned"; therefore be it,

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention of the Episcopal Church affirm that the agreed statement on "Authority in the Church (I and II)" of the *Final Report* of ARCIC represents a theological model of convergence towards which both of our Churches may grow and, in that sense, is sufficiently consonant in substance with the faith of this Church to justify further conversations and to offer a basis for taking further steps towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement of faith; and be it further

Resolved, That the affirmations noted and the questions raised about these agreed statements, as identified in the report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, be referred to ARCIC II for further dialogue; and be it further

Resolved, That this action of the 68th General Convention and the action of the 66th General Convention pertaining to the *Final Report* of ARCIC, along with the foregoing Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on the ARCIC *Final Report*, be transmitted to the Anglican Consultative Council as the official response of this Church.

ANGLICAN-REFORMED DIALOGUE

This dialogue was initiated by the Anglican Consultative Council and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in 1978. The North American member churches of the World Alliance are: Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Hungarian Reformed Church in America, Lithuanian Evangelical Reformed Church, Presbyterian Church (USA), Reformed Church in America, Second Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and United Church of Christ.

The report is published in *God's Reign and Our Unity: The Report of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission 1981-1984* (London: SPCK), and is available from Forward Movement Publications. It examines some obstacles which have hindered Anglican-Reformed unity plans, and is a major contribution to helping the churches to overcome these obstacles. Much of the report will have significance for other American churches, whose roots go back to the Anglican and Reform traditions, for instance, the Churches in the Consultation on Church Union. Consequently, it could profitably be studied and discussed in a much wider forum than Anglican and Reformed. The report is not a technical document, and has appended questions for local discussion. The Anglican Consultative Council has asked that a response to the report be sent, if possible, by December, 1986.

Resolution #A—53 Anglican-Reformed Dialogue

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention acknowledge with appreciation *God's Reign and Our Unity: The Report of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission 1981-1984*; ask the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to arrange for joint study of the Report; and direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to make an interim response to the Anglican Consultative Council and a report to the next General Convention.

BAPTIST-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

The dialogue with Southern Baptists in North Carolina continued during this past triennium with annual meetings involving Baptist pastors and priests from the three Episcopal dioceses in the state. The 1985 meeting was the sixth of this ongoing statewide dialogue, which has explored the following topics: 1983—Signs, Symbols, and Sacraments; 1984—The Doctrine of the Church as Held by Episcopalians and Southern Baptists; 1985—Baptist and Episcopal Evaluations and the Lima Report on the Topic of the Ordained Ministry.

The flow of topics studied and discussed in this dialogue grows out of questions raised at the previous year's meeting. The advantage of this is that progress is made by immediately addressing the topic which demands clarification for better understanding of the other tradition. For example, the 1983 discussion of sacraments revealed basic differences in the doctrine of the Church between Baptist and Episcopal participants, and this gave impetus to the 1984 focus of the dialogue.

CONSULTATION ON CHURCH UNION

The 1984 Plenary meeting of the Consultation on Church Union was a pivotal moment in the life of this ecumenical pilgrimage. The Plenary accepted the document *The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting* (Princeton, N.J.: Consultation on Church Union, \$1.25), after it had been revised in response to suggestions and criticisms received from the participating churches. On the whole the concerns expressed by the Episcopal Church were listened to and the majority of the Episcopal delegates' suggestions were accepted by the drafting committee. The Plenary has commended this document to the participating churches and is seeking an official response from their conventions and synods indicating whether the document is consonant with the faith of that church.

The Plenary concluded that the consensus had matured to such a point that the churches should be asked whether or not this text is indeed: "1) an expression, in the matters with which it deals, of the Apostolic faith, order, worship and witness of the Church, 2) an anticipation of the Church Uniting which the participating bodies, by the power of the Holy Spirit, wish to become, and 3) a sufficient theological basis for the covenanting acts and the uniting process proposed at this time by the Consultation." SCER believes that submitting the question to this 68th General Convention would be hasty and irresponsible. A decision of such importance should be prepared for by a church-wide study of the document, so that a decision may be made by the 1988 General Convention.

Resolution #A—54

COCU: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to initiate and facilitate a study in all the dioceses and seminaries of this Church of that document entitled *The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting*, so that the 69th General Convention may determine whether this document provides a sufficient theological basis in those matters with which it is concerned, for continuing in the process leading towards covenanting; and be it further

Resolved, That the SCER seek through appropriate channels the advice of other Provinces of the Anglican Communion and other ecumenical partners concerning this document as a basis for such covenanting action.

The Plenary also sent to the participating Churches for study and comment, not for official action, a second report, that of the Church Order Commission. This proposes a process of living our way toward union called "covenanting." "In covenanting the churches will pledge themselves formally to become visibly one, entering upon a solemn and sacred journey together, doing whatever things may be necessary, under God, to

become one church." This covenanting is seen as being much more than an agreement to continue conversations. The Consultation believes that the covenanting process must include at the start seven elements. These elements are: 1) mutual recognition of members in the one Baptism; 2) mutual recognition of each other as churches; 3) agreement on the theological principles contained in this document, *In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting*; 4) recognition and reconciliation of the ordained ministries in the several churches; 5) establishing regular eucharistic fellowship; 6) engaging together in mission and evangelism; and 7) formation of councils of oversight. By accepting these seven elements the participating churches, while remaining separate, would be giving dramatic and visible witness to their collective determination to become, by the grace of God, one church. Provision would be made for all future ordinations to be presided over by bishops of the covenanting churches. Such a major step calls for a careful and thoughtful examination. The participating churches are asked to reply with commentary and suggestions prior to the next Plenary of COCU.

Resolution #A—55

COCU: Report of the Church Order Commission

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, in consultation with the Episcopal representatives to COCU (1) to organize and conduct throughout this Church a study of the covenanting process proposed by the Consultation on Church Union and more fully articulated in the Report of the Church Order Commission of the Consultation, (2) to collate the responses, criticisms and suggestions which arise from such study, (3) to make an official reply in the name of the Episcopal Church to the Consultation on Church Union, and (4) to report such actions to the 69th General Convention.

The following resolution seeks to renew permission previously granted for use on ecumenical occasions of eucharistic liturgies prepared by the Consultation on Church Union, with the stipulations required by previous General Convention action. It further seeks similar authorization for use of *A New Text* noted in item 3, a text which is nearly identical with Eucharistic Prayer #2 in the previously authorized *Word, Bread, Cup*.

Resolution #A—56

Use of COCU Liturgies

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 68th General Convention authorize, subject to the approval of the diocesan Bishop, provided that an ordained Priest of this Church is the celebrant, or one of the celebrants, at a concelebrated service; provided the elements used are those used by our Lord himself, namely bread and wine; provided further that any of the blessed elements remaining at the end of the service be reverently consumed; and provided further that the guidelines for interim eucharistic sharing authorized by the 65th General Convention be observed (*Journal*, 1976, pp. C-89, C-90), trial use in special circumstances of ecumenical worship or for use in special study sessions

- (1). That certain document entitled *An Order of Worship for the Proclamation of the Word of God and the Celebration of the Lord's Supper* published by the Forward Movement Publications and copyrighted 1968 by the Executive Committee of the

Consultation on Church Union; and previously authorized by the 65th and 66th and 67th General Conventions;

(2). That certain document entitled *Word, Bread, Cup* published by the Forward Movement Publications and copyrighted 1978 by the Executive Committee of the Consultation on Church Union, previously authorized by the 67th General Convention and stating preference for Eucharistic Prayers #1 and #2 and excluding #5; and

(3). That certain document entitled *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: A New Text* published and copyrighted 1984 by the Executive Committee of the Consultation on Church Union.

LUTHERAN-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

Episcopalians and Lutherans have responded generously to the agreement approved in the form of a common resolution by the 1979 General Convention and the conventions of the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches. Following the great "common, joint celebration of the Eucharist" by the Presiding Bishop and the bishops of the three Lutheran Churches on January 16, 1983 at the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., there have been many joint celebrations across the country. Involvement with one another in prayer, study, and mission has been slower to develop, and this now seems to need greater and more sustained attention.

The third series of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue began in 1983 and four meetings have taken place. Four major topics are under discussion: The Gospel and Its Implications, The Historic Episcopate in the Total Ministry of the Church, Teaching Authority of the Church under the Gospel, and Ways to Full Communion and Mutual Recognition of Ministries. While the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod did not approve the Lutheran-Episcopal agreement, we are pleased that it continues in the dialogue.

The international Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group was convened in 1983 at Cold Ash, Berkshire, England to assess the results of Anglican-Lutheran dialogues (especially in Europe, Tanzania, and the U.S.A.), to make recommendations proposing how the two Communion might achieve full communion, and to suggest procedures for closer cooperation. The report (*Anglican-Lutheran Relations: Report of the Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group*, (London: Anglican Consultative Council) and its recommendations were approved by the Lutheran World Federation and the Anglican Consultative Council and sent to the churches for action. One of the recommendations is that Lutheran and Anglican Churches should consider making provision for appropriate forms of Interim Sharing of the Eucharist along the lines of that authorized in the U.S.A. and recommended in Europe.

Resolution #A—57

Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue

Whereas, The 67th General Convention recognized the Lutheran Church in America, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and American Lutheran Church as Churches in which the Gospel is preached and taught; initiated between the Episcopal Church and these Churches a relationship of Interim Sharing of the Eucharist; and authorized a third series of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue to consider outstanding questions that must be resolved prior to the establishment of full communion between

the churches (e.g., Implications of the Gospel and Apostolicity as related to the ordering of ministry); and

Whereas, the Lutheran Church in America, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and American Lutheran Church are presently engaged in a process through the Commission for a New Lutheran Church that will lead to a single ecclesial expression of these three churches in the near future; therefore be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the dioceses and congregations of the Episcopal Church be encouraged to seek more opportunities for mutual prayer and support, covenants and agreements, common study, and joint programs of ministry and mission between Lutherans and Episcopalians to give greater substance and meaning to the many instances of Interim Sharing of the Eucharist now taking place; and be it further

Resolved, That the Episcopal Church commend, encourage, and offer prayer for the joint endeavors of the Lutheran Church in America, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and American Lutheran Church to perceive and witness to their unity in Jesus Christ; and be it further

Resolved, That the 68th General Convention direct the Episcopal participants of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III to advocate paragraph 53(a) and (b) of the ministry statement in *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* as a way forward toward the mutual recognition of the ordained ministries of our respective churches; and be it further

Resolved, That the greetings of the 68th General Convention and the substance of these resolutions be communicated to the Lutheran Church in America, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, American Lutheran Church, and to the Commission for a New Lutheran Church.

PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND IN THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCCC) has been engaged in an extensive process of rethinking the issues of accountability, structure and funding so that it may be more responsive to member churches and more effective in its essential mission. The Episcopal Church participates in the NCCC through its 14 members of the Governing Board, and many other persons appointed to the major divisions and commissions, as well as selected subunit programs. An essential part of the process of rethinking has been the Presidential Panel on Future Mission and Resources. On this panel we were ably represented by the Very Rev. Elton O. Smith, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, New York, and the Rt. Rev. Gerald McAllister, Bishop of Oklahoma. As the work of this Panel has progressed there have been numerous consultations with the Presiding Bishop, the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, Executive Council staff, and our delegates to the Governing Board.

"In 1981, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. amended its Constitution modifying the Preamble and the statement of the Purpose of the Council. These amendments, adopted only after thorough study and discussion, reflect a change in self-understanding. The Council, previously described as a 'cooperative agency' of the member churches, is defined in the new Preamble as a 'community of Christian communions.'" (Foreword to the Report of the Presidential Panel on Future Mission and Resources)

At the Governing Board in November of 1984, the Report of the Presidential Panel was affirmed and a commitment was made to enter into a transitional period in which

THE BLUE BOOK

this major restructuring will take place. The precise nature of the renewed Council is not totally clear at this time, but it will most certainly mean a change from the present style of functioning. Key changes are:

1. More effective governance by the Governing Board and clearer lines of accountability by the divisions and commissions to the Governing Board and to the member communions.
2. More effective coordination and communication among the member communions as they work together in the NCCC, and as they relate to each other individually and corporately on issues, programs and funding.
3. More selectivity in developing positions on key issues facing society rather than trying to speak to every issue.
4. Greater emphasis on research and theological reflection on issues relating to life, liberty, justice and peace.
5. Greater emphasis on NCCC's purpose of promoting Christian unity, and encouraging the participation of Christian communions which are not currently members.
6. Higher priority to the development and support of regional and local ecumenical efforts and organizations.

Resolution #A—58

Changes in the National Council of Churches

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention: 1) Commend the work of the Presidential Panel in rethinking the ministry, structure and funding of the National Council of Churches, 2) Encourage and promise cooperation in efforts to provide a simpler structure that will be responsive and accountable to its member churches, 3) Request the NCCC to provide resources and reflection on key ecumenical and social issues, so that a more effective dialogue thereupon may be facilitated among the churches before positions are taken by the Council, 4) Express gratitude to Dr. Claire Randall who tirelessly, creatively and with sensitivity guided the NCCC as its General Secretary for 11 years, and send warmest greetings as she moves on to new ways of serving our Lord in her retirement, 5) Welcome the Rev. Dr. Arie Brouwer as the new General Secretary and offer our support in working with the other member communions to implement the work of the Presidential Panel.

The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches met in Vancouver, B.C., Canada, July 24 to August 10, 1983. The official delegation of the Episcopal Church, including the Presiding Bishop, participated fully, contributed significantly, and provided meaningful leadership. Because the Assembly was held in North America, many members of this Church were able to participate as guests and visitors. The highlight of the Assembly was the celebration of the eucharistic liturgy of Lima (written by a group of theologians of the Faith and Order Commission meeting that finally revised the agreed statement on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, including J. Robert Wright of the Episcopal Church). Archbishop Robert Runcie of Canterbury described this service as a sign of significant ecumenical progress, and a reminder that many brothers and sisters in Christ continue to be unable to share together in the blessed Body and Blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The Assembly developed guidelines and priorities for the next seven years. All World Council of Churches activities should promote Growing Towards Unity; Growing To-

wards Justice and Peace; Growing Towards Vital and Coherent Theology; Growing Towards New Dimensions of the Churches' Self-Understanding; and Growing Towards a Community of Confessing and Learning. The stated priorities are Unity; Fostering Ecumenical Relations at all levels of church life; Creative Theological Work; Evangelism; Justice, Peace and the Integrity of All Creation; Full Participation for all in the life of the Church; The Concerns and Perspectives of Women; and Ecumenical Learning. (Report of the Program Guidelines Committee)

Resolution #A—59
World Council of Churches

Whereas, the Episcopal Church has been an active and vital force in the founding, support, and leadership of the World Council of Churches; and

Whereas, the World Council of Churches has emerged from its Sixth Assembly with new vitality and purpose; and

Whereas, "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" (Constitution of the World Council of Churches); therefore be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention: 1) Give thanks for the unique opportunity for cross-cultural, cross-confessional, international, and interracial dialogue, sharing, and exchange; for the hope and challenge embodied in the celebration of the "Lima liturgy"; and for the rare possibility for contributing to the building up and healing of the broken Body, the Church, through the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 2) Thank the official delegation of this Church, including the Presiding Bishop, for the faithful representation at the Sixth Assembly, for its report to the Executive Council and to the larger Church, 3) Express its thanks to God for the faithful and prophetic leadership the Reverend Dr. Philip Potter gave to the world-wide ecumenical movement in his many capacities, but particularly in his capacity as the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, and look forward to new contributions from him as scholar, teacher, pastor, preacher, and prophet, 4) Welcome the new General Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Emilio Castro, assuring him and the World Council of Churches of the continued prayers and support of this Church for the essential leadership of the World Council of Churches in the reconciliation of humankind and the healing of the broken Body, the Church.

Resolution #A—60
Presiding Bishop's Ecumenical Leadership

As the Presiding Bishop and Primate, the Most Rev. John M. Allin, prepares to leave his office, be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention give special thanks for Presiding Bishop John M. Allin's strong and faithful support, and active and informed leadership in the ecumenical movement; for his role as interpreter of the significance and meaning of Christian unity for this part of the Body; for his conscientious challenge to this part of the Body to be active participants and leaders in the reconciliation of God's people; and for his constant prayers that "they all may be one" as Christ and the Father are one.

The Presiding Bishop asked the Executive Council, and it in turn resolved in October, 1984 to "request the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to evaluate the

Episcopal Church's participation in the World Council of Churches and National Council of Churches and to report its findings and recommendations relative thereto to Executive Council" as "part of a periodic process of review which the Executive Council believes should be undertaken with all bodies with which the Church is affiliated." In January, 1985 the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations accepted the request of Executive Council and appointed a committee to conduct the evaluation in cooperation with the Executive Council, and to report its findings to the 1988 General Convention.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS ON *BAPTISM, EUCHARIST, AND MINISTRY*

The importance of the agreed statement on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM) (Philadelphia: Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 75¢) in the ecumenical movement is hard to exaggerate. The text is the product of over fifty years of work by representatives of member churches of the World Council of Churches (WCC) as well as Roman Catholic, Pentecostal, and other churches which do not belong to the Council. The WCC expects to compare all the official responses, to publish the results, and to analyze the ecumenical implications for the churches at a future World Conference of Faith and Order.

The WCC has invited the churches to prepare official responses to BEM at the highest appropriate level of authority. In 1982, the General Convention received the text and commended it for study, directing the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (SCER) to organize and conduct the study and report to the next General Convention. The SCER asked the dioceses and seminaries to study and respond to the text and has prepared an official response for the Episcopal Church in light of their responses. The SCER offers this report and official response to the General Convention.

The World Council has asked four questions:

- the extent to which your church can recognize in this text the faith of the Church through the ages;
- the consequences your church can draw from this text for its relations and dialogues with other churches, particularly with those churches which also recognize the text as an expression of the apostolic faith;
- The guidance your church can take from this text for its worship, educational, ethical, and spiritual life and witness;
- The suggestions your church can make for the ongoing work of Faith and Order as it relates the material of this text on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* to its long-range research project "Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today."

It is important to understand that the Episcopal Church is not asked, as it was for the ARCIC *Final Report*, to evaluate whether this text is "consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans" but rather how far we can recognize in it "the faith of the Church through the ages." We understand this to mean the faith of the Church witnessed to in the Holy Scriptures and in continuity with the apostolic faith and mission through the centuries. We do not assume that the text says everything possible on the matters concerned.

It is also important to understand that the Episcopal Church is not being asked whether it agrees with every statement in BEM. Indeed, it hardly could, for the compilers

have incorporated a commentary in which sometimes opposed positions are noted as indicating points on which no agreement has yet been reached.

Finally, it is important to understand that the Episcopal Church is not simply asked whether it recognizes in the text the faith of the ages, but, insofar as it is in accord with that faith, what it is prepared to do about it. To what extent does this ecumenical convergence call into question and challenge the teaching and practice of the Episcopal Church? Our understanding of the faith of the Church cannot be separated from the mission of the Church in the world.

1. The extent to which your church can recognize in this text the faith of the Church through the ages.

Episcopalians will welcome this agreed statement. We see in it an expression of the faith and mission of the Church through the ages. In BEM a wide and significant range of agreement has been reached by theological representatives of the world's major churches. Much if not all of the statement falls within the classical guidelines of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.

We rejoice in the convergence of belief which this document represents, and we regard it as a major step which the World Council of Churches has sponsored in the work of healing and reconciliation. We accept with joy the challenges this text addresses to us and to other churches.

Our overall highly positive response is, however, conditioned by several reservations. We will raise our questions and suggestions about each of the sections of the document in order.

We would identify one general issue with respect to the process of the church's "reception" of BEM. We understand reception to mean not just the assent of church hierarchies and theologians, although this aspect is important. We also include the integration and incorporation of this text into the on-going life of the Christian community. This kind of reception means not only the affirmative vote of General Convention, but also the continuing study and appropriation of the statement into the life of the Episcopal Church (and other churches). We wish the document had been clearer about the necessity of this dynamic process of reception.

a. Baptism

The text on Baptism in our survey received the strongest general approval, with much agreement that its general approach represents what we understand Baptism to be, and what we acknowledge the living faith of the Church about Baptism to be. Several specific questions were raised.

Is the text clear enough that Baptism is full Christian initiation? At times (II.A.3) it seems to assert that; at other times (II.C.5) it seems not to. In this context, the term "instalment" has raised questions of interpretation.

Under III.8 we would prefer to say that Baptism "involves both God's gift and our human response to that gift" rather than "is both God's gift and our human response to that gift." Baptism is given by God and is not dependent on our response in the same way, as the document's phrasing might suggest. However, we have sometimes failed as a church to nurture and instruct people in their Baptismal faith, so that we have not prepared them well to respond.

At the same time we note that this theological question points to the knotty issue of rebaptism, which we think needs to be treated more deeply in the document itself. This is especially a question for those churches which rebaptize those baptized as infants. The statement on Baptism seems too facile on the issue of believers' Baptism

and does not express the hesitations felt by those who live where a significant number of Christians follow this tradition. At the same time, we must confess our own failure, in view of the loss from our parishes of many baptized and confirmed persons owing to poor catechetical practice leading to immature faith.

Although we note the reference to baptismal repentance (II.B.4), we would like to see reference to the lifelong call to repentance as a way of life for individual believers and for the churches.

We identify two specific areas of question which demand further engagement in the study of Baptism in the Christian community:

- 1) non-sacramental bodies (e.g., the Friends, Salvation Army) are by this document excluded from the ecclesial community;
- 2) some churches and/or individuals within churches baptize in a different formula from the classical one (“... in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit”) but still understand themselves as administering Christian Baptism. Neither the text nor the Episcopal Church acknowledges this as Baptism.

b. Eucharist

On the whole this section was well received, with a strong sense that many difficult aspects of eucharistic theology and practice were well and responsibly handled. Especially praised were the positions on the centrality of the Eucharist and the appropriateness of frequent (at least every Sunday) celebration.

We commend the Section on the Eucharist as sacrifice (I.A.4) because it deals honestly with the points at issue. It does not gloss over the issues, but transcends the usual terms of the controversies.

We noted the discussion of the presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements (I.C.15), but suggest that deepening of the text seems called for. For instance, we found no clear reference to Christ's presence in the elements for communion. We suggest that account needs to be taken of the mode of presence, duration (e.g., only for the act of communion?), and purpose of the presence (e.g., for the community eucharistic meal and immediate communion of the sick only?).

In BEM we welcome the reference to proclamation of the Word in the Eucharist (III.27), but would like to see a deepened and expanded exposition of the intrinsic and integral relation between Word and Sacrament.

We suggest that merely to say, as III.29 does, that most churches have ordained persons as presidents of the eucharistic assembly is not adequate. This is required in the Episcopal Church, and the statement raises questions of the meaning of ordination and the polity of some other churches.

We acknowledge that situations exist where the elements used in the Eucharist are other than bread and wine. Such usage represents a serious issue to be discussed with Christians of other cultures.

c. Ministry

On the whole we found this a helpful and thoughtful section, although it also presents many unresolved difficulties. For example, the relationships between the orders of bishops, presbyters and deacons as they function together on behalf of the Church are not clear. Partly this may be due to a lack of clarity in describing the ecclesial structures in which they function. Is the basic unit of the Church a diocese or a local congregation? This confusion is expressed in III.A.24. What is the relationship between presbyters and bishops? How do presbyters share in the councils of the

Church? The section on deacons (III.C.31) reflects the many questions raised in the commentary. More study on this order of ministry is needed, but such a study should not be done in isolation from the many issues surrounding the relationships of all three orders, such as ecclesial structures, jurisdiction, and authority.

BEM asserts that agreement on functions and titles is not necessary for recognition of ministries (III.C.28). We have serious reservations about such a claim. How can we avoid at least essential agreement about function if we are in any meaningful sense to “recognize” and acknowledge each other’s ministries? Is it necessary to oppose “uniform answer” to lack of agreement? Are there other possibilities? Many respondents have seen in the document simply a functionalist approach to ministry. Sections such as this would seem to support this view.

The document lacks any affirmation of the ministries of women over the course of the churches’ history. These spanned many sorts of lay ministries (because by and large all ordained ministries were closed to women) as well as specially consecrated and ordained ministries. The churches have learned from and experienced the action of the Spirit through them.

We also desire more to be said about the ordination of women, not only as a problem to be discussed as a possible obstacle to union, but as a positive good and appropriate to the human expression of the fullness of Christ’s priesthood in the Church. Further exploration of this issue needs to be begun with churches which ordain women to the presbyterate and episcopacy, because through this we may learn more of the workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

We note that there is no treatment of the Petrine ministry within the context of the ministry of bishops, and feel that this is a lack which ought to be remedied.

2. The consequences your church can draw from this text for its relations and dialogues with other churches, particularly with those churches which also recognize the text as an expression of the apostolic faith.

If we are going to receive an ecumenical document, we are convinced that we have to study and continue to assimilate it ecumenically. Today that surely means that we must study BEM in the context of the bilateral dialogues, where much significant progress in ecumenical relations is being made. We see a primary use of BEM as an instrument and reference in other dialogues. We need to devise specific ways to continue discussion of BEM ecumenically. In these discussions the close connection between faith and mission needs to be recognized, especially in the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A.

We in the Episcopal Church are called to explore specific pastoral questions in this light. For instance, our recognition of other churches’ Baptisms will by act of General Convention allow us to certify members to churches of other denominations. What other consequences might mutual recognition of each other’s Baptism involve?

3. The guidance your church can take from this text for its worship, educational, ethical, and spiritual life and witness.

We acknowledge that the whole of BEM radically challenges us. We confess that we ought to practice more fully what we say we believe. This church has, for example, already implemented most liturgical changes indicated or implied in BEM, including its implications for our liturgies of ordination. However, the Episcopal Church has not yet asked how the potential of the three-fold pattern of ministry can be fully developed for the most effective witness of the Church in the world—in its life, mission, ministry, canons, and the like.

We acknowledge that our spiritual life as a church will be refashioned by a genuine “reception” and incorporation of BEM. We are called not only to say that we find in it

an expression of the faith of the Church throughout the ages, but also to ask how these expressions require us to reshape our understandings and practice relating to other Christians and to God.

4. The suggestions your church can make for the ongoing work of Faith and Order as it relates the material of this text on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* to its long-range research project "Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today".

We would want to ensure that consultation about BEM continues on various levels—National Council of Churches, bilateral dialogues, local groups, and that theological research continues, especially in Faith and Order.

In our response to question 1 we have raised several issues already. We would here only point out that much theological reporting and sorting out needs to be done. For instance, both of two eschatologies seem to be operating through the whole of BEM: one holds that the kingdom is to come, whereas the other maintains that in Jesus the kingdom of God has arrived, and we are now growing towards its fullness.

Many questions relating to ecclesiology and pneumatology remain unanswered or unexplored. Very little is articulated about the presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church and of the believers. What, for instance, are our expectations and hopes about the Holy Spirit leading and guiding us? What is our understanding of the total process of decision-making in the Church—role of the Holy Spirit, development of our understanding of the Scriptures, living tradition, etc.? What is the relationship between primacy and collegiality?

Resolution #A—61

Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention 1) endorse the foregoing Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations as the response of this Church to the agreed statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, expressing its appreciation for the remarkable convergence displayed therein; 2) declare that the text is a major contribution in the work toward reconciliation and visible unity which the World Council Commission on Faith and Order exists to foster; 3) recognize in the text the faith of the Church through the ages, with certain reservations as expressed in this response of the Episcopal Church; 4) encourage the Commission on Faith and Order in its work of evaluating the official responses of the churches to the text at the World Conference on Faith and Order in 1988; and 5) ask that dioceses of the Episcopal Church continue to use *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, together with this response, as a resource and occasion in meetings with ecumenical partners to pursue this Church's commitment to the visible unity of the Church.

RELATIONS WITH CHURCHES IN FULL COMMUNION

The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations is responsible not only for relations with churches with which we seek full communion, but also with other churches with which we are in full communion. These are the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht, Philippine Independent Church, Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar, and the Churches of Bangladesh, North India, Pakistan and South India resulting from the union of Anglican dioceses with Christians of other traditions.

In recent years the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican Consultative Council have been consulting with these churches about expressing our full communion through participation in the Anglican Consultative Council and a representative number of their bishops as full members of the Lambeth Conference. In the United States, meanwhile, the agreement between the Mar Thoma Church and the Episcopal Church has led to a growing number of thriving Mar Thoma congregations related both to Episcopal dioceses and to the Metropolitan of the Mar Thoma Church in India. A parallel agreement has now been negotiated between the Philippine Independent Church and the Episcopal Church which provides for a Council to coordinate mission and ministry to PIC people coming to the United States. Work is planned on a further agreement concerning partnership in mission and ministry in the Republic of the Philippines.

Relations with the Old Catholic Churches are maintained by the Anglican Consultative Council through the international Anglican-Old Catholic Theological Consultation. In 1982 this Consultation proposed the formation of a North American Working Group to the Presiding Bishop and the Prime Bishop of the Polish National Catholic Church. The Working Group, consisting of Episcopalians, Canadian Anglicans, and U.S. and Canadian Polish National Catholics, has prepared a memorandum on Authority in the Church for the 1985 meeting of the international Consultation. In January, 1985 the SCER agreed that the Episcopal members of the Working Group would continue dialogue with PNCC members in the hope of finding ways to heal the painful division between our churches caused by the termination of communion in 1977.

THREE YEAR NATIONAL ECUMENICAL EMPHASIS

By the time the next General Convention meets, in 1988, a decade will have elapsed since the last major Episcopal Church consultation on ecumenism, which met in Detroit in 1978, and which brought forth (among other things) a declaration of ecumenical purpose known as "The Nature of the Unity We Seek." It is now proposed that there be a three year national ecumenical emphasis (1986-1988), culminating in a second national consultation, and in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1886, 1888).

Goals for the three year national ecumenical emphasis would be:

1. To involve the dioceses and their people, and the seminaries and religious orders of the church, in responding to ecumenical developments during the last decade.
2. To assess, through diocesan consultations, the popular hopes and expectations for the ecumenical movement.
3. To celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1886, 1888).
4. To review, and if appropriate to revise, "The Nature of the Unity We Seek."
5. To focus, in particular, on this Church's developing understanding of Authority in the Church, as "Authority" has been rethought in the context of ecumenical dialogues.
6. To seek the participation of ecumenical partners in the three year ecumenical emphasis.
7. To respond to the request of the Anglican Consultative Council for provincial consultations in preparation for the 1988 Lambeth Conference.

A plan and agenda for the three year national ecumenical emphasis has already been drafted. The Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO) have indicated their sup-

THE BLUE BOOK

port for the venture. An overall budget of \$30,000 for the three year emphasis has been projected, of which \$6,000 is included in the Request for Budget Appropriation attached to this report. In seeking support for the three year ecumenical emphasis, the following resolution is offered:

Resolution #A—62

Three Year National Ecumenical Emphasis

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention of the Episcopal Church encourage the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to implement its plans for a three year national ecumenical emphasis, culminating in a national consultation and in a celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.

FINANCIAL REPORT

	<i>Authorized Budget</i>	<i>Actual Expenditures</i>
Appropriated by the 1982 General Convention for the 1983-1985 triennium	<u>\$101,312</u>	
Budget as revised by the Joint Standing Committee on Program, Budget, and Finance, on recommendation of its General Convention Expense Section		
1983	\$31,895	\$26,205
1984	38,952	43,843
1985	<u>28,465</u>	<u>18,163</u> (to 3/31/85)
Total	<u>\$99,312</u>	<u>\$88,211</u> (to 3/31/85)

OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

To carry out the responsibilities assigned to the Commission in Title I, Canon 1, Section 2(n)(3); and in particular:

1. To encourage and coordinate the several dialogues and consultations with Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant Churches (through the Consultation on Church Union), as well as relations with Churches in full communion with the Episcopal Church.
2. To undertake an evaluation of Episcopal Church participation in the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches, as requested by the Executive Council.
3. To carry out a three year national ecumenical emphasis (as outlined in this report of the Commission).
4. To plan, in cooperation with the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers, a national study of the Consultation on Church Union document entitled "The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting" and to present to the 1988 General Convention a report of that study, as a prelude to Convention decision concerning "Quest."

5. To plan and coordinate other national studies, as requested to do so by the ecumenical dialogues and the Anglican Consultative Council.
6. To complete the study and recommendations relative to Episcopal-Roman Catholic marriages.
7. To encourage ecumenical activity in the local church, in cooperation with the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers, and with the help of additional staff in the ecumenical office.

REQUEST FOR BUDGET APPROPRIATION

As dialogues and agreements deepen and interchurch partnership in mission evolves, the Commission will need funding based upon the experience of the past triennium, and to this end we propose the following for 1986 through 1988:

Plenary Meetings of SCER (five to be held)	\$ 50,430
Anglican-Orthodox Consultation (three to be held)	11,740
Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation (four to be held, and one meeting of marriage commission)	19,280
Consultation on Church Union Plenary	6,160
Consultation on Church Union Executive Committee	5,310
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue (four to be held)	16,810
Polish National Catholic-Episcopal Working Group (three to be held)	4,010
Evaluation of Participation in WCC and NCCC	5,750
Linkage with Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO)	1,470
Three Year National Ecumenical Emphasis	6,000
	<u>\$126,960</u>

Resolution #A—63

Request for Budget Appropriation

***Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the 68th General Convention appropriate for the work of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations during the 1986-1988 triennium, including the three year ecumenical emphasis, the sum of \$126,960 from the Assessment Budget of the General Convention.**

APPENDIX

LIST OF EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATIVES IN DIALOGUES AND COUNCILS

The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches

The Presiding Bishop
The Rev. Sergio Carranza
The Rev. Canon John E. Kitagawa
Ms. Marydel Cortner
Dr. William E. Dornemann
Mrs. Eugenie Havemeyer
Mr. John M. Holloway
Ms. Alycia Kojima

The Governing Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ

The Presiding Bishop
The Rt. Rev. David B. Reed
The Rev. Canon Richard J. Anderson
The Rev. Canon Edward B. Geyer
The Rev. William B. Lawson
The Rev. William A. Norgren
The Rev. Jose A. Poch
The Rev. F. Goldthwaite Sherrill
The Very Rev. Elton O. Smith
Dr. Robert Bottoms
Mr. John L. Carson III
Ms. Joanne Fitts
Mrs. Eugenie Havemeyer
Mrs. Constance Lyle

The Consultation on Church Union (Baltimore Plenary, 1984)

The Rt. Rev. Robert M. Anderson
The Rt. Rev. John H. Hurt
The Rt. Rev. Edward W. Jones
The Rev. William A. Norgren
The Rev. Richard A. Norris, Jr.
The Very Rev. William H. Petersen
Dr. Alice Cowan
Mrs. Phebe Hoff
Dr. Cynthia Wedel

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation (ARC)

The Rt. Rev. A. Theodore Eastman, *Chair*
The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein
The Rev. William B. Lawson
The Rev. Eleanor McLaughlin
The Rev. Charles P. Price
The Rev. Philip Turner
Dr. William Banner
Dr. William Franklin

Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation

The Rt. Rev. David B. Reed, *Chair*
The Rt. Rev. J. M. Mark Dyer
The Very Rev. John H. Backus
The Rev. William B. Green
The Rev. Lloyd G. Patterson, Jr.
Deacon Ormonde Plater

Dr. E. Rozanne Elder
Dr. Paul Valliere
Mr. James C. McReynolds, *Adjunct Secretary*

The Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue

The Rt. Rev. William G. Weinbauer, *Chair*
The Rt. Rev. J. M. Mark Dyer
The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein
The Rev. L. William Countryman
The Very Rev. William H. Petersen
The Very Rev. John H. Rodgers, Jr.
The Rev. John R. Kevern
Dr. Marianne Micks

Committee on the ARCIC *Final Report*

The Rt. Rev. Harold B. Robinson, *Chair*
The Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel
The Rev. Richard A. Norris, Jr.
The Rev. Charles P. Price
The Rev. Patricia Wilson-Kastner

Committee on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*

The Rev. Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *Chair*
The Rev. Henry A. Male, Jr.
The Very Rev. William H. Petersen
The Rev. Canon John E. Kitagawa