

LAMBETH '68: A ROMAN CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION

HERBERT J. RYAN, S.J.

Woodstock College

FOR ONE MONTH this summer, from July 25 to August 25, 467 bishops of the Anglican Communion met at Church House, Westminster, London, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to discuss the theme of the renewal of the Church in faith, ministry, and unity. The fruits of more than three years of theological research undertaken not only by Anglican theologians working alone but often in joint commissions with theologians of other Churches resulted in one of the most thoroughly prepared meetings of the Christian Church in modern times.¹ Even if this Tenth Lambeth Conference had been confined solely to the Anglican Communion, such a theme discussed by the episcopate of more than forty-seven million Christians would call for reflection on the part of non-Anglican theologians.

But the Anglican episcopate did not meet by themselves. For three of the four weeks of this Conference, consultants from the Anglican Communion² and official observers from other Christian Churches³ were

¹ As witness to only part of the extensive preparation are the pounds of printed material which each participant received prior to the formal opening of the Conference. The most important items were a 400-page volume of *Preparatory Essays* (London: SPCK, 1968), which contained studies for twenty-nine of the thirty-two committee topics; a 200-page book of *Preparatory Information* (London: SPCK, 1968), which gave statistics of the Anglican Communion and the relevant statements of past Lambeth Conferences on the topics to be discussed; *Intercommunion Today, Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion* (London: Church Information Office, 1968); *Report of the Anglican-Methodist Unity Commission 1: The Ordinal, 2: The Scheme* (London: SPCK and Epworth Press, 1968); *Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations* (Saffron Waldon, Essex: Talbot Press, 1968); *Who's Who at Lambeth '68* (London: Church Missions Publ. Co., Hartford and Church Information Office, 1968).

² Of the twenty-five consultants, there were three Americans: P. B. Anderson, John Macquarrie, and Peter Day.

³ The seventy-five official observers came from twenty-four Christian Churches. The Roman Catholic Church had seven official observers and two alternate official observers. There were also three Roman Catholics among the special guest observers. Thus there were twelve Roman Catholic observers at Lambeth. Among the official observers was Bishop J. G. M. Willebrands, the Secretary for the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. The World Council of Churches delegation was headed by the Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake and included Dr. Nikos Nissiotis, Steven Mackie, and the Rev. Dr. Lukas

full, active participants in Lambeth '68. The Tenth Lambeth Conference was a precedent-breaking ecumenical endeavor in which members of the wider family of Christendom helped one Christian Church discuss problems common to them all.⁴

It is the purpose of this brief study to sketch the context in which this dialogue took place, to highlight the concerns of the Tenth Lambeth Conference, to discuss some of the theological issues that faced the Conference, and to offer in an ecumenical spirit some reflections towards a theological appraisal of Lambeth '68.

THE NATURE OF A LAMBETH CONFERENCE

A Lambeth Conference is not a council of the Church. The Resolutions of the Lambeth Conferences have no binding force for the member churches of the Anglican Communion. Yet the Resolutions are significant expressions of the opinion of the Anglican episcopate. Archbishop Howard Clark, Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada, described the nature of a Lambeth Conference in his opening address to his fellow bishops:

I must confess that at first I was inclined to look at the Second Vatican Council and to hope that we might adopt some of its procedures. But eventually I was forced to see how different are these two bodies. A Council can legislate; a Lambeth Conference cannot. The Second Vatican Council met from 1962 to 1965; this Lambeth Conference meets for one brief month.

As a result, a Lambeth Conference at its best sends forth a fresh, spontaneous response to the problems facing the Church and the world at that time. Its words are not the Church's final decrees, but messages from the pilgrim Church sent out as she journeys.⁵

Though the Anglican episcopate numbers among its members very many accomplished theologians, the Lambeth Conference does not meet to study academic theological issues. Archbishop Clark touched on this point also:

Vischer. The Rev. Dr. Ernest Payne represented the Baptist World Alliance, and another World Council of Churches President, the Rev. Dr. Russell Chandran, was an official observer from the Church of South India.

⁴ This sentiment was voiced by the Rev. Dr. Ernest Payne speaking on behalf of the official observers to express their gratitude to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lambeth Conference in the last plenary session of the Conference, Saturday morning, August 24, 1968.

⁵ Archbishop H. H. Clark, address entitled "Renewal and Judgment," pp. 2-3.

The last word has not yet been said on the theological questions of our day. The pattern of the Church of tomorrow cannot yet be discerned, even by the prophet. If we remember our pastoral responsibility, we shall not attempt to settle questions which cannot yet be settled. What we can do is to suggest Christian attitudes which will help the Christian to move with surer but humbler steps through the ambiguities of our time.⁶

In order to inform the Anglican Communion of the positions taken by the Anglican episcopate, the Tenth Lambeth Conference issued a Message from Lambeth and a set of finely-worked Section Reports and Resolutions. Only the Message and the Resolutions represent the mind of the entire Conference. The Section Reports have the approval only of those bishops who were members of the Sections issuing them. All these documents were composed during the Conference. They were not schemata or position papers written prior to the assembling of the Conference and then adopted by the bishops during their month-long meeting. Archbishop Clark explained the reason for this:

It should be sufficient if we use what time we have to say honestly and wisely the things that we can and must say together.

This may help to explain the apparently unplanned procedure that our Section will follow. As a matter of fact, there has been a great deal of advance thought about this programme. Both in England and in Canada, there were meetings of Consultants, and Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, and Secretaries of the different Subcommittees. At these meetings it became clear that few were prepared to argue that we should prepare beforehand position papers or statements for presentation to the Lambeth Conference for its approval. There were two reasons for this judgment.

The first is that all our preparations were unavoidably western. We could get bishops together in England and in North America, but we could not manage it in Australia, Asia, or Africa. We were aware of the dangers in this. The report of one of the English preparatory meetings states: "The danger of undue western emphasis was reiterated; Jesus was incarnate for *us men*; not western, or even Christian, men." So we decided to wait until all our bishops, from all over the world, were together, before beginning to work on whatever reports or resolutions seem necessary.

The second reason for this decision is the nature of the Conference.⁷

THE CONTEXT OF LAMBETH '68

Since the documents of the Tenth Lambeth Conference were written only during the Conference itself, a knowledge of the chronology and

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3. ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

procedure of the Conference may be helpful to understand the nature of these "messages from the pilgrim Church."⁸ This knowledge would provide a safeguard against a hasty and perhaps harsh judgment which would center on the limitations of the documents without fairly presenting the circumstances in which they were composed.

During the Lambeth Conference the bishops were not exclusively engaged in drafting documents. As a glance at the calendar printed for the Conference indicates, the bishops were committed to an extensive program of prayer, communal liturgical worship, and social gatherings. Part of the pastoral program for the bishops included preaching in the London area. From Saturday, August 17, to Monday, August 19, the bishops dispersed throughout the British Isles and Ireland to help in the liturgical celebration of "Missionary Weekend." The result of all this activity was that the bishops spent thirteen full days in morning and afternoon sessions, and seven half days either in morning or afternoon sessions, discussing and composing the documents that were finally issued. This is not to say that the documents were composed in haste, but one cannot deny that they were written under considerable pressure.

Time, however, was not the only factor bringing pressure to bear on the bishops at Lambeth. The structure and procedure of the Conference also contributed their share.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was Chairman and President of the Conference. The Right Reverend Ralph Dean, Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion, was Episcopal Secretary of the Lambeth Conference and ex officio a member of the Steering Committee, whose other members were Archbishop Simms of Dublin and Bishops Stopford of London, Mortimer of Exeter, Eley of Gibraltar, and Bayne, the Vice-President of the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church in the United States. Under the Steering Committee were the Section Officers. Archbishop Clark, the Primate of Canada, was Chairman of the Section on the Renewal of the Church in Faith. He was assisted by Bishop Ian Ramsey of Durham and Archbishop Simon of Wales. This first Section was divided into fourteen committees, six of which discussed the language of faith, four the experience of faith, and four the faith and secular society.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Archbishop Coggan of York was Chairman of the Section on the Renewal of the Church in Ministry. His Section Officers were Archbishop Beecher of East Africa and the Right Reverend Laurence Brown, the Bishop of Warrington. This Section was divided into nine committees, of which three were concerned with the ministry of the laity, four with forms of the ordained ministry of deacon and priest, and two with the episcopate.

The Chairman of the third Section, which dealt with the Renewal of the Church in Unity, was the Metropolitan of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, the Most Reverend Lakdasa de Mel. His Section Officers were Bishop Allison of Winchester and Archbishop Woods of Melbourne. The third Section was comprised of ten committees. Three committees addressed themselves to the pattern of unity, four dealt with church-unity schemes and relations with other Churches, and three concerned themselves with the wider episcopal fellowship.

Prior to the convening of the Conference, each bishop had indicated in preferential order three committees on which he would care to serve. Several months in advance of the opening of the Conference, each bishop was assigned to one committee and informed of the particular topic he would study with his fellow bishops on the committee level. The Sections and committees were structured as follows:

SECTION I: THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH IN FAITH

(a) The Language of Faith

1. The nature of theological language
2. The debate about God
3. The finality of Christ
4. Dialogue with other faiths
5. The varieties of unbelief
6. Confessing the faith today

(b) The Experience of Faith

7. The psychology of faith
8. Faith and society
9. Spirituality and faith
10. Faith and culture

(c) The Faith and Secular Society

11. Christian appraisal of the secular society
12. International morality today
13. The technological society
14. Urbanisation and the metropolis

SECTION II: THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH IN MINISTRY

- (a) The Ministry of the Laity
 - 15. Laymen in mission
 - 16. Laymen in society
 - 17. Laymen in ministry
- (b) Forms of Ordained Ministry
 - 18. The priesthood
 - 19. Voluntary and part-time ministries
 - 20. The diaconate
 - 21. Women and the priesthood
- (c) The Episcopate
 - 22. The nature of the Anglican episcopate
 - 23. The papacy and the episcopate—see III(b)
 - 24. Oversight and discipline

SECTION III: THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH IN UNITY

- (a) The Pattern of Unity
 - 25. Christian unity and human unity
 - 26. Principles of union
 - 27. Intercommunion in a divided Church
- (b) A Review of Schemes
 - 28. Current schemes
 - 29. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church
 - 23. Transferred from II(c)—see above
 - 30. Relations with the Eastern Orthodox Church
- (c) The Wider Episcopal Fellowship
 - 31a. Inter-Anglican structures
 - 31b. The role of the Anglican Communion in the families of Christendom
 - 32. The positive idea of a wider Episcopal fellowship

The Conference documents were produced by an elaborate procedure. Each committee was asked to submit an 800-word written report of its thought on the topic it had studied. This report was then submitted to a Section meeting, criticized, and voted on as acceptable by the Section. The committee reports were then edited to form a preliminary Section Report, from which the editors drew up Resolutions. From Tuesday, July 30, until Thursday, August 1, the committees met and drafted their reports. On Friday, August 2, the three Sections met separately to criticize and vote on their committee reports. The bishops met in plenary session on Monday and Tuesday, August 5 and 6, to debate resolutions presented from matter not on the agenda. This open debate was extended to Wednesday, August 7, and the Conference fell

behind schedule. Wednesday, August 7, until Friday, August 9, and including the morning of Monday, August 12, the Section Reports were debated by the bishops in plenary session. The afternoon of August 12, committee meetings resumed. The Section Officers, responding to criticism of their editorial efforts and especially their having appended Resolutions to the committee reports, combined several committees in an attempt to avoid overlapping reports and thus remove the need for drastic editorial revision. The combining of the committees had the added advantage of improving communication, at least within a Section.

The combined committees met from the afternoon of Monday, August 12, until lunch on Wednesday, August 14. All the committees of Section II, on Ministry, met on Thursday, August 15, and submitted their committee reports, which were debated, amended, and voted on so as to carry the approval of the whole Section. The Resolutions, which this time the committees themselves had framed, were voted on to be presented to the whole Conference for debate during the final week of the meeting. Section III, on Unity, followed the same procedure, but its work extended into Friday, August 16. Section I, on Faith, attempted this procedure, but in the early afternoon of Friday, August 16, after interminable debate on stylistic changes, those bishops who still remained at the Section meeting voted to ask an official of the SPCK to redraft the committee reports into a single coherent Section Report.⁹

Plenary sessions resumed on Tuesday, August 20. The debate again concerned matters not on the agenda. Wednesday, August 21, Resolutions from Section III were brought before the bishops, who engaged in a prolonged debate on the principles of Church union and intercommunion. The debate centered on the Anglican-Methodist Unity Scheme. This debate concluded Thursday morning and the Conference then moved on to discuss the Resolutions from Section II, on Ministry. Friday, August 23, Resolutions from Section I, on Faith, were debated. Saturday, August 24, the remaining Resolutions of Section III were dealt with and the Steering Committee presented its Message from Lambeth, which was read to the Conference by Bishop Stopford

⁹ Dr. Noel Davey.

of London. The bishops approved the Message and after debate agreed that it be issued in the name of the Conference.

This procedure seems also to have contributed to the pressure which many bishops felt permeated their deliberations. The basic working unit of the Conference was the committee. Yet the committees met for a total of only five and a half days. The Sections met for a total of three days. Many bishops doubted whether these Section meetings actually accomplished anything, and in the case of Section I, on Faith, they were not at all successful. Of the ten days of plenary sessions, which had their measure of parliamentary maneuvers and on-the-spot Resolutions and amendments, only six and a half days were partially spent debating matters which were properly the topic of the Conference. Three and a half days were exclusively devoted to matters not on the agenda. Thus the Conference actually spent at most twelve days in viable and productive groups discussing the theme of the Conference, on which more than three years of preparatory work had been spent.

Religious and political events outside the Conference also exerted pressure on the bishops. The Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches had concluded at Uppsala only five days before the Tenth Lambeth Conference opened in London. Many of the Officers of the Lambeth Conference, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, many observers, and several consultants had been present at Uppsala.¹⁰ The issues raised at Uppsala exerted a strong influence on the outlook of the Lambeth Conference, and the Lambeth documents quote Uppsala several times.¹¹ The publication of the Encyclical *Humanae vitae* and the intensity of the emotional wave that swept England and the United States in its wake caused the bishops to spend a day and a half in plenary session debating what form their expression of pastoral responsibility should take in a situation of this nature. The Resolution which the bishops finally adopted on the afternoon of Tuesday, August 6, is as follows:

This Conference has taken note of the Papal Encyclical Letter "Humanae Vitae" recently issued by His Holiness Pope Paul VI. The Conference records its

¹⁰ Archbishop de Mel, who was at Uppsala, pleaded with the bishops on Monday morning, July 29, to be brief in debate and spare this Conference what he termed "Uppsalalia."

¹¹ The Uppsala statements that are explicitly endorsed by Lambeth are quoted further on in this article.

appreciation of the Pope's deep concern for the institution of marriage and the integrity of marriage life.

Nevertheless, the Conference finds itself unable to agree with the Pope's conclusion that all methods of conception control other than abstinence from sexual intercourse or its confinement to the periods of infecundity are contrary to the "order established by God." It reaffirms the findings of the Lambeth Conference of 1958 contained in resolutions 112, 113, and 115 which are as follows:—

"112. The Conference records its profound conviction that the idea of the human family is rooted in the Godhead and that consequently all problems of sex relations, the procreation of children, and the organization of family life must be related, consciously and directly, to the creative, redemptive and sanctifying power of God."

"113. The Conference affirms that marriage is a vocation to holiness, through which men and women may share in the love and creative purpose of God. The sins of self-indulgence and sensuality, born of selfishness and a refusal to accept marriage as a divine vocation, destroy its true nature and depth and the right fullness and balance of the relationship between men and women. Christians need always to remember that sexual love is not an end in itself nor a means to self-gratification, and that self-discipline and restraint are essential conditions of the responsible freedom of marriage and family planning."

"115. The Conference believes that the responsibility for deciding upon the number and frequency of children has been laid by God upon the consciences of parents everywhere: that this planning, in such ways as are mutually acceptable to husband and wife in Christian conscience, is a right and important factor in Christian family life and should be the result of positive choice before God. Such responsible parenthood, built on obedience to all the duties of marriage, requires a wise stewardship of the resources and abilities of the family as well as a thoughtful consideration of the varying population needs and problems of society and the claims of future generations."

The Conference commends the report of Committee 5 of the Lambeth Conference 1958 "The Family in Contemporary Society" to the attention of all men of good will for further study in the light of continuing sociological and scientific developments of the past decade.¹²

Political events such as the Sudan question, the civil war in Nigeria, and the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia inspired Resolutions and comment from the bishops.¹³ The Sudan question was an issue on

¹² Redraft of the Resolution first moved by Bishop Edmund K. Sherrill of Central Brazil.

¹³ No resolution on Czechoslovakia was passed by the Conference, despite the eloquent plea for one by Bishop Crittenden of Erie. There were, however, two special services held by the bishops to pray for the people of Czechoslovakia, world peace, and justice among nations.

which many non-African bishops were completely uninformed. The bishops listened with sympathetic interest and unanimously adopted the following Resolution:

THAT the Conference wishes to place on record its gratitude to God for the faith and courage of the Christians of the Southern Sudan during the past years of testing of the Church.

We send to them and to the many thousands of their fellow-Sudanese the assurance that in their suffering and the loss of homes and schools, hospitals and churches they are not forgotten in our prayers.

We rejoice to know of the tireless efforts of the Sudanese clergy, evangelists, teachers and other church workers in their task of proclaiming the Gospel of reconciliation, both in the refugee areas and in the heart of the countryside.

The Conference prays Almighty God to lead the Sudan Government speedily to find a just and lasting solution to the "Southern Problem," which for over twelve years has been the cause of grievous suffering to the peoples of the South, and has sadly arrested the progress of the whole Republic.¹⁴

In a special plenary session on the morning of Friday, August 16, the Archbishop of West Africa, the Most Reverend Cecil John Patterson, read a statement which both the Nigerian and Biafran bishops had composed, and the Conference then proceeded to debate a Resolution proposed by Bishop Sansbury, the Assistant Bishop of London. The Resolution was passed unanimously.

STATEMENT

The Bishops of the Province of West Africa desire to give thanks to Almighty God for the prayers, the sympathy and the work for reconciliation which have supported us and have enabled us to endure these fourteen months of civil war. We are especially grateful to His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, for his message sent to us when war broke out, for his initiative in the visits of fraternal delegations to the churches on both sides and for his persistent work for peace. We were heartened by the joint appeal for Peace made in March by the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches calling for "an immediate cessation of armed hostilities and for the establishment of a lasting peace by honourable negotiation in the highest African tradition." We are grateful to the Commonwealth Secretariat and to the Organisation of African Unity for the efforts they have made and are continuing to make to bring the two sides together. We also desire to record our deep gratitude to the Voluntary Agencies and to our fellow-Christians in all parts of the world who have contributed by their generous gifts, their prayers and their concern to alleviate the sufferings of our war-saddened peoples.

¹⁴ Resolution moved by Bishop Oliver C. Allison of the Sudan and seconded by Bishop Wani of Northern Uganda.

Yet the war still goes on. We are deeply grieved and feel bound to acknowledge in penitence our ineffective witness to the compassion and mercy and reconciling love of Christ. In our failure we seek the sympathetic aid of the Lambeth Conference as follows:—

(1) to call, in the words of the Resolution of the Uppsala World Council Meeting, for “all governments to work effectively towards peace and reconciliation, and to refrain from any action which would prolong the conflict in the area”;

(2) to call on the government of both sides in the war to look with pity on those who are sick and starving and to give every facility to the organisations which are *undertaking to bring them food and medical supplies*,

(3) to consider offering, in co-operation with other churches, a further delegation to visit the leaders on both sides to promote the work of reconciliation so powerfully put before us in the Archbishop of East Africa's sermon.

Finally, we state our belief that the conflict can be resolved positively in a creative way only when each side is prepared to abandon exclusive positions and to seek to reach agreement on how to secure the vital interests of the peoples of both sides.¹⁵

RESOLUTION

The Conference receives the Statement from the Bishops of the Province of West Africa with deep thankfulness for the Christian spirit of compassion and reconciliation that informs it. We have been deeply distressed by the prolonged conflict which has divided the peoples of Nigeria and of the former Eastern Region, and which has brought, even in the days in which we have been meeting, death through starvation and disease to so many innocent men, women and children.

With the West African Bishops, we call, in the words of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches held recently at Uppsala, for “all governments to work effectively towards peace and reconciliation, and to refrain from any action which would prolong the conflict in the area.”

We welcome any agreement between the belligerent parties to provide channels for the supply of food, medicine and clothing to those in need. We call on governments to engage in a massive inter-governmental relief operation on both sides of the conflict, and we commend to our fellow-Christians the work of the Division of Inter-Church Aid, Refugee and World Service of the World Council of Churches and of other voluntary agencies in meeting immediate and longer-term needs.

We assure our fellow-Christians on both sides of the conflict of our continuing fellowship with them in the Gospel. We shall continue to uphold them in our prayers and support them in all ways open to us, as in Christ's name they minister to the suffering and work for reconciliation and peace among all their people.¹⁶

¹⁵ Statement from the Bishops of the Province of West Africa distributed Friday, August 16.

¹⁶ Resolution moved by Bishop Sansbury, Assistant Bishop of London, and seconded by Bishop Roger Wilson of Chichester.

These issues, as well as the nuclear-armaments question,¹⁷ war,¹⁸ world poverty,¹⁹ racial injustice,²⁰ and the unequal distribution of wealth among the nations,²¹ occupied hours of debate. The bishops were very concerned that Lambeth '68 speak meaningfully on issues relevant to the present day. The concern for relevance was a recurring theme in the bishops' private conversations and public addresses. This concern for relevance was not initiated only after the Conference had convened. In the first set of preparatory literature mailed out months before the Conference opened, the Archbishop of Canterbury had written concerning it:

What could be more important in this day and age than the theme of the conference, "The Renewal of the Church in Faith, Ministry and Unity"? The Christian faith is being challenged on all sides, but it will be in no defensive spirit that the bishops will tackle the problems of how to expound the Christian faith in ways that are relevant, both in language and thought, to our day, and of how to show the sovereignty of God in every part of human life.

The matter of ministry is also of great importance, for we are learning that ministry in some form or another is laid upon every Christian person, and certainly is not to be restricted to what we call the ordained ministry. So the bishops will consider not only the work of the ordained ministry but how laymen and women can find the place appropriate to them in the Church's service of God and the human race.

¹⁷ The particular concern of Bishop Greer of Manchester, England. Delivering what was perhaps the finest speech of the entire Conference, Bishop Tyndall of Derry and Raphoe defended the position that the use of nuclear and bacteriological weapons is unconditionally wrong.

¹⁸ The Conference did not adopt the absolute pacifist position advocated by Bishop Sadiq of Nagpur and struck down the proposal of Bishop Mize of Damaraland to have the Anglican Consultative Council re-examine the doctrine of the just war.

¹⁹ After hearing eleven bishops on the proposed commitment of "up to 2%" of the bishops' income from stipends to start Diocesan Hunger Funds, the Conference referred this Resolution of Bishop Luxton of Huron to the Steering Committee for redrafting. No further action was taken on it by the Conference.

²⁰ Resolution on racism endorsing a resolution passed at Uppsala and proposed to the Lambeth Conference by Bishop Roger Wilson of Chichester. The Resolution was passed in the plenary session of Friday, August 23.

²¹ One Resolution originated with committee 13 and was proposed by Bishop Vaughan of British Honduras and seconded by Bishop Usher-Wilson, the Assistant Bishop of Guilford, and Bishop Crittenden of Erie. A second Resolution originated from committee 25 and was proposed by Bishop Buchanan of Clogher. Eighteen bishops spoke on this Resolution in the plenary session of Tuesday, August 6. The two Resolutions were combined and presented as a joint Resolution from committees 13 and 25 on August 24 and passed by the Conference.

Although the Lambeth Conference is for Anglican bishops, it cannot be inward-looking, and questions of unity with other parts of Christendom will be prominent and urgent.

It is my hope that when the conference speaks of Faith it will be fearless, when it speaks of Ministry it will be bold, and when it speaks of Unity it will be imaginative.²²

In these short paragraphs Archbishop Ramsey anticipated another major concern of the Conference: the ministry of the laity and the role of women in ministry. The role of women in ministry became one of the most-talked-about topics of the Conference. It received considerable emphasis in the opening address of Archbishop Coggan of York:

2. If the order of deacon needs clarifying, how much more does the order of deaconess! The preparatory commission on the ministry of women for the Lambeth Conference of 1920 was of the opinion that the ordination of a deaconess confers on her holy orders; but this is not stated in the Conference Resolutions. The special committee of the 1930 Lambeth Conference did not regard the deaconess and deacon as equivalent in order and affirmed that the deaconess order was *sui generis*. It cannot be said that the Church of England has given a very good lead here, for Archbishops' Commission on the Ministry of Women (1935) referred to the Order of Deaconess as "a Holy Order," but the 1939-41 Convocation resolutions on deaconesses made no mention of "Holy Order" at all. We surely must get this straight. And is there not every reason to state plainly that a deaconess shall be allowed to fulfill the functions which a deacon at present is entitled to do, including preaching at the Eucharist and administering the chalice?

3. This leads to the other matter of which I briefly wrote in *Pan-Anglican*, the ministry of women. I do not know to what extent what I am about to say is true of other parts of our communion, but here in England we are suffering desperately because of our timidity and disastrous ambivalence of attitude. We are losing our most able women and losing them in great numbers from the recognized spheres of service in the Church; our women's colleges are closing and the numbers of those coming forward are reduced to a trickle. The social services are the richer—very much the richer—for our folly; but that is small excuse for our failure to grasp the nettle. Too long have we restricted the ministry of women to women and children; too long have we hesitated clearly to define the office and scope of women's ministry; too long have we allowed women of ability and experience to be inferior in status, in general estimation, and in security of tenure of office, to the raw curate who comes to his parish straight from college; too long have we grudgingly allowed her to inch her way into the ministry of the Church instead of welcoming her with gratitude for the gifts and insights which only a woman can bring. I believe that, so long as these things continue, the work of the Church will be crippled. It is time

²² *Lambeth '68*, p. 2.

for penitence, for clear thinking and plain speaking, so that the able women of the Church may know where they stand, what is the mind of the Church on their function, and what provision is made for their employment and security of tenure. Lambeth 1958 saw real advance in thinking on family planning, and spoke out plainly, giving a lead which has been greatly welcomed in the ensuing decade. Let Lambeth 1968 act and speak equally courageously in the matter of the ministry of women. Let us think hard and speak clearly on the question of women and the priesthood (the specific task of Subcommittee 21); but let us not get bogged down in it, for the matter is far wider and more far-reaching even than this. And one further parting shot before I leave this subject: is it not strange that, in an age which, as I believe rightly, is producing ecumenical theological colleges, so very little is being done in training men and women *together* for the ministry of Christ's Church?²³

The most pervasive concern for the bishops at Lambeth '68 was the search for the proper ecumenical role that the Anglican Communion ought to fulfil. In his sermon during the service at Canterbury on July 25 which formally opened the Conference, Archbishop Ramsey, when speaking of Christian unity, clearly expressed this attitude which he shared with his brother bishops:

Unity. Here Christendom is feeling the first tremors of a shaking which would have seemed incredible a few years back. What has been shaken? Much of the old complacency, much of the old contentment with our divided condition, much of the sheer ignorance of one another in theology and in practice, and above all much of the selfconsciousness which gave absurdity to the dealings of Christians with Christians. But the shaking has gone deeper still. Christendom has begun to learn that unity comes not by combining this Church with that Church much as they are now, but by the radical altering of Churches in reformation and renewal. It is here that the Vatican Council has had influence far beyond the boundaries of the Roman Catholic Church. We are all stirred to ask God to show us what are things rightly shaken and the things not shaken which must remain.

As Anglicans we ask ourselves: "Quo tendimus?" This Lambeth Conference faces big questions about our relations with one another as a world-wide Anglican family and about our role within a Christendom which is being called to unity in the truth. Can we do better than take to heart and apply to our task the counsel which Pope Gregory gave to St. Augustine: "non pro locis res, sed loca pro bonis rebus," "not things for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things." We shall love our own Anglican family not as something ultimate but because in it and through it we and others have our place in the one Church of Christ. The former is a lovely special loyalty; the latter is the Church against which our Lord predicted that the gates of death would not prevail. Now, as the work of unity advances, there will come into existence United Churches not descriptably Anglican

²³ Printed address of the Archbishop of York (no title) pp. 4-5.

but in communion with us and sharing with us what we hold to be the unshaken essence of Catholicity. What then of the future boundaries of our Anglican Communion? We shall face that question without fear, without anxiety, because of our faith in the things which are not shaken. Perhaps the Anglican role in Christendom may come to be less like a separate encampment and more like a colour in the spectrum of a rainbow, a colour bright and unselfconscious.²⁴

The practical urgency which underlay this widespread ecumenical concern was explained by Archbishop Leonard Beecher of East Africa during his sermon at the Sung Eucharist which was held at Westminster Abbey on Sunday, July 28, for bishops attending the Lambeth Conference:

An enquiry into the mission and ministry of the Church in Eastern Africa has just been completed. Part of the enquiry included interviews with civic and governmental leaders, who were asked to indicate the role which they saw for the Church in the new independent nations of Eastern Africa. A great majority of the men in public affairs in Eastern Africa today, as the research worker records, are "keenly interested in the Church." Many of them received their primary and secondary education in schools sponsored by the Church. Their answers were clear and emphatic: neither an Erastian relationship between Church and State nor its opposite was envisaged. They want to see, the research worker continues, the Church as a company of God's ministering people go on to fulfill a strategic role in the new Africa of today. A senior official is quoted as saying:

"The nation should call upon the Church to reconcile her own interdenominational disputes first of all, and then take up her God-given role as reconciler. He said that the Church will not be regarded seriously as 'the children of God' within society until they have taken seriously their task as peacemakers. People do not really begin to love others until they have first been loved. And it is up to those who have received, and been changed by, the undeserved love of God to start offering that love to others. In every place where hate now exists the Church should set about her reconciling business, he said."

Today the doctrine of reconciliation will be meaningful to the heart and mind of Africa only when the Church has ceased to be a divine society behind closed doors, and when its members have become a serving, reconciling agency in God's world.²⁵

The next day, during the first plenary session of the Conference, Archbishop de Mel pointedly reminded the bishops once more of the urgency of practical action to express their ecumenical concern:

²⁴*Lambeth Conference Opening Service, July 25, 1968: Sermon Preached at Canterbury Cathedral*, pp. 6-7. His Grace took as his text Heb 12:27-29.

²⁵*The Church's "Embassage of Reconciliation" to the Secular World*, pp. 4-5. The Archbishop's text was taken from 2 Cor 5:18-20.

In the new atmosphere of ecumenical charity, and freed from the fear of unfriendly comment, the opportunity has come for much more openness, for closer sharing of hopes and fears, for wider intercession, and, under God, the taking of calculated risks. The Holy Spirit is speaking to the Churches in a time of deep stress. Christianity takes history seriously, and God working within the Church is also able to teach us through his divine activity in the extra-ecclesiastical world. We march forward under the Holy Spirit towards unity firstly because it is the will of our Lord. Yet we must also read the signs of the times through which he speaks to the Church. A distracted world cannot be adequately served by a divided Church. We face in modern life the grievous paradox of the nations being drawn together by swift and efficient communications, yet growing in mutual suspicion, of growing into one world and yet being divided into the world of the rich and the world of the poor. The United Nations bids all races work in unity, yet horrible manifestations of narrow nationalism suddenly erupt. In a world crying out for reconciliation the Church must be reconciled in her own members before she can be the true servant of all men in the name of God. Our task is an urgent one as we go into the anxious questionings of negotiating committees from many parts of the world who come to us for sympathy and advice.²⁶

The Preamble to the Section Report on the Renewal of the Church in Faith provides a good summary description of the context in which the bishops met at Lambeth and the concerns they brought to the Conference:

What has the Church to say, in this time of turmoil and upheaval? What does the Church's faith, deeply rooted in history and tradition, enable it to affirm in an age when all that it stands for is being challenged, and its long-established beliefs are being widely rejected?

Many today regard the Church as a static institution, backward-looking, concerned chiefly with its own survival. Yet history has shown that faith is not static, but is constantly renewed as God reveals himself in the changing pattern of man's experience. It is this renewal in faith that the Church needs today.

To say that the Church needs renewal is to say that it must show itself to be a fellowship of the Holy Spirit, the giver of all newness of life and truth. The Church always needs a renewed awareness of the gospel, the good news of God's love and grace in Jesus Christ; a deeper awareness of the deposit of the faith once delivered to the saints; a fresh awareness of the things that cannot be shaken. Without renewal, Christian theology and Christian institutions become as dry bones; with the renewal of the Spirit they become the lively expression of a transforming vision.

We recognize, however, that recent theological discussion, while it has been liberating to some, has been thought by others to be destructive of faith. While

²⁶ Archbishop Lakdasa de Mel, address entitled "Church Union," p. 4.

we have become increasingly aware that God has not left himself without witness in other faiths, this has been to raise fresh questions about the finality of Christ. Again, there are features in contemporary society, especially in the West, which some would see as heralding the age of the common man, others as soul-destroying. The question that has haunted us throughout our discussions has been how the renewal, which must always characterize the Church, will be experienced and expressed in a situation so variegated and complex.

What we have tried to do in the various committees, whose all too brief discussions lie behind this report, has been to allow Christian thinking, and proposals for Christian action, to take shape around the world's questions and the world's needs. We believe that it is in this way that God will renew the Church in faith; that involvement and contemplation will fulfil each other in a deeper spirituality.

Circumstances did not allow us the time we have wished to consider or amend a number of drafts, or to gain unanimous approval for every phrase. But we are hoping that this Section report taken as a whole may succeed in portraying an attitude and an approach that combine Christian assurance with a bold exploration of theology and society, that unite Christian confidence and intellectual and social risk. These are characteristics that belong to the pilgrim and the pioneer, and we believe that it is as pilgrims and pioneers that we shall show ourselves members of a Church renewed in faith.²⁷

REFLECTIONS ON THE THEOLOGICAL ISSUES

In the Section on Faith the issues which were treated by committees 11, 12, 13, and 14 were embodied in Resolutions that caused spirited debate in the plenary sessions. These Resolutions dealt with war and peace,²⁸ called for study of the responsible and irresponsible use of power²⁹ and of violent and nonviolent political and social change.³⁰ Speaking on this latter Resolution, Bishop Reed of Ottawa urged the Church to develop an adequate theology of revolution.³¹ Two Resolutions were explicit endorsements of positions adopted by the Fourth

²⁷ This article is written from the original documents of Lambeth '68. The Section Reports appeared in two forms. For the first set of plenary sessions (August 5-12), the Section Reports were printed on long galleys. For the final set of plenary sessions (August 20-24), the Section Reports were printed on short galleys. All references to Section Reports in this article are to the short galleys unless otherwise explicitly noted. The references to the Section Reports will be SR, and the Sections will be indicated by Roman numerals: I (on Faith), II (on Ministry), III (on Unity). The pertinent reference for this quotation is SR I, 1-2.

²⁸ Joint Resolution from committees 2, 7, and 11, and Resolution from committee 12.

²⁹ Joint Resolution 7 from committees 2, 7, and 11.

³⁰ Joint Resolution from committees 1, 3, and 8.

³¹ Speech on Friday, August 23.

Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala. The first was the Resolution on racism:

This Conference commends the following statement of the World Council of Churches meeting at Uppsala:—

“Racism is a blatant denial of the Christian faith. (1) It denies the effectiveness of the reconciling work of Jesus Christ, through whose love all human diversities lose their divisive significance; (2) it denies our common humanity in creation and our belief that all men are made in God’s image; (3) it falsely asserts that we find our significance in terms of racial identity rather than in Jesus Christ.”

We acknowledge in penitence that our Churches have failed to accept the cost of corporate witness to their unity in Christ. We call upon them to re-examine their life and structures in order to give expression to the demands of the Gospel: (i) by the inclusiveness of their worship; (ii) by the creation of a climate of acceptance in their common life; (iii) by their justice in placing and appointment.

Further we call upon the Churches to press upon Governments and communities their duty to promote fundamental human rights and freedoms among all their peoples.³²

The second Uppsala Resolution which Lambeth adopted dealt with the economic and social frustration of developing countries:

THAT this Lambeth Conference welcomes the deep concern about the economic and social frustration of developing countries expressed by the World Council of Churches at its recent Assembly in Uppsala. To produce decisive and wise action in this serious situation it recommends to the Provinces of the Anglican Communion:—

1. the careful study of the issues of development including the new economic and political structures which it demands; and effective dissemination of knowledge about the issues to the Churches, and the public.

2. that the efforts of the United Nations agencies to bring about world economic justice receive the active support and prayers of all the Churches.

3. that they endorse the appeal of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala that the Churches should do their utmost to influence the governments of industrialized countries

- (a) to increase annually the percentage of Gross National Product officially transferred as financial resources, exclusive of private investment, to developing countries, with the minimum net amount of 1 per cent to be reached by 1971;

- (b) to conclude agreements stabilizing and supporting at an acceptable level the prices of vulnerable primary products and providing preferential access to developed markets for the manufactured products of developing countries.

4. that they should urge their members to support more actively existing funds

³² Cf. n. 20 above. This Resolution and the following point up the concern of the Conference for a horizontal mission of reconciliation for the Church.

and particularly the Division of Inter-Church Aid, Refugee and World Service to help meet some of the present emergencies in world poverty and hunger.³³

Another group of Resolutions of a different cast endorsed dialogue with other faiths,³⁴ Marxists, and those of no religious belief,³⁵ and "encouraged Christians to increasing co-operation with men of other faiths in the fields of economic, social and moral action."³⁶ The Church was urged "increasingly to call on the skills of full-time professionals in such fields as social work, community organisation, mass media . . . and increasingly work for social goals which really benefit human beings, e.g., in housing, education, health, and adequate wages."³⁷ The Conference also approved that "the normal pattern of missionary structure of the Church be that of ecumenical action and that every use be made of consultants from social sciences and related fields."³⁸ To meet this changing situation, the Conference "urged Dioceses to provide continuing training for the clergy after ordination."³⁹

If the horizontal "outreach" of the faith received considerable emphasis, its vertical dimension was not neglected. On the afternoon of Tuesday, August 6, after an excellent exposition of the ideals of the religious life by Archbishop Strong of Brisbane, the Conference voted unanimously in favor of the following Resolution:

That this Conference recognises with gratitude the contribution of the Religious Communities, both of men and women, to the life of the Church, and values their witness to the absolute character of the claims of God on the life of man, to the fruitfulness of a life given to prayer and service, and to the unity of the Church across the divisions which at present exist. It calls upon the Communities to take their part in the present renewal of the Church, in particular by seeking to renew themselves according to the priorities of the Gospel, and the original intention of their foundation. It recommends that in all provinces where Communities exist, close co-operation between the Bishops and the Communities should be maintained and developed.⁴⁰

³³ Cf. n. 21 above.

³⁴ Joint Resolution on Christianity and other faiths from committees 4, 9, and 10.

³⁵ Joint Resolution on religious dialogue from committees 4, 9, and 10.

³⁶ Joint Resolution on Christianity and other faiths from committees 4, 9, and 10, paragraph b.

³⁷ Joint Resolutions 3 and 4 from committees 5, 13, and 14.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Resolution 2.

³⁹ Joint Resolution 3 from committees 2, 7, and 11.

⁴⁰ Resolution moved by Archbishop Strong of Brisbane and seconded by Bishop Rutt of Taejon, Korea.

That same afternoon the bishops sent back for redrafting by committee 9 a Resolution on prayer after seven speakers had urged that the Conference clearly underscore the vertical dimension of the faith.⁴¹ The redrafted Resolution was passed unanimously on the afternoon of August 23:

RESOLUTION ON PRAYER

The primary task of the Church is to glorify God by leading all mankind into life in Christ and this always involves a continuous advance in the practice of prayer in the Spirit. The Bishops attending this Conference therefore call upon the clergy and laity of the whole Anglican Communion to join with them in their determination in humble and penitent dependence upon God, to deepen and strengthen their life of prayer, remembering always that Our Lord's periods of withdrawal for prayer were a prelude and preparation for His further service in the world that the Father might be glorified.

To this end the Church should search to discover those forms of spirituality and methods of prayer, both corporate and personal, which meet the needs of men and women today, such as those expressed by Abbé Michel Quoist in his book called "Prayers of Life." The Church should pay more attention to the development of that capacity for silent prayer which exists in all her members and should encourage corporate and personal waiting upon God.⁴²

The Conference saw that the vertical dimension of faith not only provided motivation for active Christian witness in the world but constituted a norm by which contemporary society was to be judged:

The Conference, having considered and welcomed (a) the increasing extent of human knowledge, (b) the prospect of human control of the natural environment, (c) the searching enquiries of theologians, calls the Church to a faith in the living God which is adventurous, expectant, calm and confident, and to faith in the standards of Christ, who was, and is, and is to come, as the criterion of what is to be welcomed and what is to be resisted in contemporary society.⁴³

Though the norm proposed by the Conference, "faith in the standards of Christ," may appear to be too abstract to be immediately helpful, the bishops were not unaware of this difficulty. They saw that the norm they proposed had to be situated in a theological context. In the

⁴¹ Resolution from committee 9 moved by Bishop William Chadwick of Barking and seconded by Bishop Hoskyns-Abrahall of Lancaster, England.

⁴² Joint Resolution on prayer from committees 4, 9, and 10, with amendment of the phrases "to glorify God by leading" and "that the Father might be glorified" proposed by Bishop Leonard of Willesden.

⁴³ Joint Resolution 2 from committees 2, 7, and 11.

Section Report when dealing with the theme of man's stewardship of the material world, the bishops admitted that "a theology of creation needs to be worked out which sees Christ, the agent of all creation, as inaugurating a cosmic redemption."⁴⁴

Thus the bishops did not hesitate to indicate to theologians areas where they felt more theological research was needed. The bishops also considered it part of their pastoral concern to comment on the current theological debate about God:

THE "DEBATE ABOUT GOD"

In the West the theological scene is characterized above all by the "Debate about God." This debate is a lively discussion regarding the assertions that can be made with confidence about God, man, and the world. Its context is one of theological bewilderment set against the background of the challenge, the successes, and the despairs of secular civilization. Among its many causes are certain trends in current biblical and theological schools of thought, which are themselves related to the swing from traditional metaphysics to existentialism. Other causes are man's confidence in his sole ability to be master of his environment, and a widespread conclusion that belief in God on the part of Christians does not make any distinctive difference to the way in which they behave.

We recall that beneficial reformulations of the Christian faith have often arisen out of conflicts, and we are confident that out of this present travail new understandings of the Christian faith will similarly be born. We also remember that the Church and Christian tradition cannot truly be themselves if they are static. The response to the historic Christ was from the first made by men living within a particular historical environment. This must always be so. The Christian responds to Christ in the light of the changing world and the experience of his own day. If, when the world changes, the Church does not reorientate itself, it fails for want of fresh insights. It cannot communicate plainly. It loses impact. For us, who live in times of great change, such thoughts as these are liberating and point to paths of renewal in Christian vitality and relevance.

We find grounds for hope and encouragement in this "Debate about God":

(a) Since God is its subject, it is a basic debate, having a seriousness and hence possibilities for good far beyond those of more familiar debates about Church institutions.

(b) The Debate has helped many to recognize that faith is not merely assent to propositions but also demands commitment, and calls for action.

(c) The Debate has reminded us that our understanding of truth is always incomplete and that our ideas of God may be "dated" or inappropriate. New exploration can in the end be fortifying and enriching.

There are indeed some aspects of the Debate which furnish grounds for pastoral concern. The impression is sometimes given that the whole basis of Christianity is

⁴⁴ SR I, 13.

undermined. A disproportionate reaction against customary and valued spiritual practices is not uncommon. As a result, Christians, loyal to their upbringing but not themselves able to reconstruct their belief, are bewildered and feel unsupported. Again, the Debate often leads to over-confident assertions on very complex and debatable moral issues. Mass communication, while it has the great merit of popularizing this Debate, tends to overemphasize unbalanced and extreme viewpoints, making the most of startling and easily misunderstood phrases. With all this in mind we believe that there is need for far more mutual understanding and support between those engaged in academic and those engaged in pastoral ministries.

In the ferment of the Debate we find inspiration for renewed faith, arising especially from the fresh concentration of our attention on God's activity in the world, on the transforming power of Christian hope, and on the richness of God's relation to man. We believe that:

(a) Within the upheaval that has shaken the theological scene, the purposeful activity of God is manifest, encouraging us to see in new situations the response for which they call.

(b) What is revealed in Jesus Christ is not simply man's true understanding of himself but also God's purpose for human history and for the whole creation. In Christ this purpose is made evident and its fulfilment guaranteed. Man's mastery of nature does not carry with it the assurance of his future. Our confidence is in God.

(c) To consider God's relation to man without reference to the divine transcendence is, as we have said earlier, to miss one whole dimension of that relationship. Properly interpreted, the doctrine of the Trinity addresses itself precisely to the false division between experience of God as transcendent and experience of God as immanent.⁴⁵

The sensitive awareness of the bishops to the task of the theologian was displayed once more in the discussion on the question of subscription and assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. The bishops clearly understood the historical conditioning of theological statements and well described their own Anglican, nondogmatic theological tradition in the Section Report on the Renewal of the Church in Faith.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES AND THE ANGLICAN TRADITION

In the matter of the Thirty-nine Articles we accept the main conclusion reached by the Commission set up by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, whose report entitled *Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles* (1968) advocates neither casting the Articles aside nor revising them, but rather prefers to acknowledge their place in the historical context of a continuous, developing Anglican tradition. That report, whose further study we recommend, recognizes that the

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

inheritance of faith which characterizes the Anglican Communion is an authority of a multiple kind and that, to the different elements which occur in the different strands of this inheritance, different Anglicans attribute different levels of authority. From this foundation arises Anglican tolerance, comprehensiveness, and ordered liberty, though admittedly it makes Anglican theology variegated rather than monolithic, and informal rather than systematically deductive.

This inheritance of faith is uniquely shown forth in the holy Scriptures and proclaimed in the Catholic Creeds set in their context of baptismal profession, patristic reasoning, and conciliar decision. These the Anglican Communion shares with other Churches throughout the world. In the sixteenth century the Church of England was led to bear a witness of her own to Christian truth, particularly in her historic formularies—the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal, as well as in her Homilies. Together, these constitute a second strand in the Anglican tradition. In succeeding years the Anglican Communion has continued and broadened this responsible witness to Christian truth through her preaching and worship, the writings of her scholars and teachers, the lives of her saints and confessors, and the utterances of her councils. In this third strand, as in the Preface to the Prayer Book of 1549, can be discerned the authority given within the Anglican tradition to reason, not least as exercised in historical and philosophical inquiry, as well as an acknowledgement of the claims of pastoral care. To such a threefold inheritance of faith belongs a concept of authority which refuses to insulate itself against the testing of history and the free action of reason. It seeks to be a credible authority and therefore is concerned to secure satisfactory historical support and to have its credentials in a shape which corresponds to the requirements of reason.

Here is the full range of the Anglican inheritance and it is in this inheritance that the Articles must be set if they are to be given their true status and significance. So, wherever the Articles are printed they should never stand alone but always be set within their proper context.

Secondly, when the Articles are mentioned or implied in any affirmation of faith required as a preliminary to ordination, or on other occasions, they should always be set in their historical context, and assent and subscription should be regarded as an expression of a determination to be loyal to our multiple inheritance of faith. Through this inheritance there emerges an authority to which a man, in giving assent, professes his Christian allegiance with reasonableness and a good conscience.⁴⁶

In the text treating of the Thirty-nine Articles the bishops referred to "a continuous, developing Anglican tradition." At Lambeth considerable development of the Anglican tradition was achieved. This was especially accomplished in the Section that dealt with the Renewal of the Church in Ministry.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 20–21.

No previous Lambeth Conference had ever sought to clarify what ministry is. Surprisingly, no Lambeth Conference had ever reflected on the nature of the episcopate.⁴⁷ Lambeth had said little on the ministry of the laity.⁴⁸ Though other Lambeth Conferences had discussed the question of deaconesses with a lack of consistency and an ambiguity bordering on contradiction, no theological understanding of the order of deacon had ever been clearly expressed by a Lambeth Conference.⁴⁹ The only previous Lambeth Conference that had concerned itself about the priesthood had met in 1908, but the bishops of the Conference confined their remarks to an appeal to Christian parents not to "hold back their sons from seeking Holy Orders because the worldly prospects of that sacred profession are bad."⁵⁰ That same Lambeth Conference went on to call for a "larger view of this matter of ministry. The Church needs to realize in new ways the inherent priesthood of the Christian people."⁵¹

Lambeth '68 did attempt "a larger view of this matter of ministry." The attempt was partially successful. For the first time at a Lambeth Conference the bishops addressed themselves to the fundamental theological questions of the nature of ministry, priesthood, and episcopate. Unfortunately, two subsidiary theological issues, the ordination of women and the role of a suffragan bishop in the government of the Church of England, preoccupied the bishops' attention to such an extent that no theological clarification of the order of deacon was achieved.

The opening paragraphs of the Section Report on the Renewal of the Church in Ministry sketch out a first draft in answer to the question, what is ministry? The paragraphs are deliberately biblical in language, and ministry is not defined but described functionally. Moreover, the theological context implied in this description is as important as the description itself. Ministry is to be understood in a theological framework that is open to the vertical dimension of faith and that is thoroughly Christic and sacramental.

⁴⁷ *Preparatory Information*, p. 114. ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 105-6.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-14, and cf. the Archbishop of York's opening address of July 29, pp. 4-5. The diaconate is referred to as "a lay Holy Order" in SR II, 13. Both Bishops Reed of Ottawa and Maguire of Montreal pointed out to the Conference that this terminology is misleading, despite the attempt to explain the usage of it that immediately follows the phrase in the Section Report. It was not clear from the debate how the Section Report will be rephrased.

⁵⁰ *Preparatory Information*, p. 107. ⁵¹ *Ibid.*

This is God's world. The whole people of God exists as the Church for God and for the world, not for the sake of the Church. This is the essence of the Church's ministry. The heart of the gospel is that in Christ there is a new creation. By his death and resurrection he has broken the power of sin and death and set loose in the world unlimited powers of renewal. To be a Christian is to accept with Jesus the way of self-emptying in order to share with him the powers of this new age. Thus all ministry is sacred ministry, whether it manifests itself within the ordered life of the Church or through its service of compassion and reconciliation in the world.

Alike in confirmation and at the ordering of deacons, priests, and bishops, the gift of the Holy Spirit is invoked for the work of ministry to which the whole Body of Christ is called.

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who . . . took upon him the form of a servant . . . humbled himself, and became obedient unto death." As Christ's followers walk this lowly way, they will find authority for their ministry, and gain a sensitivity to the Holy Spirit's promptings which will issue in a life fashioned after the pattern of the Lord himself.

In order that it may be what it is called to be, the Church is equipped by Christ with leaders, beginning with the apostles whom he chose from among the first disciples. The pattern of this leadership is given by Christ himself. They are to be servants of their brethren, carrying about the dying of the Lord Jesus in order that the life of Jesus may be seen in them. By their ministry they are to equip the whole Church for ministry, so that the whole Church, in all its lay members serving the world in their daily work, may become an effective sign and instrument of God's purpose to renew his whole creation.

We must see within the context of this total ministry of Christ the varied ministries of lay men and women, of deacons and priests, and of the episcopate which is called to lead the Church in its fulfilment of Christ's universal commission, as servants of the servant Lord and servants of men for his sake.⁵²

In the plenary session on Thursday, August 23, the Conference passed the following Resolution:

THAT the Lambeth Conference commends the study of the report upon Priesthood as an Anglican contribution towards an understanding of the nature of priesthood in the present ecumenical situation.⁵³

Thus the Report on Priesthood, which was the work of committee 18, was given a special status by the Conference. The chief architect of this remarkable document, which was one of the major achievements of the Tenth Lambeth Conference, was the noted theologian Bishop Edward Knapp-Fischer, who for fourteen years was Principal of Cuddesdon and is presently the Bishop of Pretoria, South Africa.

⁵² SR II, 1. ⁵³ Resolution from committee 18.

PRIESTHOOD

Man

Man is a unity of body and spirit, sharing the sacramental nature of the universe of which he is part. He is made to have dominion over the created order, and to use it according to God's will and to his glory. God speaks to men through the events of history and seeks their co-operation with this purpose through their active involvement in the world's affairs. The offering of themselves and the world's resources to God is their priestly responsibility. Men's sin is to refuse this responsible obedience by using God's world for their own ends.

Christ

In Christ God declares himself and his purposes. Christ represents God to men and men before God, and he restores their relationship with God and with one another. In his glad acceptance of human life and of suffering and death upon the Cross Christ offers his perfect obedience to the Father on behalf of mankind, and so he perfectly fulfils the priestly vocation of all men.

The Priesthood of the Church

All Christians are committed to sharing the sacrificial life and death of Christ in his ministry of revelation and reconciliation (Rom 6:3,4). *All* Christians share in the priesthood of their Lord. This is the primary order of ministry in the Church to which *all* Christians are consecrated by baptism, and which in union with Christ they fulfil by offering the diversity of their lives, abilities, and work to God.

The Ordained Ministry

In order that all the members of the Church may grow up into the fullness of this priesthood, Christ calls and empowers some to be priests of the priestly people. Although those called must be recognized by the Church as its representatives, it is by ordination that they are set apart by God for their special ministry. It is through a bishop, the representative of Christ and of the universal Church and a symbol of its unity, that a priest receives God's commission and grace and a share in the apostolic ministry. The characteristic function delegated by the bishop to a priest is that of presiding at the Eucharist in which all Christians, intimately united with the crucified and risen Lord and with one another, are offered anew to God. In the Eucharist the whole life of the Church and the world is gathered and expressed. Here, above all, we worship, we give thanks, and we intercede; here God's word is proclaimed and his reconciling love is imparted; here the Church is united, built up, and renewed for its mission to the world. In presiding at the Eucharist a priest is seen as an agent of Christ, of the Church, and of the bishop; for a priest as well as a bishop is a focus and symbol of the unity in Christ of all his people. This unity of bishops, priests and people is obscured unless the relationship between them is seen to be a continuing reality.

Vocation

God calls to the ordained ministry people of various gifts in a variety of ways, and their ministry must be exercised in a wide variety of circumstances. Some, for example, are called to a *parochial ministry*, some to a *ministry of scholarship or teaching*, some to *community life*. Others may fulfil their ministry in the context of professional, business, or industrial life. But whatever the circumstances priesthood always involves pastoral responsibility within a particular community.

Vocation to God's service in the ordained ministry is never the concern of an individual alone. It is also that of the Church which he is to serve and of the bishop who bears the responsibility of ordaining him. The variety of people whom God calls to the ministry must be matched by diversity in methods of training them, in which their different needs and circumstances must be carefully taken into account. Many of those engaged in training men for the ministry today are showing courage and vision in their readiness to experiment with new methods. Any period of training is also essentially a time when vocation is tested. Called by God to serve a world in turmoil, priests must be helped in their training both before and after ordination to that faithfulness in prayer and study which is the indispensable foundation of their ministry.

The Work of a Priest

Ministry means *service*. A priest is called to be the servant of God and of God's people, to be conformed to the life of Christ who took upon himself the form of a servant. As *priest* he serves by faithful obedience in prayer and worship. As *pastor* he serves in gladly accepting the discipline imposed upon his time, his energy, and compassion. He serves by being a sign to the whole Church of its priesthood, and by helping it through its members to grow in its fullness. As *prophet* he serves in proclaiming God's word, not only in preaching but in pronouncing God's judgement on sin and his mercy in forgiveness, and in equipping and renewing God's people for mission. Only as a priest remains close to Christ and all his members by daily persevering in personal prayer and by taking his proper part in the Church's worship can he grow in his ministry of service to God and man. A priest, himself a *sinner*, is set apart by Christ in ordination to minister to Christians living within the tension between nature and grace—a tension which he shares—in order that he and they may be transformed into Christ's likeness. It is immaterial whether in his office he be described as priest or presbyter provided that it is recognized that his ministry is both ordained by Christ himself and acknowledged by God's people.

Today there are many doubts and much perplexity about the meaning and demands of a ministry which calls for sanctity, lifelong commitment, and constant renewal. Its sure foundation is the calling and abiding faithfulness of God, and it is in this assurance that every priest can find fulfilment and joy. As he perseveres faithfully in his vocation he will discover that "the work which he has undertaken and the skills which he acquires, far from being a superficial layer on top of his

'real personality,' become wholly integrated with himself. If a man becomes a priestly man, he can never cease to be what he is."⁶⁴

The treatment of the episcopate develops both the servant theme of the opening Section on Ministry and completes the Eucharistic and Christic themes of the Report on Priesthood. The bishop ever remains deacon and priest, and although he exercises authority, this authority is not to be understood by an analogy drawn from civil society. His authority is rooted in the risen Christ and is to be exercised according to the pattern of Christ in the collegial reality of the Church.

THE EPISCOPATE

Its Nature

The bishop is called to lead the Church in the fulfilment of Christ's universal commission. Christ requires those who exercise leadership in the Church to be servants of all. Our way of exercising the office of bishop has often obscured this truth. What we do, and the way we do it, should remind people of Jesus the servant. This is true of all ministry in the Church; it should be especially true of a bishop.

The service of the bishop has its centre in the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church, in his celebration of the Eucharist and in ordination and confirmation. It is developed in his work of teaching and safeguarding the faith and in his general care for the up-building and equipping of the Church. It is concerned with deepening and broadening ecumenical relationships and reaches out in service, witness, and prophetic word to the life of the human community as a whole.

Christ who is the Servant is also Lord. The bishop is called to exercise an authority which is rooted in the authority of the risen Christ. This authority has to be exercised according to the pattern that he gave (John 13). St. Paul, when he speaks of his authority as an apostle, speaks especially of his share in the suffering and humiliation of Christ. The bishop has to lead his people in their obedience to Christ, leading them and taking them with him. As a teacher he must try to evoke the creative thinking of his people. As an administrator he must call out and train their varied gifts so that the Church may move forward together in its varied mission.

The Commission of Christ is given to the whole Church. The bishop is therefore to exercise his ministry in fellowship with others. In his own diocese he must guide, teach, and serve in an ordered fellowship with his clergy and laity. He can fulfil this role as focus of authority in his diocese only because his ministry is exercised in partnership with his brother bishops and with the regional and universal Church.

In determining the size and structure of a diocese two factors have to be borne in mind. The first is that the Church must minister relevantly to men in their

⁶⁴ SR II, 8-10. The committee report ends with a quote from Leslie Houlden, "Priesthood," *Preparatory Essays*, p. 264.

secular community. The second is that the Church must be a family in which bishop and people can know and love each other. It may be that some dioceses will of necessity be too large for one bishop alone to be an effective father in God to all his people. In such cases he will share his responsibility with a coadjutor, suffragan, or assistant bishop. Such a colleague should exercise all episcopal functions and have an equal place in the Councils of the Church.

Training

While the servant character of the episcopate fulfils and brings into unity the significance of diaconate and priesthood in the life of a bishop, there are certain specific responsibilities which come to him by virtue of his consecration. In common with others called to positions of leadership, bishops should have opportunities of undertaking a course of training for their office. Where such training cannot be provided within a regional Church, it is to be hoped that the Anglican Consultative Council will make the necessary provision for bishops from a wider area.

Discipline

The bishop has a special part to play in the necessary discipline to be exercised by the Church in the name of Christ. Authority to exercise this discipline is recognized as the bishop himself clearly submits to it. The bishop will try to ensure that parents understand and accept their responsibilities in the baptism of their children and that the sanctity of Christian marriage is upheld. Special problems presented by such matters as polygamy and the growth of sects will require bishops to consult with each other in their provinces and as far as possible to establish a discipline that is widely understood and accepted. True discipline is for the welfare of individuals and communities and is to be exercised in love for their recalling, restoring, and renewing.

Oversight

A bishop will best minister oversight and discipline as he himself is disciplined by daily prayer and study of the Scriptures. His devotions will include intercession, thanksgiving, and searching self-examination with repentance. A diocese tends to reflect a bishop's own spiritual life and outlook, and he, for his part, is deeply dependent on the prayers and support of his people.

His disciplined use of time will involve and be conditioned by (a) pastoral oversight and administration of the diocesan family; (b) service to the whole community, including those of other faiths, within the area of his diocese and beyond; (c) care of his own family and household; (d) strict limitation of the number of engagements and responsibilities which he undertakes, with a readiness to delegate to others so that he may have unhurried time for individuals; (e) his own reading, recreation, and rest.

Simplicity in life, humility in manner, and joy in serving should be the marks of a bishop's life.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

The collegial reality of the Church, as the bishops at Lambeth were seeking to express it, called for a clear statement of the role of the laity in the Church. The bishops unanimously passed a Resolution which described this role: "That no major issue in the life of the Church should be decided without the full participation of the laity in discussion and in decision."⁵⁶ This very broad Resolution must be understood in the context of the Section Report to prevent a false impression of the meaning of the Resolution and ultimately of the collegial nature of the Church:

We are aware that the vital role of the laity which we have tried to describe is not fully reflected in the structure of our Church. This report itself lacks many insights it would have had if laymen had shared more fully in its writing. There are still many places—at parish, diocesan, and provincial levels, in the choice of parish clergy and bishops—where the laity do not share in decision-making. We commend Resolution (1) to all concerned with all the earnestness we can command.⁵⁷

The most sharply debated Resolution of the Conference dealt with deaconesses.⁵⁸ After amendment, the Resolution around which the debate flared stated "that those made deaconesses by laying on of hands with appropriate prayers be declared within the diaconate."⁵⁹ The Resolution passed with 221 affirmative votes, 183 negative votes, and 19 abstentions. Once the Resolution passed, 125 bishops voted not to put the Resolution into practice. Though the heated discussion of the Resolution was quite long, the phrase "within the diaconate" was never defined, and from the debate it was not clear if the bishops considered the diaconate to be a holy order. The debate reflected the theological ambiguity of the order of deacon in previous Lambeth Conferences, an ambiguity which Archbishop Coggan of York had asked the bishops specifically to dispel.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, Lambeth '68 did not clarify this situation.

⁵⁶ Joint Resolution 1 from committees 15, 16, and 17. ⁵⁷ SR II, 7.

⁵⁸ This was true even of the initial plenary sessions. Cf. *Memorandum for [sic] the Bishop of Chester*. This document, written by Bishop Ellison of Chester, England, is a commentary on the debate of August 8. This document, together with the mimeographed notes of Bishop Brown of Warrington entitled *Section II "In Ministry" First Draft Report*, p. 5, clearly indicates the clash over the issue.

⁵⁹ Resolution 4 from committee 20.

⁶⁰ Archbishop of York's opening address, pp. 4-5.

This issue was closely related to the ordination of women to the priesthood. The initial Section Report to the plenary sessions in early August contained a clear Resolution on this subject: "That this Conference approves the ordination of women to the priesthood and asks national and regional Churches or provinces to consider making appropriate provision within their own spheres."⁶² The Resolutions that finally passed called for careful study of the question.⁶³ The Section Report pinpointed the issue this way: ". . . Are we to conclude that it nevertheless inheres in the very nature of the gospel that women are intrinsically incapable of receiving ordination to the priesthood?"⁶⁴ The bishops wisely followed on this issue Archbishop Clark's advice to the Conference in his address during the first plenary session on Monday, July 29: "The last word has not been said on the theological questions of our day. The pattern of the Church of tomorrow cannot yet be discerned, even by the prophet. If we remember our pastoral responsibility, we shall not attempt to settle questions which cannot yet be settled."⁶⁵

Section III, on Unity, dealt with questions that were immediate and urgent. The ecumenical commitment of the Anglican Communion, Church unity schemes, ongoing interchurch dialogue simply could not be postponed. The Conference recommended that Christians should do together everything which conscience does not compel them to do separately. Thus the Conference recommended a review of Church structures to see where they may foster this co-operation and encouraged responsible experiment in ecumenical work. The Conference gave primacy to local ecumenical action and endorsed the hope expressed at Uppsala that "members of the World Council of Churches, committed to each other, should work for the time when a genuinely universal council may once more speak for all Christians."⁶⁶

The Conference recommended a policy on admission to Communion which included in clearly defined circumstances the practice of reciprocal intercommunion.⁶⁷

⁶¹ Cf. n. 49 above. ⁶² SR II (long galleys), Galley 2, lines 191-94.

⁶³ Resolutions 1-5 from committee 21. ⁶⁴ SR II, 15.

⁶⁵ Archbishop H. H. Clark, "Renewal and Judgment," p. 3.

⁶⁶ Resolution 1a-c from committee 26. Resolution 1a quotes the Lund Conference on Faith and Order.

⁶⁷ The terminology here employed is that found in *Intercommunion Today, Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion*, nos. 21-22.

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

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

The Conference recommends that where there is agreement between an Anglican Church and some other Church or Churches to seek unity in a way which includes agreement on apostolic faith and order, and where that agreement has found expression, whether in a covenant to unite or in some other appropriate form, a Church of the Anglican Communion should be free to allow reciprocal acts of intercommunion under the general direction of the bishop.⁶⁸

A re-examination of the relation with the Church of South India with a view to its full communion with the member Churches of the Anglican Communion, and the same status for the Churches of North India and Pakistan and the Church of Lanka, was recommended.⁶⁹

The bishops also passed the following Resolution:

The Conference welcomes the proposals for Anglican-Methodist Unity in Great Britain and believes that the proposed Service of Reconciliation is theologically adequate to achieve its declared intentions of reconciling the two Churches and integrating their ministries.⁷⁰

Treating matters of interchurch dialogue, the Conference passed unanimously four Resolutions which concern Anglican-Roman Catholic relations:

The Conference welcomes the proposals made in the Report of the Section on the Renewal of the Church in Unity which concern Anglican relations with the Roman Catholic Church.

The Conference recommends the setting up of a Permanent Joint Commission, for which the Anglican delegation should be chosen by the Lambeth Consultative Body (or its successor) and be representative of the Anglican Communion as a whole.

⁶⁸ Resolutions 3-5 from committee 27.

⁶⁹ Resolution 6b from committee 27, and resolutions 7 and 8 from committee 28.

⁷⁰ Resolution 9 from committee 28.

In view of the urgent pastoral questions raised in the case of mixed marriages the Conference welcomes the work of the Joint Commission on the Theology of Marriage and its application to Mixed Marriages, and urges its speedy continuance.

The Conference recommends that the principle of collegiality should be a guiding principle in the growth of the relationships between the Provinces of the Anglican Communion and those Churches with which we are, or shall be, in full communion.⁷¹

In the first Resolution the Conference welcomes the Section Report proposals which deal with Anglican-Roman Catholic relations. The task of the Permanent Joint Commission is more clearly detailed in the Section Report and is worth giving in full:

We recommend the setting up of a Permanent Joint Commission, our delegation to be chosen by the Lambeth Consultative Body or its successor and to be representative of the Anglican Communion as a whole. This commission or its sub-commissions should consider the question of intercommunion in the context of a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry, and should also consider in the light of the new biblical scholarship the orders of both Churches and the theology of ministry which forms part of the theology of the Church and can only be considered as such. The hope for the future lies in a fresh and broader approach to the understanding of apostolic succession and of the priestly office. On this line we look for a new joint appraisal of church orders.

Conversations between Anglicans and Roman Catholics should be conducted with due regard to the multiplicity of conversations also in progress with other Churches. In them all we propose to hold fast the principles of Catholic truth as we have been given to understand them, though we realize that, in renewed obedience to the Holy Spirit, we must at all times be willing to go forward adventurously.

Reports of Anglican-Roman Catholic conversations in the several provinces should be made available to members of the Permanent Joint Commission, and information on all these matters circulated by it throughout our Communion.⁷²

The fourth Resolution, concerning collegiality, to be properly understood needs to be put into its context in the Section Report, for it casts further light on the nature of the episcopate as it is currently understood in the Anglican Communion:

The Anglican tradition has always regarded *episcopacy* as an essential part of its Catholic inheritance. We would regard it as an extension of the apostolic office and function both in time and space, and, moreover, we regard the transmission of apostolic power and responsibility as an activity of the college of bishops and never as a result of isolated action by any individual bishop.

⁷¹ Resolutions 10-13 from committee 29. ⁷² SR III, 17-18.

In the discharge of his episcopal responsibility, the bishop is the guardian of the faith, the father of his people, and the driving force of mission in his area.

Traditionally the bishop is father in God to the clergy and laity of a territorial diocese, and part of his vocation is to represent his diocese within the councils of the wider Church.

While we have no wish to diminish the importance of this traditional pattern, the demands of a new age suggest the wisdom of also consecrating bishops without territorial jurisdiction but with pastoral responsibility, directly or indirectly, for special groups such as the armed forces, industry, and particular areas of concern within the mission of the Church. This principle would simply be the extension of the widespread current practice of appointing suffragans, auxiliaries, and assistants. We submit that all such bishops, by virtue of their consecration as bishops in the Church of God, should have their due place in episcopal councils throughout the world.

The principle underlying *collegiality* is that the apostolic calling, responsibility, and authority are an inheritance given to the whole body or college of bishops. Every individual bishop has therefore a responsibility both as a member of this college and as the chief pastor in his own diocese. In the latter capacity he exercises direct oversight over the people committed to his charge. In the former he shares with his brother bishops throughout the world a concern for the wellbeing of the whole Church.

Within the college of bishops it is evident that there must be a president. In the Anglican Communion this position is at present held by the occupant of the historic See of Canterbury who enjoys a primacy of honour, not of jurisdiction. This primacy is found to involve, in a particular way, that care for all the Churches which is shared by all the bishops.

The renewed sense of the collegiality of the episcopate is especially important at a time when most schemes for unity are being developed at a national level, because the collegiality of the episcopate helps to stress the worldwide and universal character of the Church. This collegiality must be a guiding principle in the growth of the relationships between the provinces of the Anglican Communion and those Churches with which we are, or shall be, in full communion. Within this larger college of bishops, the primacy would take on a new character which would need to be worked out in consultation with the Churches involved.

As a result of the emphasis placed on collegiality at the Second Vatican Council, the status of bishops in the Roman Catholic Church was in great measure enhanced, though the teaching of the First Vatican Council on the infallibility and immediate and universal jurisdiction of the Pope was unaffected. We are unable to accept this teaching as it is commonly understood today. The relationships between the Pope and the episcopal college, of which he is a member, are however still being clarified, and are subject to development. We recall the statement made in the Lambeth Conference of 1908, and repeated in 1920 and 1930, "that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history

has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition." We recognize the Papacy as an historic reality whose developing role requires deep reflection and joint study by all concerned for the unity of the whole body of Christ.

Although the declaration and guardianship of the faith has traditionally been regarded as belonging fundamentally to the episcopal office, the collegiality of the episcopate must always be seen in the context of the conciliar character of the Church, involving the *consensus fidelium*, in which the episcopate has its place.⁷³

The bishops also passed Resolutions calling for pan-Orthodox and pan-Anglican dialogue⁷⁴ and called for the initiation of Anglican-Lutheran conversations as soon as possible.⁷⁵ Two other Resolutions that won acceptance were also concerned with the area of interchurch dialogue. One called for support of the Anglican Center in Rome,⁷⁶ and the other for strengthening the Anglican presence in Geneva.⁷⁷

Several Resolutions dealt with changes in inter-Anglican structures and the setting up of an Anglican Consultative Council.⁷⁸ Even amidst these practical organizational matters the vertical dimension of the reality of the Church was not neglected. The inter-Anglican Union of Prayer, Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ was commended for the renewed sense of responsibility for one another which it has created within the Anglican Communion.⁷⁹ Yet even when preoccupied with the practical issue of inter-Anglican structures, the Conference was aware of the wider dialogue in which the Anglican Communion as a whole and its member Churches and Provinces ought to engage.

The Conference recommends:

a) that a General Episcopal Consultation (drawn from many countries) be held in the near future, and expresses the hope that the Archbishop of Canterbury will take the initiative in sending invitations in the first instance to those Churches which are in full or partial communion with the See of Canterbury or with other Provinces of the Anglican Communion.

b) that Regional Episcopal Consultations should be held on a wider basis of

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 18-20. ⁷⁴ Resolution 14 from committee 30.

⁷⁵ Resolution 17 from committee 31A.

⁷⁶ Resolution moved by Bishop Moorman of Ripon and seconded by Bishop Hallock of Milwaukee and passed in the plenary session of Tuesday, August 6.

⁷⁷ Resolution 20 from committee 31B.

⁷⁸ Resolutions 18 and 19 from committee 31B, and resolutions 21 and 22 of committee 31A.

⁷⁹ Resolution 23a-b from committee 31A.

representation than that suggested for the General Episcopal Consultation, under such local auspices and arrangements as seem appropriate and helpful in each region.⁸⁰

Thus the bishops have recommended that the Anglican Communion engage in broad dialogue with other Churches. Moreover, the bishop whose service "is concerned with deepening and broadening ecumenical relationships"⁸¹ is to act collegially with his brother bishops. At the same time "no major issue in the life of the Church should be decided without the full participation of the laity in discussion and in decision."⁸² These statements from Lambeth reveal a dynamic vision of the Church in dialogue. But this vision brings with it a theological issue which on reflection may be the theological question that Lambeth '68 is asking the Anglican theological tradition. It is a question that would interest any Christian theologian. Yet the question depends on a set of theological issues that the bishops at Lambeth never debated.

The theological issues underlying the Section Report on the Renewal of the Church in Unity, and the Resolutions coming from committees 26-32, were not the theological issues that were debated by the bishops at Lambeth on Wednesday, August 21, and Thursday morning, August 22, when these documents were reported to the plenary sessions of the Conference held on those dates. In the first part of this article the chronology, procedure, and context of Lambeth '68 were given in detail, for without a knowledge of these factors such a statement would hardly seem credible. Owing to the fact that Section I, on Faith, had not completed the Section Report and Resolutions on schedule, the bishops began the final debate of the Conference on the Resolutions not of Section I, on Faith, but those of Section III, on Unity. Consequently, the Conference was asked to recommend for consideration by the Provinces of the Anglican Communion certain Church-unity schemes without first having considered the new theological elaboration of the notions of ministry, priesthood, and episcopate which had been the achievement of Section II, on Ministry.

The theological issue which the bishops debated centered on the general topic of full communion, which involves the mutual recognition of ministers. The debate was conducted within a theological framework

⁸⁰ Resolution 24a-b from committee 31A. ⁸¹ SR II, 16.

⁸² Joint Resolution 1 from committees 15, 16, and 17.

that was to be greatly deepened the very next day, Thursday, August 22, when the Conference debated the material prepared by Section II, on Ministry, approved its Resolutions, and especially commended the Report of committee 18 on Priesthood.

Had the Conference commenced with either the material from Section I or Section II, the debate on full communion with the English Methodists perhaps would never have occurred, or at least it would have been placed in a theological context that would not have centered on the rather narrow theological understanding of the adequacy of the proposed Service of Reconciliation to achieve its declared intention of reconciling the Church of England and the Methodist Church and integrating their ministries. Treating this question prior to and in isolation from the broader theological understanding represented in the documents of Section II, on Ministry, caused a debate on the application of theological principles to a specific problem before the widening and deepening of those principles implicit in the work of Section II had been elucidated by debate.

The second issue which the bishops discussed was reciprocal intercommunion, the occasional and reciprocal sharing in the Eucharist by members of Churches which are seeking, but have not yet achieved, full communion or organic union. The Archbishop of Canterbury strongly supported this practice, and his authority with the bishops was enough to insure that this practice would be recommended by the bishops to the member Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion. The Archbishop's argument in favor of this practice was, briefly put, that the Eucharist in its eschatological dimension brings about the unity of the Church. This argument taken by itself is not a conclusive theological justification of the practice of reciprocal intercommunion. But the Archbishop, who was thoroughly informed and followed closely the real theological issues of the Conference, offered his argument with full knowledge of the theological context elaborated by Section II, on Ministry.⁸⁸ The Archbishop's argument gains considerable cogency when put into the broader theological understanding of ministry and Eucharist expressed in the work of Section II.

⁸⁸ Much of the same type of theological thinking which underlies the Section Report *Renewal of the Church in Ministry* is to be found in *Intercommunion Today*. Cf. especially nos. 119-20, 66-67.

The theological issue which underlies the Section Report and Resolutions of Section III, and which was never debated by the bishops owing to the procedure which events forced them to follow, is the nature of the Church and its restructuring for dialogue. It seems that the bishops felt that the primary function of the Church was to be an agency of reconciliation on both the vertical and horizontal levels. In Section III, on Unity, the bishops committed themselves to a program to fulfil this mission by dialogue. Thus the fundamental question arises, whether there are sufficient resources in the great Anglican theological tradition to build an Anglican ecclesiology of the Church reconciling by dialogue. What will be the sacramental, liturgical, and structural effects of such an ecclesiology on the wider family of Christendom?

Read with this question in mind and in the context of the whole Conference, the Message from Lambeth passed by the bishops with only one dissenting vote on Saturday, August 24, provides an excellent summary of the concerns of the bishops and the themes they discussed at the Tenth Lambeth Conference:

At the end of our Conference we thank God for the renewal of fellowship and vision which He has given us as we have worked and prayed together.

Our work has been set against the grim background of events in Vietnam, West Africa and Czechoslovakia, and mounting protest against social injustice. It is a world which will no longer accept widespread want and poverty. It is a world in which the accepted institutions and traditional ways of thought are increasingly questioned. Even in the realm of theology the familiar teaching through which ordinary Christians learnt their faith is being re-examined and in part rejected by some theologians.

FAITH

To those bewildered by all this we say—God reigns. He is the creator of all that is: He is at work throughout His creation. God loves. This world—torn and distracted though it is—is His world: God has not abdicated. God speaks. All these human conflicts and these changes are not out of His control and some of them Christians should welcome. God is. We believe in Him and in His Son Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and for ever. And by the example and standards given us by His Son we judge, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, what in this strange world is to be welcomed and what rejected.

The faith of the Church that God reigns and loves and speaks is sustained and renewed through the prayers of her members. Her life is in Christ and her life is vigorous as her members try to live in and with Christ. We call all Christians to fresh efforts to deepen their prayer-life, to search for those forms of prayer which

are most relevant to them in their own situation and to develop that talent for stillness in the presence of God which all possess in some degree. We seek in all things to follow the Lord's example. The Lord withdrew for prayer and took His disciples with Him. From prayer He and they returned to fresh service of and in the world.

MINISTRY

The role of the Church in the world is the role of her Lord—that of the Suffering Servant. To this theme of the Servant Church we found ourselves returning again and again. The impatient protests of young men and women drove home to us that the Church will be renewed only in so far as she pursues that role. We have to confess that all too often we have failed to serve as our Lord served. Consequently to many men and women inside and outside the Church she too often appears as a self-centered or inward-looking sheltered and privileged institution. The test of every penny we spend, of every meeting we attend, and of every service we hold, is whether it makes it easier for the world to see the Church in her role as servant. We call on the bishops and clergy to be vigilant against all temptations to worldliness and to strive to attain to that simplicity of living and detachment from worldly entanglements which is so evident in the life of our Lord.

The ministry, the service, of the Church to the world is and must be discharged mainly by the laity. We have given much thought to the ministry of the laity, what it is, and how it may be strengthened. The ministry of the laity does not consist primarily in service to the Church or service in the Church's worship. It consists primarily in witness through word and deed in the world to the Christian Gospel. The Gospel is a proclamation of God's love for all men and of His will that all men should be one in the family of the children of God. It is, therefore, a Gospel of reconciliation. The ministry of lay people is that they should be agents of reconciliation. In the home, at work, in industrial disputes, in the exercise of economic power whether as employers or employed, in the bitterly divisive issues of race it is for the laity to bring to bear a Christian influence towards social justice, compassion and peace.

In discharging their ministry in the world the laity must be continuously renewed and strengthened by the assembling of themselves together in the House of God, for corporate worship, to hear the word of God and to receive sacramental grace. The first duty of the ordained clergy is to make provision for this. The laity have a right to expect from the clergy help and teaching on how to say their prayers, and encouragement and sympathy when they ask advice on what they should do in their particular situation. They have a right to a proper share in the government of the Church so that any decisions taken may be such as will make the fulfilling of their mission in the world easier and not more difficult, and here the voice of the younger generations with all their vigour, enthusiasm and idealism must be given opportunities of expression.

UNITY

The fulfillment of the ministry of the Church would be a great deal easier if the Church were not divided. Even now, in spite of our divisions, it would be easier if whatever can be done together were done together. We urge, therefore, that more attention be paid to local Councils of Churches, that all efforts to remedy social injustices whether at national or local level should be done ecumenically so that the world may plainly see that what is being done is being done not by this or that Christian denomination but is being done by "the Christians." But even this is a poor substitute for a reunited Church, the one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. Renewal demands unity: unity cannot come without renewal. Much progress towards reunion has been made, for which we thank God. Much more remains to be done, for which we pray God's help and guidance.

Our message is a message of hope. God is active in His world. The changes which bewilder are not all evil, though all challenge us to find the right human response. God is active in His Church renewing her so that she may more clearly proclaim her faith to the world, more effectively discharge her mission of service to the world and may recover that unity for which Our Lord prayed and without which she cannot be truly herself.

It is our belief that God is now renewing His Church. It is for us to recognize the signs of His renewing action and to welcome them and obey them. It is no time for either despair or doubt. Rather it is a time to remember the Lord's saying, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."⁸⁴

⁸⁴ *A Message from the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference to the Clergy and Laity of the Anglican Communion*, mimeographed text printed after the close of the Conference from the manuscript of the Steering Committee read by Bishop Stopford. The bishops did not have a printed text before them when they voted their approval of the Message.