

Wounded in Common Mission, Called to Common Conversion:  
The Spiritual Basis of Communion

Christopher Wells\*

*The Windsor Report quickly gathered authority as a normative text for Anglican ecclesiology because it focused on the catholicity without which claims to Anglican "communion" seem implausible and untenable. In turn, the unfolding "Windsor Process" can be understood as occasioning a renewed Anglican scrutiny of the Church's apostolicity, that is, the original or evangelical basis for covenanted life together. On the latter count especially, Anglicans now have an opportunity to seize more surely a spirituality of communion, founded in the exemplary sacrifice of Christ on the cross and ordered toward visible reconciliation for the sake of mission. Our reflected experience of the ecumenical movement serves as a perpetual school of virtue in this regard, enjoining repentance as a grace of mutually-subjected love that may heal the wounds of division between Anglicans and in the wider body of the Church.*

*Banishing Fear: Scriptural Catholicity as Ecumenical Gift*

Soon after the publication of the Windsor Report in 2004, Archbishop Rowan Williams reflected on the nature and purpose of the Church in what was then, and arguably remains, his most developed ecclesiological essay to date.<sup>1</sup> The occasion of the essay was the centenary of former Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey's birth, and Williams took the opportunity to seize Ramsey's suggestion in *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* that Anglicanism's primary vocation concerns its witness to Christ's Passion, that is, its embrace and imitation of the crucified Word. For dying, we live! (See Matt. 16:24-26.) In this perspective, Ramsey thought, Anglicans might, by virtue of their humility and penitential spirit--making reparations, as it were, for divisions in the body--speed along the visible reunion of the whole Church.

In the present milieu of Anglican discussion and debate, whether in specialist or generalist circles, Ramsey's ascetical language can sound old-fashioned, and may even seem aberrantly gothic if taken the wrong way or over-emphasized. Christian thought about sacrifice is, after all, complicated both by the breadth of Scripture's own wrestling with the matter and by various contemporary exposures (feminist, liberationist, Jewish) of the self-deceiving, other-subjecting pitfalls and paradoxes of power. On both counts, the Church's history may rightly be viewed as a perpetual contest of naming and defining God's people that calls forth apparently exclusive differentiations. And to what end? A more mature, better articulated corporate identity, honed to inspire holiness and virtue among the faithful? Or visible reconciliation, perhaps? No--or at least, not obviously, and rarely visibly. Consider, for instance the unlovely legacy of "inter-Anglican" (beginning at home) divisiveness with respect to the genuine historical, theological, and spiritual puzzle of our possible or probable Protestant past. Even to raise the matter in these latter days evokes sighs of irritation and/or boredom in the minds and hearts of most Anglican scholars, and therefore all the more for non-specialist observers, who also read and pray to the

end of a faithful and flourishing ecclesial life. For what can be gained, people wonder (not without reason), by plunging again into quagmires of hermeneutical undecidability: old books full of old argumentation--so-and-so against the papists in the name of a Calvinistic orthodoxy; someone else in the guise of a moderate rejoinder to the first writer but no less anti-Roman and decidedly anti-Puritan; and a third, passionately against the low-church proclivities of the first two but still virulently anti-papal and smugly dismissive of Lutheran and other alternatives--write in an almost indecipherably antiquated prose that, for all its elegance and pomp, seems to yield the very opposite of "a noble song . . . fashioned for the king," notwithstanding one and another "stirring" in the "heart" of the authors themselves and their parties (Ps. 45:1)? And if we are again to read these old books, must we not ask of each one, in the spirit of the scriptural figure, *which* king (or queen) and kingdom is being proposed or propped up and why should we care, given the plurality of claimants to multiple thrones, in a region exhausted by seemingly endless warfare? How, that is, are we even to begin going about preparing to decide who was or ought to be taken for the lawless pretender and the rightful heir of this truth or that doctrine? And how much more will we be perplexed when we place these matters, as we must, in the context of *the Church*, either visible or invisible, amidst a wider sea of peoples--daughters and sons, princesses and princes (Ps. 45:10-17)?

I raise these problems not to suggest that all historical discernment is relative to the point of meaninglessness. A single citation on the matter of Anglicanism's "Reformed thinking" may suffice as a placeholder in this regard: we have assumed "the governing authority of the Bible," repudiated "the necessity of a central executive authority in the Church's hierarchy," and radically criticized "any theology that sanctions the hope that human activity can contribute to the winning of God's favor."<sup>2</sup> I do mean to suggest, however, that inter- and intra-ecclesial Christian history will inevitably, as a spiritual discipline, surrender the simple conceit of "sides" and facile accountings of rights and wrongs in favor of an even-handed parceling out of, and laying claim to, various prides and betrayals. Thus, we often find that our historians, as a matter of principle and a mark of courage, bear unwelcome memories into conveniently amnesiac courts, like Nathan to David: "You are the man!" (2 Sam. 12:7). But they also live in the midst of rebellious houses, like Ezekiel, who, on pain of obedience, enacted the departure of an exile--digging "through the wall with [his] own hands" and hoisting "the baggage" upon his shoulder "in their sight"--as a sign for both the "prince in Jerusalem and all the house of Israel in it" (Ezek. 12:1-10).

Perhaps especially in the chastened spirit of the latter, Anglicans of a Ramseyian ilk tend not to lay claim to the Protestant mantle, presumably because it conjures up images of "the triumphant march" of protest or proclamation rather than self-abnegating witness (another semantic possibility for the Latin *protestare*).<sup>3</sup> The usefulness of the Protestant moniker for an explicitly ecumenical ecclesiology is also, however, a genuine question. Williams, for instance, writes that the "reformed" tendency of historic Anglicanism "towards a looser form of ministerial order and a stronger emphasis on the sole, unmediated authority of the Bible" could, if "pursued far enough in isolation," lead to a "strict evangelical Protestantism" that is incompatible with the "catholic" and the "cultural and intellectual" streams of our tradition.<sup>4</sup> Likewise, the Windsor Report (WR) may, by virtue of its ethos, stated intentions, and particular conclusions, be located in the tradition of uneasiness with denominationalism, which should affect how we think about the normative ecclesiological freight that WR now bears.<sup>5</sup> It is

noteworthy, for instance, that WR positively appropriates the term “Protestant” just once, when observing in passing that Anglican churches have claimed “to be both Catholic and Protestant.” But a sustained feature of its argument is an emphasis upon Anglican catholicity, not always designated by the lowercase usage, as the just-quoted phrase indicates.<sup>6</sup> In this respect, WR builds on the trajectory of the statement of the 1920 Lambeth Conference that the growth of the Anglican Communion “presents an example on a small scale of the problems which attach to the unity of a universal Church. As the years go on, its ideals must become less Anglican and more Catholic.”<sup>7</sup> And Archbishop Williams rejoined the thought in his “Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today,” addressed to “the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion” following the American General Convention in June 2006. “If we are to continue to be any sort of ‘Catholic’ church,” warned Williams, “if we believe that we are answerable to something more than our immediate environment and its priorities and are held in unity by something more than just the consensus of the moment, we have some very hard work to do to embody this more clearly.”<sup>8</sup>

In all events, it seems uncontroversial to suggest that Anglicans do well to avoid reactionary statements of why they are not “Catholic,” and indeed “Roman Catholic,” the two being intertwined as an historical and phenomenological fact (though no one, including the magisterium, takes them to be coextensive without remainder). On this count, Anglican ecclesiological texts still sometimes fall short--though their flaws may, in each case, be remediable with reference to other passages within the same documents. WR, for instance, cites the Roman Code of Canon Law--quoting Vatican I’s “supreme, full, immediate and universal ordinary power,” attributed to the Bishop of Rome--in order to contrast “the Roman Catholic Church,” its “Pontiff” and “Curia,” and the “Anglican way,” the latter path permitting Scripture “as the locus and means of God’s word” to energize the church for mission and sustain its unity (§70; compare §42). Granted, we still remember, or have heard about, persecutions and difficulties at the hands of various powers, and one in particular, that were once at least fearful. Both truth and charity (Eph. 4:15) demand, however, that we first place the difficult statements of Vatican I in their historical context, and then mark what the Catholic Church has said since, perhaps especially in the intersection of Vatican II’s Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* (1964), and its Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum* (1965).<sup>9</sup> On both counts, WR would have done better to follow the lead of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission’s (ARCIC) *Authority in the Church* (1976), which first noted candidly that the “claim that the pope possesses universal immediate jurisdiction, the limits of which are not clearly specified, is a source of anxiety to Anglicans who fear that the way is thus open to its illegitimate or uncontrolled use.” The statement then continued: “Nevertheless, the First Vatican Council intended that the papal primacy should be exercised only to maintain and never to erode the structures of the local churches. The Roman Catholic church is today seeking to replace the juridical outlook of the nineteenth century by a more pastoral understanding of authority in the Church.”<sup>10</sup>

Another instance of our painting with too broad a brush on these matters may be seen in *One Baptism, One Hope in God’s Call* (2006), the report of the Episcopal Church’s Special Commission on the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion (of which I was a member), which offered a theological response to the incipient “Windsor Process” in advance of the 75<sup>th</sup> General Convention. The introduction of the report quotes the claim of the 1948 Lambeth

Conference that authority in Anglicanism is “dispersed rather than centralized . . . having many elements” in which we recognize “God’s loving provision against the temptations to tyranny and the dangers of unchecked power.”<sup>11</sup> The point is doubtless true enough as a statement of the intended ordering scheme of the Church of England--thence Anglicanism--as one reformed church amidst other Christian churches, called by God at successive points in history to discern a path of faithfulness. The reinvocation of “tyranny and unchecked power” in the report was, however, infelicitous, first, in the absence of a specification of the source of concern: the same enemy as some sixty years prior, or a different one? Hence, second, the original statement’s reference to something presumptively bad--a “centralized” papal office *tout court*--takes on at best the air of a cliché when, again, it is repeated in apparent innocence of the great push and pull about identity, visible order, and boundaries at and after the Second Vatican Council.<sup>12</sup>

The question of the fate of Christ’s body in history thus returns and may be stated in the received terms of the ecumenical movement: What is the proper Christian response to our inherited cartography of inter-ecclesial alienation when we find that it no longer accurately maps the streets and the buildings of the city that we share, the single communion of the baptized? The problem is the same one identified by Paul in his challenge to the Corinthians: their refusal to “wait for one another” (1 Cor. 11:33) in defiance of the Lord’s antecedent claim upon them all together, “in Christ.”<sup>13</sup> The Corinthians were thus guilty of disobedience, the naming of which, Paul hoped, might, by God’s grace, call forth an appropriate penitence, thence reconciliation.

In this tradition, the great ecumenist Abbé Paul Couturier coined in the 1930s the term “spiritual ecumenism” to emphasize the need for common prayer and amends across the divided body of the churches; and after enjoying a broad reception in Faith and Order circles, the term found its way, to the astonishment of many, into the Second Vatican Council’s Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio* (1964), and then into countless ecumenical elaborations of the magisterium. Of these, the most important has been Pope John Paul II’s *Ut Unum Sint* (1995), which emphasized that Vatican II’s interest in “renewal, conversion, and reform” naturally tended toward “repentance” as the antidote for our “exclusions which seriously harm fraternal charity,” “refusals to forgive,” “pride,” “unevangelical insistence on condemning the ‘other side,’” and “disdain born of an unhealthy presumption.”<sup>14</sup> Indeed, we will never adequately address the genuine doctrinal differences that remain between us, the pope insisted, without addressing the concomitant “burden of long-standing misgivings inherited from the past, and of mutual misunderstandings and prejudices,” that are moreover compounded by “complacency, indifference, and insufficient knowledge of one another.” The “commitment to ecumenism” can thus only, in the end,

be based upon the conversion of hearts and upon prayer, which will also lead to the necessary purification of past memories. With the grace of the Holy Spirit, the Lord’s disciples, inspired by love, by the power of the truth, and by a sincere desire for mutual forgiveness and reconciliation, are called to reexamine together their painful past and the hurt which that past regrettably continues to provoke even today. All together, they are invited by the ever fresh power of the gospel to acknowledge with sincere and total objectivity the mistakes made and the contingent factors at work at the origins of their deplorable divisions. What is needed is a calm, clear-sighted and truthful vision of things, a vision enlivened by divine mercy and capable of freeing people’s minds and of inspiring in everyone a renewed willingness, precisely with a view to proclaiming the gospel to the men and women of every people and nation.<sup>15</sup>

In the interest of such a “purification of past memories,” and indeed “a calm, clear-sighted, and truthful vision of things,” Anglicans and Catholics together might dare to speak again of our mutual need for “reform” which “should be met with faith, not fear,” as ARCIC counseled.<sup>16</sup> For instance, while “Anglicans sometimes fear the prospect of over-centralization, Roman Catholics [fear] the prospect of doctrinal incoherence. Faith, banishing fear,” however, “might see simply the prospect of the right balance between a primacy serving the unity and a conciliarity maintaining the just diversity of the *koinonia* of all the churches.”<sup>17</sup>

The last point, to do with the working out of visible communion, has become a commonplace in more particularly Anglican ecclesiological texts. *One Baptism, One Hope*, for instance, demonstrated that WR may be read as a contribution to this task of “right balancing” (in the words of ARCIC), first of all with reference to Anglican affairs; for

the three Instruments of Communion, along with the Archbishop of Canterbury, are “not a substitute for the mutual accountability of the rest of the Church, but . . . rather a means of expressing it, drawing it together, and enabling the whole Church to listen to each member and each member to listen to the whole.” Here, we may speak of “unity-in-diversity”--with confidence, as former Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie said, that all authority will not be “dispersed to the point of dissolution and ineffectiveness.” For the Communion needs, in the end, “appropriately sensitive and fine-tuned systems of decision making which allow both for the full participation of all members and for an eventual way of making difficult decisions which can enhance, rather than endanger, the unity and communion of our richly diverse family.”<sup>18</sup>

Secondly, however, the report of the Special Commission placed the argument in the service of a more comprehensive embrace of Christian affection as such--“the ‘bonds of affection,’ rightly lifted up by WR as a way of expressing our covenant relationship with God and one another” (citing WR §§5, 45-49, 132 and following). Hence, the Report continues with decided conviction:

We believe these bonds bear a peculiar promise as well for our ecumenical partners, with whom we share “the indissoluble link” of Christian mission. Indeed, the connection between unity and mission is intrinsic to WR, and therefore invites a rich understanding of ecumenical accountability. To this end, we welcome the interest in the coherence of Anglican theology and teaching raised repeatedly in ecumenical responses to WR and central to the work of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER) and the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (IATDC). In the same way, we appreciate the commitment of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Mission and Evangelism (IASCOME) to mission and the unity of the Church.<sup>19</sup>

In this spirit of ecumenical welcome, the remainder of the present essay is given to reflection on *communion* as a theological fact that grasps all who are Christian not first of all as a political or structural but a spiritual matter, in Couturier’s sense, that properly subsists in the primitivity of the Church’s scriptural faith. I begin with a tale of ecumenical mission in order to evoke the “grammar of recognizability”<sup>20</sup> that provides the basis for our faith across denominational lines, in this case, Anglican and Roman Catholic lines. This leads me, second, to sketch an argument for the urgency of always thinking of Christian unity when we think of Christian mission. Third, I focus on a fruitful strand in ecumenical literature borne of reflecting on the Church and Scripture in a single sweep: the painful way of the pilgrim people of God as a provision of grace, “until there be realized new heavens and a new earth in which justice

dwells.”<sup>21</sup> Finally, I apply the argument to present Anglican and especially Episcopalian discernments about the shape of communion as a kind of elaboration upon *Called to Common Mission*’s claim that “the Church is sent into the world as sign, instrument, and foretaste of the kingdom of God” and, at the same time, “stands in constant need of reform and renewal.”<sup>22</sup>

### *Terms of Engagement*

In May 2005 I traveled to General Cepeda, Coahuila, Mexico with thirty Roman Catholics on a short-term mission trip of the “Family Missions Company,” friends of mine who have served as lay missionaries in Latin America, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and Asia since 1975, after Frank and Genie Summers experienced a dramatic conversion, sold all that they had, and gave it to the poor.<sup>23</sup>

I was especially struck, first, by the depth of our missionary hosts’ immersion in and affection for the local culture and people as a persistent presence over time, joined to a simple missionary lifestyle. The daily routine evinces an exemplary habit of charity, not only via building projects and almsgiving for the steady stream of needy ones who knock at the door, but also home visits to shut-ins in order to listen, laugh, cry, and pray, with hugs and kisses all around. In this way they have won the respect of many in the town, including the bishop in nearby Saltillo, for they are friends with the poorest of the poor in their midst.

Second, I was struck by the constancy of prayer and evangelization with gusto and thoughtfulness, bathed in Scripture, joined to a warm eucharistic piety. Each day began with an hour of “praise and worship” songs in a charismatic key, scriptural exhortations, and various intercessions and thanksgivings. And at all hours I found members of our group in the small chapel—a quiet, “upper room” at the back of the mission house, with several windows looking out on the surrounding area—reading Scripture, journaling, and kneeling or prostrating themselves before the large, handmade, wooden crucifix and tabernacle below. A highlight was the feast of Corpus Christi at the local parish, followed by exposition and adoration of the Blessed Sacrament and a procession around the neighborhood. We walked singing appropriate folk songs like “Ven a mi dulce pan de la vida” (“Come to me sweet bread of life”), while moving to one and another makeshift altar in the doorway of a *mercado* or along the roadside, festooned with flowers and appropriate prayers or scriptural phrases. We stopped at each one, kneeling to listen to several readings, followed by a prayer.

We also spent three evenings “evangelizing” surrounding *ranchos*, which are small, rural villages without a parish of their own, more or less cut off from a regular pattern of worship and adult formation. On the way there, piled into a van, driving through the desert in early evening, we prayed a rosary for the people we were about to meet, that their hearts would be open to the gospel, and for ourselves, that we would be faithful witnesses. Upon arriving, we rang the bell of the chapel and walked around inviting everyone we met to join us. “We are Catholic missionaries,” we would begin, to distinguish ourselves especially from the Jehovah’s Witnesses who have had great evangelistic success in recent years. (Eighty-five percent of the inhabitants in one *ranchito* that we visited are now Jehovah’s Witnesses.) Those who showed up were attentive, hungry to hear the Word of God that, in most cases, they cannot read. Our common worship

centered around songs set to guitar and good for clapping along to, followed by a scriptural teaching in Spanish, and several translated testimonies from the short-term visitors. We thus heard of the calling of Abram and his faithful response, though he did not know where the Lord was sending him (Gen. 12; see Gal. 3), and Jesus' apocalyptic discourse in Mark 13, ending with the simple instructions to "Keep awake." Several of our company spoke of coming to faith as adults, or of the significance of knowing God's love in the face of Jesus, drawing pertinent connections to the liturgical year (Trinity Sunday!). Finally, those who wished to--in each case, nearly everyone--came to the front to join in small groups of mutual petition, hands of intercessory comfort gently placed on shoulders and heads or extended upward.

### *Unity and Mission*

Reflecting on my trip back at home, my thoughts focused on the peculiar encouragement and hope of Christian friendship, offered without reserve in close quarters. Only through our friendship with one another, it seems, is the power of the gospel incarnated in our lives--in General Cepeda, in South Bend, wherever--as the missionary Church. Acts 2:42-47 may serve as a kind of urtext in this regard, as it describes the devotion of the earliest followers of Jesus

to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. Awe came upon everyone, because many wonders and signs were being done by the apostles. All who believed were together and had all things in common; they would sell their possessions and goods and distribute the proceeds to all, as any had need. Day by day, as they spent much time together in the temple, they broke bread at home and ate their food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having the goodwill of all the people. And day by day the Lord added to their number those who were being saved.<sup>24</sup>

How, and therefore whether, we live together has everything to do with the success we can expect in our preaching. The relationship is causal: life together, rightly ordered, *will* yield "awe" and "wonders and signs," and a swelling of our common ranks, by God's grace.

Would that Acts 2 were simply a description of the Church today. Would that we Christians did live together in love, and that "the world" accordingly "believed" (John 17:21). "By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:35). Commenting on John 17:21-23, John Paul II wrote: "This is a very important missionary text. It makes us understand that we are missionaries above all because of *what we are* as a Church whose innermost life is unity in love, even before we become missionaries *in word or deed*."<sup>25</sup>

Yet we often balk at the sacrifice of ourselves demanded by the gospel (Matt. 9:37) in several, related ways. Visible unity is hard to come by for Christians accustomed to going it alone, not only in individualized cultures of separation and alienation but in denominations that generally forget or dismiss one another. Thus, the familiar logic of John 17:21 kicks in: our disputes make a mess of our mission. John Paul II put the point strongly: "it is obvious that the lack of unity among Christians contradicts the truth which Christians have the mission to spread and, consequently, it gravely damages their witness."<sup>26</sup> Our disagreements often speak louder than words, so that, despite our claims to the contrary, we apparently do not love one another, certainly not unto death.<sup>27</sup> And what, then, of our call to live into a mature habit of love for the

poor, and to become poor in spirit ourselves through service and mutual subjection, dignifying one another's joys and sorrows by making them our own (1 Cor. 12:26)? Short of this, should we expect to be able to "listen to what the Spirit is saying to the churches" (Rev. 2:17)?

### *Wounds in Communion: Finding Ourselves in Scripture*

Facing such questions, we might find a strange comfort in a longstanding suggestion of the ecumenical movement: the unity of the Church is *wounded*. In the statement of the Episcopal Church's House of Bishops in 1886, for instance, preceding their affirmation of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, the bishops "solemnly declared" that "this church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world."<sup>28</sup>

Many Christians today, of all denominations, presume that the Roman Catholic Church could not make a similar affirmation, including with reference to absorption, but the opposite is the case, as Pope Benedict underlined again in a 2005 address to Lutherans in Cologne. If unity "subsists" in the Catholic Church, he said, this "does not mean [that is, require] what could be called ecumenism of the return: that is, to deny and to reject one's own faith history. Absolutely not!"<sup>29</sup> This should not surprise us, since Vatican II taught, in step with the ecumenical movement, that all those who are justified by faith in baptism are thereby made brothers and sisters in the one body--borne by their respective church or community to salvation;<sup>30</sup> and if saved, then in no need to "convert," that is, change churches. For "preparing and reconciling those individuals who wish for full Catholic communion" and "ecumenical action" are, at once, "distinct" and not "opposed," since the latter is predicated not on hoped-for individual but inter-communal reconciliation, as the quotation of Benedict suggests.<sup>31</sup> In this spirit, John Paul II spoke of conversion in *Ut Unum Sint* only as incumbent on us all, and even as "a deep challenge to the Catholic faithful."<sup>32</sup> And recent affirmations by the magisterium that the Church is "wounded" further clarify the basic, corporate point that all Christian life converges in the one (and holy and catholic and apostolic) body of our Lord.<sup>33</sup>

In every case, ecumenical engagement begins from the scriptural presupposition that "the Church possesses a unity it cannot lose and still remain truly Church."<sup>34</sup> This is not to say, however, that we can, as communities or a single Community, escape the gauntlet of the cross (Eph. 2:16), which we presently bear, in part, through our lack of cooperation with one another, and subsequent shrinkage, malaise, and worse. Paul, after all, wrote to the Corinthians as Christians who were fighting but had not consigned one another to outer darkness (see 1 Cor. 1:13, 12:21). They were, so to speak, in "certain though imperfect communion" with one another, leading him effectively to urge them not to settle for less than the "fullness of catholicity."<sup>35</sup> On this account, moreover, he commends as exemplary his own torturous résumé, which he remarkably explains as his experience of "the sufferings of Christ, . . . so that we would rely not on ourselves but on God who raises the dead" (2 Cor. 1:5, 9). Similarly, the eucharistic teaching of 1 Corinthians 10-11 is placed in the context of the Church's body in chapters 10 and 12. And individual suffering is, in the letter to the Colossians, understood as a "completion" of "Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the Church" (1:24).



Applied to our own experience of dissension among Christian communities, such a scriptural theology of the body strangely liberates as it consigns us to suffer together our dysfunctionality and the means to its overcoming “in” Christ, “in” his passion (Eph. 2). Perhaps Philippians 2 casts the longest spiritually formative shadow of Incarnation and passion: “Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus,” who emptied and humbled himself; *therefore* “God also highly exalted him” (2:5-9).<sup>36</sup> The Church’s theology of sacramental initiation follows from this: we have “all of us” been baptized into Christ’s death and buried with him (Rom. 6:3). And if we still *seem* to be divided, notwithstanding God’s having “broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us” (Eph. 2:14), then we can be sure that we have not yet died—to ourselves, to our pride, to our denominational self-sufficiency--as we are called to, even “every day” (1 Cor. 15:31).<sup>37</sup> In this case, we will do well to say “of our churches as separated ‘bodies,’ as well as of each of us as disciples, . . . that we are ‘struck down, but not destroyed . . .’ (2 Cor. 4:9).”<sup>38</sup>

Jesus’ apocalyptic ecclesiology may be cited along these passionate lines, as well. “Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand” (Matt. 12:25). John Henry Newman boldly applied this text to the Church of England in his notorious *Tract 90* (1841) when he warned that, “if it remains divided, part against part, we shall see the energy which was meant to subdue the world preying upon itself, according to our Savior’s express assurance that such a house ‘cannot stand.’”<sup>39</sup> To be sure, one notes the concomitant promise a few short chapters later that the gates of hell will not prevail against the Church (Matt. 16:18). But Matthew 16:25 completes the teaching: “those who want to save their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it,” a dominical parallel for 1 Corinthians 15:36-38: “Fool! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies” and “God gives it a body as he has chosen.”

If the foregoing ecclesiological and ecumenical reading of the New Testament is tenable, then we might look out for three broadly related themes in our common study of Scripture that will be both theologically requisite and spiritually productive for our collective discernment, particularly in times when “repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation”--imperatives that have always animated the ecumenical movement--are in order.<sup>40</sup>

First, history is a providentially ordered whole, in God’s hands, not ours. This point is fundamental, and all of Scripture follows upon it. Yes, “believe in God, believe also in me” (John 14:1). But our free will must be placed alongside the mystery of election in a relentless paradox. “If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself” (John 14:3), said the Word Incarnate, through whom all things were made, who will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. Apart from him we “can do nothing” (John 15:5). It is therefore especially the experience and witness of the Church that all of history is enfolded into the life of God, “convoked or convened by an act independent of itself.”<sup>41</sup>

Second, God calls us to a rigorous obedience to his Son. We are, for instance, exhorted to “serve Christ” (Rom. 14:18) because of our faith in him; for “faith comes from what is heard . . . through the word of Christ” (Rom. 10:17). But this faith and word must therefore extend to our life in community, which is to be ordered by “harmony . . . in accordance with Christ Jesus”

(Rom. 15:5) and, more to the point, “in subjection to one another out of reverence for Christ” (Eph. 5:21). Thus Paul finally situates both of these, our obedience to God in Christ and our devotion to humble service of one another, within the larger story of salvation--the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile in the Israel of God--with the caveat that we not boast nor “become proud, but stand in awe,” not claiming “to be wiser” than we are. “Note then the kindness and the severity of God: severity toward those who have fallen, but God’s kindness toward you, provided you continue in his kindness” (Rom. 11:20, 22).

Third, God gives us the gift of sacrificial obedience to Christ. That is, we are called, and then led into, a passion, a reaching out to God after Christ’s example. This begins with baptism (Rom. 6:3-11) but continues thereafter, so that death itself comes to typify the witness (*martyria*) of the Christian life in a most paradoxical way: “for while we live, we are always being given up to death for Jesus’ sake, so that the life of Jesus may be made visible in our mortal flesh” (2 Cor. 4:11). Here the Christian gratefully follows the figure of the prayer of the psalmist who, in the day of trouble, “sought the Lord; my hands were stretched out by night and did not tire; I refused to be comforted. I think of God, I am restless, I ponder, and my spirit faints” (Ps. 77:2-3). Indeed, in the teeth of our inevitable betrayal of the gospel, the faithful greet the Lord’s outstretched hand as a just and righteous chastisement (Isa. 9:13-17). Thus, as Israel was “lifted up” in a sacrifice by the LORD (Jer. 23:39), in the self-sacrifice of the “servant”--who “shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high” (Isa. 52:13)--so is the condition of the Church’s hope: that God will “draw all” people or things to himself (John 12:32; see John 12:27-28) as an imitation of that which was previously wrought in Christ; as, that is, a certain conformity to Christ on the cross, whose wounds are the antidote for sin and the avenue to new and renewed life in him.

### *A Holy and Acceptable Sacrifice*

These are difficult matters to think and speak about ecumenically, as they draw the communities of the Church up short, making it hard to see how to make progress. It is thus easier to pretend that they do not grasp us and that our hope is at some blessed remove, thanks perhaps to theological, hermeneutical, historical, pastoral, psychological, political, or material advances that enable us to extract the truth-as-we-now-accept-it from its extraneous husk; to disentangle, for instance, a genuine word of liberation from the apparently primitive masochism of Scripture. If we have inherited the sins of our forbears, however--not only “schism” but repackagings of the gospel, trimmed to taste--these need not prevent us from trying to face anew God and Scripture, thence one another. While it is true, for instance, that there is freedom in Christ (Gal. 5:1), it is also the case that “those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires” and are not “conceited, competing against one another, envying one another,” but rather “bear one another’s burdens” (Gal. 5:24, 26, and 6:2). This, then, is the prayer of the Church, in a posture of conversion: “give us such an awareness of your mercies, that with truly thankful hearts we may show forth your praise, not only with our lips but in our lives, by giving up our selves to your service, and by walking before you in holiness and righteousness all our days; through Jesus Christ our Lord.”<sup>42</sup> And again (inspired by Rom. 12:1): “here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee.”<sup>43</sup>

Returning to the report of the Special Commission, one notes that Galatians 6:2 and also Colossians 3:12 and following (“clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, and patience”) were set up as markers—a preliminary gesture toward the virtuous “fruits” without which we can be sure that we never knew Christ, or vice versa (Matt. 7:20, 23; John 13).<sup>44</sup> The report shied away, however, from a frank address of the difficult decision facing US Episcopalians especially. Can we agree to “respect” (as the primates said in 2005) Resolution 1.10 of Lambeth Conference 1998 as “the standard of Christian teaching on matters of human sexuality” that holds for Anglicans, even if we ourselves do not believe it to be true?<sup>45</sup> This way of asking the question recalls the Bishop of Exeter’s address to the US House of Bishops in March of 2006. “One of the major challenges for the Episcopal Church now,” he said, “has to do with whether there are enough of you to stand on broadly the same ground, holding a range of opinions on the issue of Lambeth 1.10 but firm in carrying forward the Windsor vision of a strengthened and enabling communion life.”<sup>46</sup> In this perspective, the WR moratoria (on electing and confirming episcopal candidates living in same-sex unions, and on authorizing and performing public rites of blessing of these unions) can be understood as “gracious” steps toward repairing broken bonds of trust and accountability “until a new consensus emerges.”<sup>47</sup> Or, as *One Baptism, One Hope* argued: “We believe that WR was wise . . . to use the particular tool of moratoria (if workable) as a means of opening a space in which the development of a community of repentance might be reestablished, or perhaps initiated for the first time.” Such a space could “only be useful and effective,” however, if it leads to “a different degree of consensus, whether a renewed consensus or consensus at a different locus, or an understanding that we cannot reach consensus at present.”<sup>48</sup> Perhaps “a larger framework like the proposed Covenant” may provide a kind of terminus ad quem in this consensual regard, since the 2009 General Convention will, it is hoped, give the Episcopal Church an opportunity to clarify “how and where we want to stand as a church . . . on the current issues,” as Presiding Bishop Katherine Jefferts Schori has suggested.<sup>49</sup>

From another perspective, our Roman Catholic interlocutors have encouraged Anglicans to seize WR’s proposed moratoria on not only the report’s own stated catholic grounds but on the apostolic grounds “witnessed in the Scriptures, the early councils and the patristic tradition.” For Christians have both “synchronic” and “diachronic” obligations, that is, obligations to the present “communion of churches” and to the historical “consensus” of the Church, Cardinal Kasper noted in a letter to Archbishop Williams, borrowing a page from ARCIC.<sup>50</sup> On both counts, the particular and the universal aspects of the Church complement each other with a view to the health of the whole body and its parts. For every particular or local church, the Catholic Church teaches, is not “a subject complete in itself,” so that “the universal Church is the result of a reciprocal recognition on the part of the particular churches” without remainder. If that were the case, a kind of “ecclesiological unilateralism” would impoverish “not only the concept of the universal Church but also that of the particular church, betray[ing] an insufficient understanding of the concept of communion.” Indeed, history has shown that, “when a particular church has sought to become self-sufficient, and has weakened its real communion with the universal Church and with its living and visible centre, its internal unity suffers too, and it finds itself in danger of losing its own freedom in the face of the various forces of slavery and exploitation.”<sup>51</sup>

In this light, I cannot agree with the suggestion of Mark Harris, my colleague and friend on the Special Commission, that WR's image of "walking together or walking apart" wrongly makes of communion "a matter of like-mindedness (or perhaps like-spiritedness), rather than a meeting with the Lord."<sup>52</sup> This is surely a false dichotomy if we are to be agitated about and formed by "the mind of Christ," God's own wisdom (1 Cor. 2:7, 16; Phil. 2:5), and so "be of one mind" ourselves (1 Pet. 3:8; Rom. 12:2). Were this not the case, the Special Commission was mistaken in *One Baptism, One Hope* to "strong[ly] desire to be committed to the interdependent life of the Anglican Communion," a commitment not undertaken "lightly or unadvisedly" (§25), since it includes an obligation for each church "to foster, respect, and maintain all those marks of common identity, and all those instruments of unity and communion . . . with fellow churches, seeking a common mind" (§27). Likewise, the Special Commission ought not to have attempted to discern "the mind of Christ" nor to "continue to develop ways to find a common mind while honoring dissent" (§45); and that we were "not of one mind" in the wording of the resolution on the first moratorium (note 75 in §51, and again in the explanation of Resolution A161) does not matter. On the other hand, Harris may mean, as he suggests further on, that we only need to try to be of one mind with those in our own canonical/provincial community, the "all" that is ready-to-hand, as it were, notwithstanding the universal ambition of WR §51: "what touches all should be decided by all." The end of such a "provincial" principle, however, if applied rigorously, can only be a provincialism that would take and bless but not break in appropriate ways the proliferation of churches with overlapping jurisdictions (hence competing missions, teachings, etc.) that stands as a judgment upon our expressed commitment to restoring all to unity with God and one another. Rather than guarding communion among Christians, the principle underwrites the "captivity" of our "localisms and self-assertive separatisms."<sup>53</sup>

In the event, the 75<sup>th</sup> General Convention of the Episcopal Church reaffirmed and developed, in a series of resolutions, its commitment to interdependence among Anglicans.<sup>54</sup> These resolutions as passed may plausibly be interpreted through the lens of the Special Commission's prior commending of the ecclesiology of communion to the Convention, including the constituent accountability of Anglican churches to each other, with a view to the development of a common Covenant. Careful readers will therefore note that §§3-6 and 8 of *One Baptism, One Hope* adduce the Church scripturally (thereby providing a basis for §26, much of §27, §§31-32, and §§78-79) without reference to Episcopalians or Anglicans; and the particular arguments for constituent membership (§23), interdependence (§§24-32), and Covenant (§§67-77) depend upon this prior foundation. This may have been an unintentional feature of the text, but it reflects faithfully the presumption in the New Testament of a single body of Christ, not the anomaly of a host of more or less autonomous churches in less than full communion but sharing, to varying degrees, the same faith. One thus finds the same presumption in the liturgies for confirmation and ordination in the US Prayer Book (and similarly in other prayer books), that "this Communion" and "this Church" are placed in a subordinate relation to "the one holy catholic and apostolic Church," and again, "Christ's holy catholic Church."<sup>55</sup>

A thorough accounting of the resolutions that were passed at Convention also demands, however, recognition of the apparently contradictory B032, which originated in the House of Bishops, not the Special Committee that tried to form the various Windsor-related resolutions into a coherent whole. The resolution affirms that "no resolution of the General Convention is intended to affect either the historic separate and independent status of the churches of the

Anglican Communion or the legal identity of The Episcopal Church.” Perhaps the concern about “legal identity” was raised with a view to potential lawsuits over property issues. The final clause of the resolution on “Pastoral Care and Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight” (A163) had already been altered by the House of Bishops, however, to urge not only “continued maintenance of historic diocesan boundaries” and “the authority of the diocesan bishop” (per the original version of the resolution, inherited from the Special Commission) but also “respect for the historical relationships of the separate and autonomous Provinces of the Anglican Communion.” Rightly or wrongly, the tradition of “autonomous” member churches in the Anglican Communion is well-established, though WR taught that communion is “the fundamental limit to autonomy” (§82, a phrase quoted in *One Baptism, One Hope* §25; compare §§13 and 29). However, the report of the Special Commission only used the words *separate* and *independent* as effective swear words in order to emphasize with WR that each member church is obliged “to act interdependently, not independently” (§51, quoted at *One Baptism, One Hope* §27; compare §§6 and 10 of the latter). It is hard, therefore, to understand the introduction of these words into the Convention’s deliberations by the House of Bishops as anything other than a direct challenge to the ideals of WR and *One Baptism, One Hope*, as well as to the ideals already articulated by the Convention in terms of its “commitment” to God’s own “call” and “mission.”<sup>56</sup>

Unfortunately, one finds a similarly fearful hesitancy regarding the concrete implications of Anglican interdependence in the resolutions and statement that emerged from the Spring 2007 meeting of the US House of Bishops, a point well articulated and documented in subsequent reflections by several episcopal commentators.<sup>57</sup> At the time of writing (mid-September 2007), it is not known what the final answer of the House of Bishops will be to the requested reassurances of the primates regarding the authorization of Rites of Blessing for same-sex unions in the Episcopal Church and the meaning of Resolution B033 of the 75<sup>th</sup> General Convention, reassurances that may “enable us to find a way forward together for the period leading up to the conclusion of the Covenant Process.”<sup>58</sup>

### *Conclusion*

Our way together has long been painful, recently in “the Anglican Communion’s embarrassed and ungraceful debates about sexuality and authority,”<sup>59</sup> but throughout the history of the Church in countless humiliations, often of Christians by other Christians, to the dismay of the watching world. A certain exhaustion and despair, therefore--with failed attempts at love in our wake, and self-justifications secreted away in our souls or proclaimed from our latest battlement--surely accounts to some extent for our continual disdain of and offense at one another, followed by predictable resentments and clouded consciences. In this way, carelessness remains our common currency, and the integrity of our witness often little more than a cacophony of noisy gongs and clanging cymbals, perhaps sounded with a prophetic intent, and even with real understanding, knowledge, and faith, but gaining--amounting to, signifying--nothing (1 Cor. 13:1-2).

If, however, the odd upheaval of broken communion among and between the faithful is best understood with reference to Scripture’s own passionate presentation of the Church, then our challenge remains to engage more attentively the corporate grammar of our faith, by which we

may hope to disentangle the “long-engrained habits of unfaithfulness in our practice.”<sup>60</sup> For we cannot--any of us, in the Christian body--will our problems away, just as we ought not wish to abandon the particular gifts bequeathed to us by the Holy Spirit. In both respects we are all effectively Corinthians, “sent not to commend” ourselves, but by our “very brokenness to point to” the fact that we have only as we receive.<sup>61</sup> Accordingly, we can expect to make progress in sanctification just insofar as we order our life in the whole body around “Jesus Christ, and him crucified” (1 Cor. 2:2).<sup>62</sup>

\* Christopher Wells is a doctoral candidate in Theology at the University of Notre Dame. He served on the Special Commission that produced *One Baptism, One Hope in God’s Call*, and on the legislative committee that handled the Windsor-related resolutions at the 75<sup>th</sup> General Convention (2006). The author thanks Daria Lucas, J. Robert Wright, Joseph Britton, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions in revising this article.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Lutheran Catholic,” Ramsey Lecture in Durham Cathedral, November 23, 2004, in *Glory Descending: Michael Ramsey and His Writings*, ed. Douglas Dales, John Habgood, Geoffrey Rowell, and Rowan Williams (Norwich: Canterbury Press; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005). For the sake of clarity, I capitalize *Church* (and occasionally *Communion* or *Community*) when I am referring in this essay to the one Church of Christ, and use *church* or *churches* (and *community* or *communities*) when I am referring non-specifically to a denomination or group of denominations. All biblical quotations are from the NRSV.

<sup>2</sup> Rowan Williams, *Anglican Identities* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cowley Publications, 2003), 2.

<sup>3</sup> Williams, *Anglican Identities*, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Rowan Williams, “The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today,” June 27, 2006, online at [http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/sermons\\_speeches/index.html](http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/sermons_speeches/index.html), in the section entitled “Future Directions.”

<sup>5</sup> The Primates’ Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) found in 2005 that WR articulated “the way in which we would like to see the life of the Anglican Communion developed” (Primates’ Communiqué from Dromantine, Ireland, February 2005, §8, online at <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/39/00/acns3948.cfm>). Every major statement since then by the Instruments of Communion has presumed this to be the case.

<sup>6</sup> WR §63; compare §88 for emphasis upon an “Anglican” point contrasted with “Roman and Protestant” views. The first usage of “Protestant” in WR occurs in a quotation from the Preamble of the Episcopal Church’s Constitution (§48, note 17: “The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America . . . is a constituent member of the Anglican Communion,” a fellowship of churches “in communion with the See of Canterbury”). For appropriations of *catholicity* to Anglicans, see WR §§46-47, 49, 63, 79, 104, and a number of times in the draft Covenant in Appendix Two.

<sup>7</sup> Lambeth Conference 1920, “Report of the Whole Committee on some important results of the extension and development of the Anglican Communion” in *Ecumenism of the Possible*:

---

*Witness, Theology and the Future of the Church*, ed. William A. Norgren (Cincinnati, Ohio: Forward Movement Publications, 1994), 99.

<sup>8</sup> Williams, “Challenge and Hope.”

<sup>9</sup> See, for instance, the movement of *Lumen Gentium* (LG) 18-29. All conciliar, papal, and other authoritative Catholic texts discussed in this essay may be found on the Vatican’s website.

<sup>10</sup> ARCIC, *Authority in the Church I* §24d. See *Authority in the Church II* (1981) §18. All ARCIC texts are online at [http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/arcic/e\\_arcic-info.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/arcic/e_arcic-info.html).

<sup>11</sup> Report of the Special Commission on the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion, *One Baptism, One Hope in God’s Call* §9, online at <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/documents/SCECACReport.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> See most recently the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), *Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church* (2007); and Christopher Wells, “The Burden and Grace of Roman Catholic Leadership: An Anglican Response to the CDF,” forthcoming in *Pro Ecclesia*, 17/1 (2008).

<sup>13</sup> WR §5, adopted in Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §25.

<sup>14</sup> John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint* (UUS) §§15-16.

<sup>15</sup> UUS §2.

<sup>16</sup> Co-Chairmen’s Preface, *Authority in the Church I*.

<sup>17</sup> ARCIC, “Elucidation” §8.

<sup>18</sup> Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §28. Internal quotations are from WR §§65, 66, 42, respectively.

<sup>19</sup> Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §31.

<sup>20</sup> Rowan Williams, *Why Study the Past? The Quest for the Historical Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 107.

<sup>21</sup> LG 48, paraphrasing 2 Pet. 3:13.

<sup>22</sup> *Called to Common Mission* (1998) §5, online at [http://www.episcopalchurch.org/6947\\_10367\\_ENG\\_HTM.htm](http://www.episcopalchurch.org/6947_10367_ENG_HTM.htm).

<sup>23</sup> See <http://www.fmcmissions.com> and Genie Summers, *Go! You Are Sent* (Baton Rouge, La.: Charleston Press, 1995).

---

<sup>24</sup> Cited at Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §§5-6.

<sup>25</sup> *Redemptoris Missio* (1990) §23.

<sup>26</sup> UUS §98.

<sup>27</sup> Rom. 5:7 and 1 John 3:16; compare Col. 1:24, Rom. 8:13, Phil. 3:10.

<sup>28</sup> BCP, 876-877.

<sup>29</sup> Address of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI, Cologne, August 19, 2005, online at [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xvi/speeches/2005/august/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_spe\\_20050819\\_ecumenical-meeting\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/august/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20050819_ecumenical-meeting_en.html).

<sup>30</sup> See *Unitatis Redintegratio* (UR) 3-4, a text cited by Benedict XVI in Cologne.

<sup>31</sup> UR 4.

<sup>32</sup> UUS §82.

<sup>33</sup> See CDF, *Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion* (1992), n. 17; *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1994) §817: Christian divisions are “ruptures that wound the unity of Christ’s Body.”

<sup>34</sup> Michael Root, “Essential Unity and Lived Communion: The Interrelation of the Unity We Have and the Unity We Seek” in *The Ecumenical Future: Background Papers for In One Body through the Cross: The Princeton Proposal for Christian Unity*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 108.

<sup>35</sup> UR 3 for the phrase “certain though imperfect communion,” and nn. 3-4 on “fullness.”

<sup>36</sup> Quoted at length at Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §8; compare LG 8 §3 and UR 4 §4.

<sup>37</sup> UUS §6 creatively paraphrases Romans 6 and Ephesians 2: “How is it possible to remain divided, if we have been ‘buried’ through baptism in the Lord’s death, in the very act by which God, through the death of his Son, has broken down the walls of division?” Compare Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §3.

<sup>38</sup> *In One Body through the Cross: The Princeton Proposal for Christian Unity*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), §6; compare UR 4.



---

<sup>39</sup> *Tract 90 in The Via Media of the Anglican Church: Illustrated in Lectures, Letters and Tracts Written between 1830-1841* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901), vol. II, 271.

<sup>40</sup> WR §134, quoted at Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §34, which adds: “Repentance is one of several elements of the process to move beyond hurt and offense to renewed *koinonia*.”

<sup>41</sup> Williams, *Why Study the Past?* 111.

<sup>42</sup> General Thanksgiving, BCP, 101, 125.

<sup>43</sup> Holy Eucharist Rite I, BCP, 336.

<sup>44</sup> Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §§56, 79.

<sup>45</sup> Primates’ Communiqué from Dromantine §6, only partially quoted at *One Baptism, One Hope* §16.

<sup>46</sup> The Rt. Rev. Michael Langrish, “Some Reflections offered to the House of Bishops of ECUSA,” Kanuga, North Carolina, March 22, 2006, online at [http://www.exeter.anglican.org/article.php?tabnam=dbminibishop&artid=77&pagetyp=mini&P\\_HPS.ESSID=8cefd5ac347f9a7fefb2be6254578f67](http://www.exeter.anglican.org/article.php?tabnam=dbminibishop&artid=77&pagetyp=mini&P_HPS.ESSID=8cefd5ac347f9a7fefb2be6254578f67).

<sup>47</sup> For “gracious” see the statement of Presiding Bishop Katharine Jefferts Schori in the live “Conversation” from Trinity Church Wall Street, Feb. 28, 2007, online at [http://www.trinitywallstreet.org/calendar/index.php?event\\_id=40355](http://www.trinitywallstreet.org/calendar/index.php?event_id=40355). On “consensus” see WR §§134 and 144, discussed in Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §§51, 54.

<sup>48</sup> Special Commission, *One Baptism, One Hope* §§38, 48.

<sup>49</sup> Jefferts Schori, “Opening Remarks,” Trinity Church telecast.

<sup>50</sup> “Letter of His Eminence Cardinal Walter Kasper to His Grace Dr Rowan Williams Archbishop of Canterbury,” December 17, 2004, online at [http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/reception/responses/pdf/ecum\\_pontificalcouncilforchristianity.pdf](http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/reception/responses/pdf/ecum_pontificalcouncilforchristianity.pdf). See ARCIC, *Gift of Authority* §26.

<sup>51</sup> CDF, *Some Aspects*, n. 8. See similarly against unilateralism WR §§29, 51, 117, 119, 143, and in several appendices.

<sup>52</sup> Mark Harris, “Windsor Nosh” (May 2006), part 1, online at <http://anglicanfuture.blogspot.com/2006/05/ive-noshed-enough-on-windsor-report.html>.

<sup>53</sup> Williams, “The Lutheran Catholic,” 221.

---

<sup>54</sup> Commitment to Interdependence in the Anglican Communion (A159); Commitment to Windsor and Listening Processes (A165); and Anglican Covenant Development Process (A166), online at <http://gc2006.org/legislation/>.

<sup>55</sup> BCP, 418, 526 (taking the instance of the priesthood).

<sup>56</sup> Resolutions A165 and A166.

<sup>57</sup> John C. Bauerschmidt, "Comments on the House of Bishops' Statement," March 24, 2007, online at [http://www.episcopaldiocese-tn.org/bishop/Bauerschmidt\\_Statement\\_Re\\_House\\_of\\_Bishops\\_March\\_2007.pdf](http://www.episcopaldiocese-tn.org/bishop/Bauerschmidt_Statement_Re_House_of_Bishops_March_2007.pdf); James M. Stanton, "A word about the House of Bishops' resolutions," March 24, 2007 (<http://www.episcopal-dallas.org/bishop3.htm>); Pierre W. Whalon, "A Bishop's Estimate of the Situation," March 31, 2007, online at <http://anglicansonline.org/resources/essays/whalon/situation.html>.

<sup>58</sup> Primates' Communiqué from Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, February 2007, §35, online at [http://www.aco.org/primates/downloads/communique2007\\_english.pdf](http://www.aco.org/primates/downloads/communique2007_english.pdf).

<sup>59</sup> Williams, *Anglican Identities*, 85.

<sup>60</sup> Williams, "The Lutheran Catholic," 220.

<sup>61</sup> Michael Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (London: SPCK, 1990 [1936, 1956]), 220.

<sup>62</sup> Jefferts Schori, "Conversation" at Trinity Church, for the phrase "the whole body" used in this way.