

‘The A.R.C.I.C. Agreed Statements are not agreeable to Scripture and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion’¹

For the Motion: David Samuel

With regard to the first Agreed Statement on the Eucharist, the term ‘The Eucharist’ is not the proper name for this sacrament. It should be properly called according to Scripture ‘The Lord’s Supper’, or as an alternative as in the *Book of Common Prayer*, ‘The Holy Communion’ and, of course, it should be ‘The Administration of the Lord’s Supper’ not ‘The Celebration of the Eucharist’. So I think on that count, first of all, I would claim that the A.R.C.I.C. Statement on the Eucharist is not Scriptural. Let me just remind you of the words of our Lord when he instituted this sacrament. (Incidentally the grammatical structure in all the synoptic gospels, and also in Paul’s account in 1 Cor. 11, is the same.)

And having taken a loaf, having given thanks [past participles], he brake [finite verb] and gave [finite verb] unto them, and having taken the cup and having given thanks he gave to them . . .

So you see ‘having given thanks’ is the subordinate clause and the main clause is ‘he gave’. So clearly what we are talking about here is the administration of a supper. That is the Scriptural meaning, the plain grammatical meaning of it in all three Synoptic Gospels and also in the account in 1 Corinthians 11.

So we are talking of the administration manward; the direction of the sacrament is manward, not Godward. That is the Scriptural teaching and that also is the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. They all consistently speak with one voice of the administration of the sacrament and never of the celebration of the Eucharist and in that they are faithful to the Word of God. We know from the history of the Reformation that Cranmer reordered the whole of this Service in order to bring this out quite clearly. A.R.C.I.C. seeks

¹ The Motion for debate at Church Society’s Public Meeting held in Westminster Central Hall on Saturday 7 November 1987.

to change that emphasis of Scripture and also to change the direction of the Sacrament by speaking repeatedly in the Eucharist Statement of the 'Celebration of the Eucharist' or 'Eucharistic Celebration'.

The second thing which we have to notice about the Scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper is 'remembrance'. When Jesus said 'Do this in remembrance of me' he meant eat and drink the bread and wine believingly remembering His death for us. 'Remembrance', the Greek word is 'anamnesis', means only one thing wherever it is used in the New Testament, that is simply 'recollection—recalling to mind'. It never means 'to offer a memorial offering' or 'a memorial sacrifice'. That is an entirely different thing and Greek has a special word for it—'mnēmosynon'.

Our Lord did not use that in the institution of the Lord's Supper. If he had meant 'a memorial' in that sense then clearly he would have said so. I believe that this is very important because in A.R.C.I.C. we see an attempt again to deflect the direction of the sacrament from the remembrance that each individual believer makes when he eats and drinks the bread and wine, to something else, to an offering and to a memorial sacrifice of Christ's death. I will come to that more particularly later on.

I would like you to notice especially the words of Paul when he comes to recount the institution of the sacrament in 1 Corinthians 11. He uses ten verses in all, vv.20–29, and in those ten verses he speaks nine times either of eating and drinking or of eating or drinking. In other words, clearly what the sacrament is about when we talk about 'remembrance' is eating and drinking worthily, that is with repentance and faith, trusting in the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. That is the true 'anamnesis'—that is the true remembrance of the Lord Jesus Christ. If you look at the first verse of that passage, Paul says 'when you come together it is not to eat the Lord's Supper'. He says 'I don't commend you in this; you are doing the wrong thing. When you come together you should be coming together to *eat* the Lord's Supper'. So he is saying the sacrament is about eating and about drinking in remembrance of Christ's death. When you come together you should eat the Lord's Supper, not offer a memorial sacrifice. He does not talk about that at all. As I have said, the teaching of the Church of England is perfectly in line with this. Again Cranmer changed the emphasis of the service. He cut off the prayer called the 'Canon of the Mass' precisely at the point where our Lord's actual words of institution finish and there the congregation said 'Amen'. And then the people came up to make their own 'anamnesis'—their own remembrance—as they ate and drank the bread and wine. In the Canon of the mediaeval mass the anamnesis or remembrance was made by the priest in the prayer of thanksgiving or consecration; it was made *for* the people by the priest, not by the people themselves as they ate and drank in remembrance of our Lord's suffering and

death. The A.R.C.I.C. Statement is seeking to reinstate that understanding of the Lord's Supper which was present in the mediaeval mass and which is present in the Roman Catholic mass today. Let me quote you these words from the A.R.C.I.C. Statement: 'The Eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind', that is, it is not a recollection merely. It is not a remembrance of the death of Christ. It is something more. It is, they claim a memorial offering and I do not think the words will bear that meaning.

It then goes on to state: 'In the Eucharistic prayer the Church continues to make the perpetual memorial of Christ's death'—'in the prayer', and not in the people eating and drinking individually as Cranmer intended, as Paul clearly intended, as our Lord intended, to eat and drink in remembrance of Christ's death for them, receiving the sacrament by faith with thanksgiving in their heart. All this is very important. What is happening in the A.R.C.I.C. Statement is a change of emphasis, a change of direction which will take us away from a truly scriptural and reformed position back to the unreformed teaching of the Church of Rome, as it was in the Council of Trent and even as it is today in Vatican I and Vatican II.

And then also, thirdly, the Statement speaks in this Sacrament of 'entering into the movement of Christ's self offering'. Now how can we do that? Christ made one propitiatory sacrifice for sins. As John Stott has said in his book *The Cross of Christ*² that sacrifice stands out in towering isolation from any sacrifice which we can make. Any sacrifice which we make of praise and thanksgiving of our lives is a responsive offering. It cannot be a part of or become joined with Christ's perfect offering because if that happens immediately you have confusion and the Gospel becomes obscured.

What does the Bible say? 'When he had by himself—you notice 'by himself'—not with anyone else joining in—'purged our sins He took his seat at the right hand of the majesty on high'. 'His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree'—note the emphasis 'His own self', 'His own body'—uniquely. This is Christ's sacrifice in which we cannot share. His sacrifice must always in the teaching and liturgy of the Church be distinguished qualitatively from our sacrifice which we may offer in response to that. As John Stott says: 'The New Testament never suggests that our offering may be made in or with Christ. Those propositions are never used in that connexion in the New Testament.' And he rejects the phrase 'enter into the movement of Christ's self offering' as unBiblical.

Fourthly, with regard to this first Statement we need to note also the scriptural teaching about the nature of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper because this is of crucial importance. The New Testament teaches that Christ's presence in the Church is always a spiritual presence, one which is communicated to the heart of the believer. When he ascended up in the sight of the disciples the angels present

² Reviewed on pp. 189–191

told the disciples that he would return in 'like manner' as he had ascended into heaven, that is, his *bodily* presence would remain at the right hand of the Father until his return at his second coming. Christ's presence in the Church today is through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. He is the 'other comforter, the one who takes Christ's place in the Church today'. His is a spiritual presence and the point to notice is this: that the sacrament of the Holy Communion is not an exception to this rule in the teaching of the New Testament but rather a reinforcement of it. When our Lord said 'This is my body'—and he held the bread in His hand—it was quite clear to the disciples that he did not mean any material, substantial or local presence of his body amongst them. And there could be no misunderstanding by the disciples because our Lord often spoke in parables and in figurative expressions. With their parabolic background to their thinking as Hebrews they could not fail to understand that he meant what he was saying figuratively, symbolically. The teaching of our Church in the Thirty-nine Articles is exactly in line with this and in Article 28 we are told:

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

Not with the mouth, but by faith, the organ, the mouth of the soul.
Article 29 says:

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ . . .

Now A.R.C.I.C teaches something quite different from all that. It teaches that there is a change *locally* in the bread and the wine. It declares that 'the elements are not mere signs. Christ's body and blood become really present and are really given'. 'Through the Prayer of Thanksgiving, the bread and the wine', says A.R.C.I.C., 'become the Body and Blood of Christ'. And again, by the transforming action of the Spirit of God earthly bread and wine become the heavenly 'manna and the new wine'. Now if anyone is in doubt about what 'become' in these statements means he has only to turn to the response of the Roman Catholic Bishops of England and Wales to this A.R.C.I.C. Statement. This is what they say:

The Statement clearly maintains the real and true presence of Christ. The substantial nature of the change of the bread and the wine is clearly asserted by the repeated use of the word 'become'.

Therefore the A.R.C.I.C. Statement meets the requirements of Roman Catholic orthodoxy on this question of the real presence, but does not accord with Biblical truth.

I come to the Statement on Ministry. This reinforces and supports the earlier one on the Eucharist. Let us ask ourselves what is the New Testament doctrine of Ministry. It is this. It is one of preaching and proclamation. Jesus said in His commission to the disciples: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature'.

This theme is carried on throughout the New Testament. The characteristic words in relation to New Testament ministry are 'kerugma'—which means the preaching or the message, and 'kerux' which means the herald or preacher who announces or proclaims the message. We have the picture of a king sending out a decree. The herald goes and proclaims it and declares it. The Christian minister is a 'kerux', a herald, and the *essential* nature and function of New Testament ministry is to declare what Christ has done, to proclaim the finished nature of Christ's work upon the Cross, not to try to repeat, recapitulate or perpetuate that work, which is what the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is regarding the priest and the Mass. The New Testament minister goes out and says 'come, for all things are now finished and complete. God has prepared for your reception. It is all perfect and that is the message that Christian ministers declare. It is interesting that in the pastoral epistles presbyters—that is ministers—are called 'examples, teachers philanthropists, rulers but never is any sacerdotal or priestly function in the sense of priestly offering attributed to them. Nowhere in those epistles or anywhere in the New Testament. Now the teaching of the Church of England is perfectly in line with this scriptural teaching. Article 19 says that 'the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached'—that is the priority—and the sacraments are duly administered according to the ordinance of Christ—that is subordinate—the sacraments are adjuncts of the Word. The preaching of the Word has priority. We know that this was the whole aim of the Reformers—to reflect this scriptural emphasis. The Reformers removed the words from the Ordination service 'receive power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate mass' and in place of those words they substituted the words 'take authority to preach the Word of God and to administer the sacraments in the congregation', and the bishop was to hand the ordinand a Bible to indicate the importance of the preaching of the Word. Now A.R.C.I.C.'s teaching is opposed to all this. It seeks quite unashamedly to establish that ministers are sacrificing priests. The Greek word is 'hiereus' and that is what it means—a sacrificing priest, and that is what A.R.C.I.C. uses to describe Christian ministers. It does it in this way which is very interesting. It says it acknowledges that you cannot find this word 'hiereus' used of ministers in the New Testament but goes on to say that Christians came to see the priestly rôle of Christ reflected in these ministers and says that the essential nature of the ministry is offering the Eucharist.

So you see what we have here is a quite unscriptural emphasis which is incompatible with the Bible's teaching. Hebrews 7:24 speaks of the priesthood of Christ as unchangeable—the Greek word is *aparabatos* which means inalienable, that is, it cannot be shared by any other, it cannot be transmitted or passed on to any other nor can it be reflected in the rôle of any other and yet the A.R.C.I.C. Statement claims it can. So I contend that that too is an unscriptural statement.

Then we come to the Statement on Authority. There is a profound difference between this and the Thirty-nine Articles. A.R.C.I.C. speaks of 'a normative record' but it does not speak of *the* normative record of revelation in Scripture. It speaks of Scripture as 'the primary authority' but not as the supreme or sole authority. Scripture and Tradition are not properly distinguished or demarcated in this Statement on Authority. The Church of Rome teaches quite clearly, in Vatican II, for example, that Scripture and Tradition are equal: 'it is not from Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed. Both sacred Scripture and sacred Tradition are to be accepted with the same sense of devotion and reverence'. Vatican II goes on to say on this subject: 'Sacred scripture and the teaching authority of the Church', that is, the magisterium of the Pope, and the Bishops and Councils 'are so linked and joined together that one cannot stand without the other'. You cannot have the Word of God without the Pope and the Magisterium of the Church. Now there is a great deal of this sort of thing in the A.R.C.I.C. Statement about authority too. Several times in the A.R.C.I.C. document Scripture is in fact put on the same level as tradition and the conclusions of the Agreed Statements are justified as 'consonant with the biblical teaching and traditions of our common inheritance'. This is clearly at variance with the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion which regards Scripture as the supreme and sufficient authority for the Church in all matters of faith. On the question of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome A.R.C.I.C. says 'that a universal primacy will be needed in a reunited church and, that primacy should properly belong to the bishop of Rome'. I put it to you that nowhere in the New Testament is there the slightest hint that a universal pastor of the church is necessary. There were many leaders in New Testament times as we all know. There was James, there was Paul, there was Peter, and Bishop Lightfoot said 'if there is any primacy in the New Testament it belongs to Paul'. So I cannot see that we can draw any substance or authority from Scripture itself to support this claim, that in a reunited church there must be a primacy and that that primacy should belong to the bishop of Rome. The arguments which are used in the A.R.C.I.C. Statement to buttress this position are all drawn, not from Scripture but from Tradition. And this underlines the fundamental weakness of all the A.R.C.I.C. Statements on Eucharist, Ministry, Authority and

Salvation and the Church. They all depend ultimately for their support upon Tradition upon 'what is evidenced in the church's liturgy' (the Eucharistic statement), upon 'what Christians came to see in their ministers' (the Ministry statement), upon the fact that 'the early church found it necessary to employ terminology in ways not used in the New Testament' (Elucidation), upon how 'Fathers and Doctors of the Church gradually came to interpret the New Testament' (Authority Statement) and so on and so forth. If you take away Tradition you take away the ground on which all the Agreed Statements stand, but if we open the door to tradition in this way in the Church of England, where oh where is it all going to end?

Finally, on the question of the Statement 'Salvation and the Church', which purports to deal with the question of Justification, here again we find exactly what I have highlighted throughout, the conflation of Scripture and Tradition to produce the result which the Commission requires. The two doctrines of Justification—the Roman Catholic doctrine which is of course Justification by works through grace, and the Reformed and Scriptural doctrine which is justification by grace through faith alone: the one (Roman Catholic) depending upon traditional ideas, the Reformed one depending on Scriptural teaching: these two are brought together and conflated. They are first of all juxtaposed and then conjoined. The result is what Professor Henry Chadwick indicated that he would like to see, in a preliminary paper a year before this Statement was published and that is the doctrine of *double* justification by faith and by works, by imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ and also by inherent righteousness—the sanctification and good works of the individual believer. Sanctification and justification are confused in this Statement and vice versa. The ground of our acceptance with God is said to be both Christ's righteousness and ours. Let me quote from this Statement: (paragraph 16): 'God's declaration that we are accepted because of Christ' (that is the Reformed and Scriptural teaching)—but that is not enough—the Statement goes on to say: 'together with his gift of continual renewal by the indwelling Spirit' (that is Sanctification) inward change—that is the Roman doctrine of Justification—Both of these it says, 'is the ground of the believer's hope'. So you see that our hope of acceptance by God rests on a double justification. This is not the Bible's teaching of justification. It destroys the believer's assurance and robs the Christian of peace and joy in believing. I could not accept that doctrine because if I accepted that doctrine I would be making myself a castaway. I would have no ground on which to stand before God because Christ and his righteousness are the only ground of our hope and acceptance with God both at the beginning and at the end of our Christian life and when we come to stand before the presence of Almighty God. In this Statement of Salvation or Justification, the traditional teaching of the

Church of Rome is put alongside and conjoined with the teaching of Scripture. That is what makes it perhaps of all the Statements the most confusing and the most misleading, and it makes it also possible for some to claim—because there are many Biblical quotations in it—that it is a Biblical statement when it is not. So then I come to my final point: the only safe course for the individual Christian and for the Church of England is to remain faithful and committed to Scripture alone, Christ alone, Grace alone and Faith alone. 'Alone' is the distinguishing mark of the true Church in the Apostolic age, in the age of the early church when Christians would go into the arena with the lions before they would accept any other God alongside Christ. It was the distinguishing mark of the true Church in the Reformation when the watchword was Scripture alone, Grace alone, Faith alone and Christ alone and it is the distinguishing mark of the true church today—that true church which will no doubt be a remnant in the twentieth century also. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the A.R.C.I.C. Agreed Statements are not agreeable to Scripture and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

Against the Motion: George Carey

We are here to hear clear views expressed. We are here to hear tough things said to one another but in a spirit of love and so whatever I want to say (and I will be saying some tough things) it is not to diminish my respect for David and for what he stands for, but I want to say that I am delighted to take part in this debate, even though there is a lot of pressure on me at this particular time. Perhaps I can come at this with a little introduction of my own. Anyone that knows me will know me as a man of hope. I see many signs of God breaking down barriers today and healing old divisions among us. I do not share the views of my friend the Revd. Reg Burrows from Newcastle in his understanding of gloom and despondency in the Church of England today. He says that the Church of England is under judgment and he cites A.R.C.I.C. as a mark of this. I must say a gentle and jocular 'Rats' to that thesis. Perhaps he sees evidence of judgment. On the contrary I see signs of life, churches growing and mission being established. I certainly cannot agree with the idea that the A.R.C.I.C. Agreed Statements are among the signs of an apostate church. I will be arguing in this talk that I see them as a mark of God's Spirit, healing and restoring us to the unity which is the Will of God.

But first of all let me share with you a parable. When my wife was on a houseparty at Brunel Manor earlier this year, she went out with some friends for a ramble on Exmoor and one man in the party said he had a map and off they set. But after a while they got hopelessly lost. The map was a map of the area but it did not seem to work. 'Everything is so different' commented Bill miserably. 'It is true that the map is forty years old but I did not expect the place to have

changed that much'. And I use that story to illustrate how we sometimes go wrong in using our theological maps that are out of date. We dare not do our theology using routes taken by people who lived four hundred years ago. Whether we like it or not, the maps have changed even though the area looks the same. Rome has undeniably changed over the years in a hundred different ways and the Church of England has changed and is changing as well. A new spirit is at work in Church life if that massive *Not Strangers But Pilgrims* Lent exercise last year is anything to go by. And A.R.C.I.C. is a mark of this change and shows the way in which theologians together are exploring all pathways with a theology of convergence and not confrontation. But you may say with justification: 'Go on and prove it', so let me try to do that.

First, I believe that the A.R.C.I.C. Statements are consonant with Scripture and the Thirty-nine Articles because of their firm commitment to the Work of Christ, in spite of what my friend David has said. Let me point out the wonderful words in the Eucharistic Statement:

Christ's redeeming death and resurrection took place once for all in history. Christ's death on the Cross, the culmination of his whole life of obedience, was the one perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world: there can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished once for all by Christ. Any attempt to express a nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharist must not obscure this fundamental fact of the Christian life.

What wonderful words! When I first read those years ago I could hardly believe what I was reading. How far have we travelled from the days of the polemics of the Reformation period. And you will recall, if you recite it yourself in the Book of Common Prayer in your services tomorrow, that the Reformers felt it necessary to say in the 1662 Prayer Book 'who made there by his one oblation of Himself once offered a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.' Now when I read David's little book on the Agreed Statements, *Agreeing to Differ*, I could find no acknowledgement of that breakthrough in the booklet. I heard nothing of that acknowledgement from what he has said this afternoon. I feel disappointed that we have not recognized that 'once for allness' in the Statements. It occurs in this Statement and it occurs in all of them. That *eph'hapax* which is fundamental to Evangelical theology and we ought to be applauding that wonderful and magnificent agreement represented by those theologians. And I want to say, Ladies and Gentlemen, here is the high ground of ecumenical debate. This is the heart of eucharistic doctrine. And if you think that that remarkable statement is slipped in grudgingly, then look at Elucidation paragraph 20 and elsewhere.

But let me stay with the Eucharist Statement for a little longer, because sometimes it is said: 'well, the people here, the theologians, seem to say that on one side and then seem to retract it by other statements they make. What about the word 'remembrance', the Greek word *anamnesis* that David mentioned a moment ago? You will recall if you have studied the document that the Statement says 'the notion of "memorial" as understood as making effective in the present of an event in the past has opened the way to a clearer relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the Eucharist.' Now I happen to believe that that is correct. I believe that through modern scholarship we know a lot more about the meaning of *anamnesis*. I can take you to the Mishna, Book 10, in which the Jew is obliged to consider himself as if he had moved from Egypt into the Promised Land. It is a dynamic understanding of your involvement in the present and in a past event. Now David rejects this term, we have heard, and I quote from his booklet: 'because an event which has happened in the past cannot be made present. There is no way by which the sacrifice of Christ can be made present, though the benefits of His death are available to all who believe.' And David concludes, on 'anamnesis', 'it is a mistaken and dangerous idea because it opens up the way to the identification of Calvary and the Eucharist'. But with the greatest respect to David, it does *not*. In the passage already quoted it goes on to say that 'the Eucharist is a perpetual memorial in which we entreat—[note these words which follow]—the benefits of His passion. We participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of His self-offering'. Now before we look at that difficult phrase 'enter into the movement of His self-offering' (David's already commented on that) I want to underline that stress upon the benefits of His passion. There is no identification of Holy Communion with Calvary. And the Elucidation makes that very very clear. The death of Christ is unique and we have got to take that one on board. But what about this phrase 'entering into the movement of His self-offering'? Well, let me remember that the Statement has already said that the sacrifice of Christ is complete and unrepeatable. And we must understand that phrase as not undermining that fact. And I see it in this kind of way. It points to the mystery of what God has done and what He continues to do. Salvation itself is a mystery. The Eucharist or Communion is a mystery—the way in which we come and receive Christ, we remember Him and the benefits of His passion—that is a mystery, and even the phrase 'the benefits of His passion' is a mystery. We do not know what these words mean in their fullness. It's not Anglican theology anyway to think of the Eucharist as a bare memorial, as mere signs. Our theology says that the Sacraments are *effective* signs. That's good Calvinist theology as well as good Anglican theology. I think that the received tradition of Anglicanism is to see the Communion Service not merely as something

which we receive passively but as something which we respond to actively, and enter into a Salvation which is ever effective. That's what I believe this idea of 'entering into the movement of His self-offering' means. It does not mean to say that Calvary is not finished. It's already declared that it's the finished work of Christ. I was going to read from the F.O.A.G. document but I haven't got time but if you want to follow that up for yourselves, read this F.O.A.G. document in the red book *Towards a Church of England Response*, page 70 for the Anglican comments on that particular thing.

Now at this point I want to go onto the attack a little against false ideas of Anglican theology which from time to time break in to the Evangelical world. I am going to go straight to the Church Society pamphlet 'A.R.C.I.C. and the Church of England' in which the claim is made there that there is an actual change made in the Bread and Wine and David has already said that. But we do not serve the interests of truth by misrepresenting the facts. A.R.C.I.C. repudiates a material change in the elements. That is categorically stated in the Elucidation Section 6 and Section B. It says that what is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses realities of this world to convey realities of the new creation: bread for this life becomes bread of eternal life. But you may ask: 'Does not sacramental change imply material change'? Of course not. Because they have already ruled out material change. And if you want to go to the Elucidation again, page 119. By the way, I dug out yesterday a wonderful reference in Calvin's Institutes, Book Four, Chapter 17, verse 4 in which he says something strikingly similar to this particular Section. I encourage you to look at that. Now I am not saying that everything in the Eucharistic Statement pleases me or is what I would have preferred. But I am saying that here is a remarkable statement that shows that two traditions are at least listening to each other and moving together gradually and I regret that Evangelicals have been so slow to applaud the very real theological advances made.

But let me now turn to the second Statement, *On Ministry* which came under very heavy attack from Evangelical members of General Synod as some of you will know who were there. Again I want to turn, because I want to make the issues quite sharp, to what David has written about ministry in his *Agreeing to Differ*. Again I am disappointed that he did not applaud the advances made and his mistake in that booklet and his mistake this afternoon is to start by polarizing two classical theological positions, the Church of Rome and the Reformers. And I believe that this is using out-of-date maps. The moment you start there you fail to see what is close up under your very nose. In the Ministry document the ordained ministry is set in the ministry of the people of God. Now I for one would have liked a more substantial treatment of the ministry of the laity. Anyone who knows my theology knows that my theology of ministry starts with the

ministry of the church, the ministry of the people of God. It's sad that A.R.C.I.C. is too clerical by far, but having said that, what is significant about this document is the emphasis on the uniqueness of the priesthood of Jesus. There is no confusion with the ministry of Jesus in His high priestly work. You will know that the Statement goes on to say something like this, that 'Christ's high priesthood is real, the ordained ministry is a priesthood by analogy'. It's an analogical notion of priesthood and so I see the ordained priesthood in the A.R.C.I.C. Statement is placed firmly in the context of the ministry of the whole church and it exists for the service of the faithful. Now David rejects entirely, as you heard, the entire language of priesthood when it is applied to the ordained ministry. Well, so be it. All I can say is that the Early Church quickly started applying priestly words to the ordained ministry and the Prayer Book uses this term as well and that is a fact that will not go away, but I want us all to recognize that this thrust on the once for all death of Christ means that the priesthood of the ordained ministry in the A.R.C.I.C. Statement is not a sacerdotal priesthood but it is closer to our concept of ministerial priesthood because what the minister does is that he acts in the name of the congregation and he focusses their offering of worship.

Now I want to take up two things that need to be said. I am sorry to turn yet again to David but he spoke first so I am able to get back at him. He'll be able to get a last word back at me later on. He has said on a number of occasions that in the Church of England the priest is a teaching presbyter and not a sacrificing priest. He has already said something similar this afternoon. But really the priest is neither of those terms. We reject the sacrificing priest, of course, but Anglican theology also rejects the teaching presbyter. Much as I would not knock the emphasis upon proclamation and preaching: I would go quite a long way with David on much of what he has just said but preaching is not the entirety of priesthood and ministry. For example you only have to go to the Ordinal, you only have to go to the Articles, and you know that ordination means that we not only are going to preach but we celebrate the sacraments of the New Covenant; we declare the forgiveness of sins; we act on behalf of the congregation sacramentally. You read the Articles and the Ordinal and you will see that as a fact. And this takes me into the very choppy waters of the phrase: 'nevertheless their ministry is not an extension of the common priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit (Concerning the Ordained Ministry, Section 10). Now that's a very difficult phrase but you know I must confess that Evangelicals have made heavy weather of that phrase which must be taken in the light of all that has preceded it. May I point out that I believe that it is in line with the Anglican doctrine of ministry anyway. You go to the Ordinal, for example. Where the Bishop says to the candidate

kneeling down before him: 'Send down your Holy Spirit for the office and work of a Deacon/Priest/Bishop in the Church of God'. There is a definite invocation of the Holy Spirit at that particular point and the singing of the *Veni Creator* 'Come Holy Spirit' underlines a theology which expects the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. And it is for that reason that I do not take fright at such a phrase. I am a Principal of a Theological College, a thriving bustling enthusiastic and Godly place, and many of my students—women as well as men—have given up careers and nice homes to train for ministry. They know what sacrifice is all about. They feel a call, definite, personal, real and I teach them to expect through their first calling into ministry, through the training, through the calling of the church, through the ordination in the Cathedral they go to, a real work of the Holy Spirit. I believe that such a phrase is in line with the way not only of Anglican theology but in the way that Paul saw his own authoritative ministry and you will recall also his words to the wavering Timothy: 'Stir up the gift that was given to you through the laying on of my hands'.

I am not going to say much about the Authority Statement for this very simple reason: that it was the only one in General Synod which was sent back with very real questions and misgivings. In General Synod we said about the Eucharist and the Ministry that we saw them adumbrating substantial agreement. We did not say that about the doctrine of Authority. We said that it showed 'significant convergence' and we asked the Commission to look again at the ministry of the laity, to give more adequate treatment to the Marian dogmas and the infallibility dogma and to give more attention to the universal primacy of the Pope. So I do not really want to enter into a detailed examination of that text because we have got to return to that in the days to come, but can I just mention two things which come from it. First of all, the place of Scripture. We have heard some alarmist words from David, but let me read some words from Elucidation No. 2 and this is what it says: (about the place of Scripture)

The person and work of Jesus Christ preached by the Apostles and set forth and interpreted in the New Testament writings through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit are the primary norm for Christian faith and life. No endeavour of the Church to express the truth can add to the revelation already given. Moreover, since the Scriptures are the uniquely inspired witness to divine revelation, the church's expression of that revelation must be tested by its consonance with Scripture.

That is a most important and significant statement. It means that in drawing closer together with the Roman Catholic Church and with Roman Catholic Christians Scripture becomes our theological starting point and the primacy of Scripture becomes our yardstick and norm. Of course tradition has its part to play and we have to remember that Anglicanism has never rejected tradition or reason.

The Ordinal which we use today says something like this:

The Church of England is part of one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in Holy Scripture and set forth in the Catholic Creeds. Led by the Holy Spirit it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historical formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

We call that a 'dispersed' understanding of Authority. We take Scripture as our norm, the primary norm, but we do not rule out what God has done in the Church and is doing now but all the time we test it by Scripture. Secondly, I draw attention to what is going on in the second *Authority Statement* where mention is made of the ministry of Peter (Section 8). What a different climate we find in this Statement. Here there is no triumphant cry of 'Thou art Peter and upon this Rock I will build my Church'. No, what we find is an acknowledgement that although the words were first spoken to Peter this does not mean that they can be spoken of the Bishop of Rome *with an identical meaning*. But before we move on lastly to the Salvation document I want to mention this one fact. That the three agreed Statements, *Eucharist*, *Ministry* and *Authority* are not on the same footing. As I said a moment ago the *Eucharist* and the *Ministry* received a very encouraging mandate from the General Synod. The *Authority Statement* did not, although the *Final Report* went on as indicating that the General Synod felt that it did represent substantially the faith of the Church of England. So you might want to say: 'In what way is the *Final Report* final? What happens now?' It's only final in the sense that the work has been done by that first Commission. The Lambeth Conference of Bishops is going to take up this and to receive all the reports from different parts of the Anglican Communion and no doubt, following that, statements will be made.

Let me now go on to Justification by Faith and the document *Salvation and the Church*. Some of you will know that I have written a little over the years on Justification by Faith and I have been a bit of a 'Rome-Watcher' in what it has been doing theologically. I want to pick out a couple of points and you will see that I do disagree with David on this area as well, so I believe that this document *Salvation and the Church* is a very significant one. Let me pick out three or four things. 'The basis of Salvation is the Grace of God revealed to us through the Gospel,' it says. What about the source of our Salvation? 'The work of Christ is once for all and the fruit of which is made actual through the Holy Spirit within the Church.' And thirdly, 'Justification [note these words] is a divine declaration of acquittal which through the work of the Cross God's perfect righteousness is reckoned to our account'. Now all those words are lovely Reformation words which are now coming back in this document. What about the

old problem of Works? David has expressed his view of that. Well, Section 19 expresses very clearly that Works follow very hard on the heels of salvation. It actually quotes Ephesians 2: 'We are created in Christ for good works, not saved by them'. And this Report has received warm commendation from many Evangelicals, including Roger Beckwith, and I believe that it is substantially in line with Anglican theology. Now, let me tell you a bit about the process of reception of that one. That document has just been published and is now going out to the different churches and the churches will have the opportunity to respond and Church Society will be able to have an opportunity to respond before F.O.A.G. presents a report to General Synod on that.

Let me conclude. I believe I have given strong grounds why we can with confidence say about the *Eucharist*, the *Ministry* and the *Salvation* documents that they are consonant with Anglican theology. I believe that they signal a major theological breakthrough and that they deserve recognition for it. Yes, we have to acknowledge that some things are not expressed in quite the ways we would have liked, but I want to remind you that the task of finding a unity which is God's Will for his entire church is that we have to listen to the other point of view. We have to try to discover God's truth together. We have to learn to get back to the essentials together and it may mean that we have to put things in a different way from the way in which it has perhaps been done in the past. But what is the place of Church Society in this? Well, let me end, again on a controversial note. When I was young I used to play a lot of football. I used to get annoyed at those who only came along to yell abuse when we made mistakes on the pitch. And to all those Evangelicals who complain about A.R.C.I.C. and ecumenism, I just gently urge you and chide you to get involved at your local and national level as opportunities permit. Try to see the positive advances that have been made. Give us some encouragement from time to time, but remember this. Those who only yell at the referee will eventually be totally ignored.

GEORGE CAREY is now the Bishop of Bath & Wells.