

KENOSIS AND KOINONIA:

THE PATH AHEAD FOR ANGLICAN ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

Koinonia is at the very centre of the Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue in both its phases. It was the architectonic principle of the Final Report of ARCIC I, and it is the central concern of ARCIC II, as the members of that Commission struggle to formulate the steps towards full communion between our two denominations. The notion of koinonia has already signally contributed to our doctrinal rapprochement. To explore the roots of the theology of koinonia in the doctrine of kenosis which emerged as Paul struggled with the down-to-earth problems arising from conflicting groups within his communities will assist us, we hope, as we now turn our attention to the practical task of building communion between our sister churches.

Koinonia, or communion, of its very nature implies unity-in-diversity, and ultimately mirrors the unity-in-diversity of the Trinity. At root unity and diversity are not conflicting forces which achieve balance through a constant tug-of-war or judicious compromise. Rather than cancel each other out, they reinforce each other. To deal with them properly, we must let go of our image, based upon material reality, of quantitatively defined forces and counter-forces, and enter the spiritual mystery of how persons relate to each other, indeed of how they are at root relational. It is only in utter respect for the otherness (diversity) of the other person that bonds of unity can be forged. A unity which bypasses diversity is but a pale image of what unity should be, a mechanical and spiritless uniformity. Unity that is worth its salt welcomes diversity, expresses itself in and is enriched by diversity.

Kenosis, or emptying out, points to a spiritual pattern which is imaged in many other ways in the New Testament. Originating in the so-called kenotic hymn quoted in Paul's Letter to the Philippians (Phil 2:6-11), kenosis refers to the process by which Christ Jesus, in the form of God, did not cling to his status of being God's equal but emptied himself out. The emptying does not imply that he obliterated himself, that he ceased to be himself, but that he refused to cling to a definition of who he was and what rights he was entitled to, in order to go out towards the human and sinful other, take the form of the servant, and become vulnerable unto death as we are. For this, the Father rewarded him with the name which is above every name, bestowing full recognition to the self which perduced through humiliation and death. John's Gospel touches upon the same basic pattern when he tells us that the Grain of wheat must fall into the ground and die if it is to produce any fruit (Jn 12:24). The Synoptics abound in similar references, such as the Sermon on the Mount's injunction not to parade one's relationship to the Lord outwardly but to await the reward of the Father who sees in secret (Mt. 6:2-6), and the injunction to lose one's life in order to find it (Mt. 16:25), to

A Synopsis of
KENOSIS AND KOINONIA: THE PATH AHEAD
FOR ANGLICAN ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

The notion of koinonia is already at the centre of the Final Report of ARCIC I. It offers a model of unity within diversity, prescribes the respect of otherness as the basis of genuine unity. It is rooted in the doctrine of the kenosis of Christ Jesus which Paul formulated in an effort to overcome conflicts within his communities. Without kenosis there is only the empty shell of koinonia.

The paradox of unity-in-diversity deeply marks the primitive Church, as exemplified by the co-existence of Johannine, Pauline, and Jewish Christian communities. It is also operative within the Pauline congregations, with their strong and their weak. The strong had a higher level of education, were more sympathetic to Gnosticizing and enthusiastic tendencies. The weak, of lower standing, were bothered in conscience by the liberties taken by the strong. Paul does not try to abolish the distinction, but asks for mutual forbearance and respect. The very strength and security by which we are ourselves enables us, requires us to divest ourselves, take risks, as we go out to the other. It is in emptying ourselves out that we will find ourselves.

All of this applies to the unity-in-diversity of our two churches. We must let go of (not give up) the values which we treasure most dearly: clarity for Roman Catholics, comprehensiveness for Anglicans. Already we have taken significant steps towards each other. Vatican II represented a key RC kenotic gesture, as was ARCIC I and its acceptance of universal primacy for Anglicans. The next RC step is a magnanimous and trusting acceptance of ARCIC I by the Roman Catholic side.

The measure of substantial agreement thus far reached is such that first institutional steps towards communion ought to be taken. On the Roman Catholic side this would involve a de-bureaucratization of the papacy, a willingness to allow local initiative and decision much more scope than at present. More immediate transitional steps would involve: a) the systematic fostering of shared spiritual experience; b) the fuller recognition by the Roman Catholic side of Anglican Orders, which newer insights into sacramental theology will make easier. Abolicae Curae affirms the insufficiency of the evidence that would enable the Church to positively recognize Anglican orders. Many individual Roman Catholics on the basis of their discernment of the faith, commitment, priestly activity of their Anglican brothers and sisters, have found the sufficient evidence to make their own judgement of recognition. To promote more widely the sharing of experience which underlies this is a crucial step in breaking through the present impasse. c) The less restrictive rules on intercommunion applying to the Eastern Churches ought to apply to Anglicans. This would also imply a broadening of the promise exacted of partners in mixed marriage in terms of the common baptismal covenant.

Jean-Marc Laporte S.J.
Regis College,
Toronto School of Theology

humble oneself in order to be exalted (Mt. 23:12). The pastoral point of this pattern is to beckon us to image forth the death and resurrection of Christ by bearing the cross of our own selfhood.

KENOSIS THE GROUND OF KOINONIA

The basic principle of this article is that without kenosis there is no koinonia. This applies to the many forms of Christian community: from primary groups of strong-minded people seeking to be at one as they worship and serve the Lord -- this was probably the type of situation which prompted Paul to urge his beloved Philippians to kenotic deference -- all the way to the painstaking dialogue and diplomacy required to knit together our separated Churches. Putting this principle in terms of unity and diversity, it is only in emptying oneself out, in going out to the other, in fully respecting the otherness of the other, that the unity-within-diversity of genuine communion becomes a reality. Otherwise we have but the empty shell of koinonia.

This paradox of unity/ diversity was at the heart of the life of the primitive church. Rather than a centralized effort to ensure uniformity according to a careful master-plan, we initially find the co-existence of differently organized forms of Christian life, which, in the course of a century or so, gracefully evolved towards the pattern of deacons, presbyters, and bishops, normative ever since.

One can refer, for instance, to R. Brown's helpful reflections on the contrast between the Johannine communities and the other communities of the emerging "Great Church". With the death of the Beloved Disciple (discipleship plays a much more important role in the Johannine Corpus than apostleship), continuity was assured by the continuing presence of the Paraclete rather than by the succession of officials who were to keep intact what was given to them by the original apostles. The exchange between the Johannine communities and the Great Church entailed the adoption of prevailing structures of authority by the Johannine communities, and of the Johannine higher christology by the Great Church.<1>

One can also refer to the differences between the Pauline communities and the original Jewish Christian communities in Palestine. The first were urban, encompassed a wide sample of the social strata of the time, prized ways of bringing people of widely differing backgrounds to be respectful and deferent towards one another so as to create genuine community bonds. The second were rural, shared the ethical radicalism of the synoptic gospels, were less inclined to be open to people of radically different background.<2> One can also allude to the shift in the Pauline communities from a relatively informal and charismatic organization, where different claims to authority abounded, to the clear pattern found in the later Church, of the bishop as leader and focus of unity within the local Church,<3> a shift documented in

the later Pauline literature, especially the pastorals.

Our main focus however is how Paul dealt with diversity within his communities, and the community we will concentrate on is that of Corinth. It is the one with the most obvious diversities, the one whose social make-up has received the most attention. It encompasses the different parties mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12. It also encompasses the strong and the weak, characterized mainly by their attitudes towards consuming meat sacrificed to idols (1 Cor 8). Though no total consensus on the precise nature and interrelation of these groups is available, current scholarship is moving towards some convergence, and the work of Theissen and Meeks, referred to above, offers us an insightful approach to the interfacing of these groups with the social classes to be found in the urban setting of Corinth.

The community at Corinth, as well as other Pauline congregations, reflected a wide range of social status.<4> Most of its members were likely to be slaves, artisans, small traders, but Paul in his letters usually mentions persons who, though not belonging to the Roman establishment, have nonetheless achieved a certain wealth and position, in more contemporary terms upwardly mobile persons of high status inconsistency open to radical change within themselves and their society.<5>

Let us begin with the "strong", those of a higher level of education, more in touch with the ambient religious culture and its incipient Gnostic tendencies. Many of them were "God-fearers", persons who accepted the monotheism of the Jewish religion without becoming proselytes, since this would jeopardize the social relationships so crucial to their status. Given the heavy hopelessness beginning to pervade the Empire, these more cultured people would be sympathetic to the gnostic, knowledge-oriented view that salvation is purely spiritual, totally achieved in the here and now by withdrawal from the bustle and confusion of the market-place to inner space and its ecstatic phenomena. They would also resonate to visiting missionaries who proclaimed the Gospel with greater rhetorical effectiveness and show of wisdom than Paul. From their position in society, they would already be accustomed to social intercourse with Pagans in meals which featured meat sacrificed to idols, and felt they could do this with a free conscience, since now they knew the idols did not really exist. They buttressed their position on this latter point with arguments which Paul reflects in his letter and to some extent accepts, at least in principle (1 Cor 8).

The weak, if we accept Theissen's interpretation, were persons of a lower social standing and education who would not take well to the free and easy social intercourse of the strong with Pagans. A rare occurrence for them, eating meat bore a numinous quality. Thus, be they of Jewish or Gentile origin, when they saw the strong partake of meat sacrificed to idols, their consciences were sorely bothered.

How did Paul assess the conflicts that emerged within this complex situation? In Galatians he had underlined the inward transformation resulting from justification by faith. The Spirit has been sent into our hearts (Gal 4:6), and we now stand in freedom (Gal 5:1). In Corinthians he stresses the body in all its complexity: the body of the individual Christian sown corruptible and raised incorruptible, the body of the Church with its messy plurality, its strong and its weak, and the need for the strong to forgo their privileges in the interests of the weak. It is at this point that we can perceive a theology of koinonia in the making. Differences are not to be abolished, absorbed, but respected and affirmed. The unity which the strong clung to and boasted in was as hollow as it was premature. The path to genuine unity, unity within diversity, is that of a love which bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things (I Cor 13:7). Such love is able to recognize that:

Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one (I Cor 12: 4-6).

In Galatians Paul invites to a celebration of unity: "In Christ Jesus we are all one; in him there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female" (Gal 3:27-8). By contrast in Corinthians he glories in the indispensable plurality of Christ's body (1 Cor 12), composed of many diverse members, all of them knit together by a kenotic love. Each member, each group, has an indispensable role to play, a unique gift to bring to the body. The otherness of the other is precious. The one who is relegated to the periphery can be as indispensable as the one who claims to be of more central importance. Unity is not something to be imposed by arbitrarily excluding the other who is threatening and unfamiliar. The knitting together of the one and the many is in final analysis the Lord's task and not our own; He is the one to recapitulate all things and present them to the Father (I Cor 15:28). Meanwhile we see as through a glass darkly and journey in trust, rejecting none of the Lord's gifts, no matter how disquieting.

What specific imperative flowed from this as Paul faced the conflicts which rent the Corinthian Church? We can express that imperative in the following pattern: though strong in being who we are, and in enjoying certain rights and privileges, we should not cling to them and stand upon them, but identify ourselves with the weak who are bereft of them. Thus in the divisive matter of meat sacrificed to idols Paul urges the strong to give up the privilege which comes from their knowledge and guiltless conscience, lest they become a stumbling block to the weak (Ch.8). He uses himself as an example of this pattern. His apostolic mission gives him certain rights which he forgoes in the interests of reaching all men and women:

For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law - though not being myself under the law - that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law - not being without law towards God but under the law of Christ - that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the Gospel, that I might share in its blessings. (1 Cor 9:19-23)

Paul concludes his section on this topic with the words "Be imitators of me as I am of Christ" (1 Cor 11:1). This leads us into the letter to the Philippians to which we referred above. It is there that the Christological basis of this pattern is more fully developed. Let us look more closely at his exhortation to the Philippians to be a community after the mind of Christ.

According to a traditional and soundly based interpretation of the kenotic hymn, though Christ Jesus was primordially in the form of God, he did not cling to, or avail himself of the right of recognition which flowed from his equality with God, but emptied himself of that right, becoming man in weakness and vulnerability, and taking the ultimate step of obedience unto death on the cross for us. He does not exchange his strength for weakness, but precisely out of that strength, which abides, he chooses to be weak. His strength is so deeply rooted that it need not be exhibited or explicitated. It remains latent, hidden. <6> His kenosis was graced by the Father's act of exalting him, bringing his equality with God to full recognition. In his risen state that equality becomes transparent, revealed for what it is and proclaimed by every tongue. <7>

The implied contrast is between our Adam-self which turns in on itself, clings to its own rights and prerogatives, defining them with great care and defending them at all costs, since at the core it is insecure, fearful, threatened; and our Christ-self which empties itself out, goes out to others, is not afraid to take risks, since at its core there is a strength which is absolutely secure because it comes from God. Life which is constantly paralyzed by the fear of dying is restricted, narrow, ultimately not worth living. Life which embraces death is transformed. Weakness parading as strength; strength embodying itself in weakness: this sharp alternative cuts across all levels of personal, social, and ecclesial relationship.

This principle of discernment is meant to be used as a scalpel rather than as an axe. It does not preclude the possibility that certain risks are foolhardy and uncalled for, and, in the opposite vein, that some attempts to define and to defend oneself do not stem from weakness. How then shall we assess the reactions of our churches to an ecumenical rapprochement which can

threaten their already established identities? Here psychological models which transpose the doctrine of kenosis in contemporary terms may be of assistance to us. The pivotal point is the quality of those reactions. Do they come out of a stance of inner freedom and spontaneity or are they neurotic: stereotyped, repetitive, rigid, fraught with anxiety, closed to the possibility of new life? In the first case we find distinctive identity and relationship in fruitful symbiosis; in the second we find rigid isolation and engulfment in a vicious cycle of alternation.

ANGLICAN ROMAN CATHOLIC RECONCILIATION: A VISION

How is the paradigm of kenosis pertinent to the establishing of koinonia among our separated churches? Koinonia is precisely that state in which persons, and groups, of diverse background, standpoint, temperament, are able to be so deferent and self-emptying towards each other that a new (not chronologically as in neos but creatively and eschatologically as in kainos) reality emerges, a higher unity that does not cancel out their diversity but celebrates it. This applies to smaller communities as well as to our two sister Churches that now approach each other with the rich diversity which has emerged over a 400 year long separation, but also with stereotypic reactions to each other based upon deeply imbedded fear and anxiety.

Christ's open-handed gesture of kenosis aims to undo Adam's tight-fisted gesture of grasping for equality with God. Adam's sin, on this view, is not so much clinging to a false value as it is clinging to an authentic value in an anxious and disordered way. It was not wrong for Adam to seek equality with God. What was wrong was for him to seek this equality on his own terms, on his own time rather than God's. In urging us towards kenosis Paul invites us to seek out the roots of our personal and institutional disorder. What authentic institutional value is each Church prone to affirm in a disordered way? What is each reluctant to let go of? To discover this requires a searching examination of conscience. One of the advantages of ecumenical dialogue is that honesty enables each side to lay bare its own weakness in these matters and to receive with compassion the other's confession of weakness. My experience is that in the Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue we have begun to do this in earnest.

The institutional value Roman Catholics are tempted to cling to appears to be that of clarity. The preference is for doctrines and norms of behaviour stated in an unambiguous and uncompromising way. When this Roman approach works well, persons and groups at a lower level are confident in their right to apply clear principles with epikeia and human compassion. When it does not work well, principles grow into detailed regulations and insistent calls for submission in matters which do not threaten the unity of the Church. Outer compliance may be achieved but inwardly there will be seething irritation or apathy towards the central authority. The negotiation between unity and plu-

rality which constitutes an essential task of any institution has to that extent failed. The victory of unity is either illusory or pyrrhic.

The corresponding Anglican value -- and here I speak more tentatively because I do not know that tradition from within -- seems to be that of comprehensiveness. The preference is for formulations which, whenever possible, will enable individuals and groups with different sensitivities and convictions to be at home. When it works well, comprehensiveness is a felicitous approach, English rather than Roman, equally traditional and equally valid, to dealing with the one and the many as it affects institutional life. When it does not work well, it may promote a blurred perception of church life and discourage the posing of sharp questions on matters of essential moment. Again the negotiation between unity and plurality has to that extent failed. Their tension has not been allowed to fully emerge.

Clarity and comprehensiveness, in openness to each other, will bring out what is authentically human and perennially valid in our two traditions of dealing with the tensions endemic to all human communities. Together, they can foster a searching and compassionate dialogue between the claims of unity and those of diversity.

To be more specific in formulating the steps we ought to take towards each other, let us ask which of us is the strong and which the weak. Disparity of size and of claims each makes vis-à-vis the other easily leads to the view that Catholics are the strong and Anglicans the weak. In a sense this is correct. Thus on the Catholic side there is a more urgent call not to stand on rights and prerogatives, to take the first step, to be especially careful lest the indispensable gifts and roles to be played by a less numerically important sister Church, more modest in its ecclesiological claims, be forgotten or downtrodden. But at the same we must remember the context of Philippians. Paul is not singling out in that community (as he does in I Cor) those who are strong. All are liable to be in the position of illusory "strength"; all are urged to put on the mind of Christ Jesus, to let go of what is an obstacle to new life. In this light both Anglicans and Roman Catholics are invited to discover within themselves neuralgic areas of illusory strength, to get in touch with the anxiety and the fear which these areas cover up, to become radically vulnerable, in order to receive from the Lord that which he has promised to accomplish in those who follow the pattern of his living and dying.

Both partners in this dialogue have in marvellous ways already begun to respond to the Lord's invitation to imitate this pattern. Vatican II, an unprecedented and humanly unexpected kenotic reponse by the Roman Catholic Church, has set the stage for the ecumenical efforts and breakthroughs of the last twenty years. It reassessed and sought to reform many long-standing Roman Catholic practises and attitudes. One of its most significant acts was

to ratify a shift in the Church's self-consciousness. No longer simply equating itself with the Body of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church in Vatican II fully recognized genuine ecclesial reality outside itself, endorsed a new formulation that the Body of Christ subsists in the Roman Catholic Church, and resolutely committed itself to seek reconciliation with other Christian bodies. This opened the path for a number of official dialogues. The Anglican members of the Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue have matched Vatican II with a striking and unprecedented kenotic gesture of their own, joining their Roman Catholic partners in expressing willingness to accept in principle that the Pope exercises an authentic and authoritative primatial function within the universal Church. <8> However this particular action of the Anglican dialogue members has yet to be officially endorsed by the Churches of that Communion. Should this official endorsement be forthcoming, this major kenotic step will have reached its completion.

What major step is the Roman Catholic side now called upon to take? The first step is to receive the Final Report. This does not mean swallowing it whole without critical analysis. However it equally does not mean examining the document with the presumption of bad faith, with the itch to list every lurking ambiguity and every possible instance of papering over real disagreement. Nor does it mean demanding of the Anglican partner, before any measure of institutional rapprochement can take place, literal adherence to the clear formulas by which the Roman Catholic side has grown accustomed to express its faith. If the Roman Catholic side is confident in the strength and authenticity of its tradition as it unfolds throughout the centuries, it does not have to anxiously protect itself by demanding that the other give such adherence to its formulas, but it can confidently, trusting the Spirit at work in itself and in its partners, explore new formulas, new ways of expressing the truth embodied in the traditional formulas of both denominations. In this there is a real risk, a letting go of what has become familiar and comforting, but it is precisely at this point that Paul's kenotic injunction becomes pertinent, even urgent. This price must be paid if the Lord is to bestow upon us the gift of a new ecclesial reality which encompasses the old but goes beyond it, to the glory of God the Father.

Official acceptance of the conclusions of the Final Report by both parties would not imply that we can immediately proceed to full communion with each other. Authority I pointed out four areas of outstanding divergence, and it appears from Authority II that at least in one of them, that of the infallibility, even under strictly delimited terms, of the papal magisterium, the most that can be said is that substantial agreement has been reached in fieri rather than in facto esse. The measure of substantial agreement is such, however, that in addition to efforts to reach a more explicit resolution of outstanding doctrinal issues, we should vigorously pursue how we might best en flesh in suitable juridical structures the unprecedented and unexpected convergence already achieved in ARCIC I -- and both of these are mandates of

ARCIC II. These structures would be unique; it is hoped that they would be temporary since we are beginning to see full communion as a goal not entirely beyond our God-assisted grasp. However they would play an absolutely crucial role. It is in the experience of living together, growing together, together facing the challenges of our dying millenium, that both of us will receive the courage to take the final steps towards each other.

Before suggesting first institutional steps towards partial communion, let us with hopeful trepidation imagine the final steps towards full communion and their outcome.

Again the steps which Anglicans might have to take are less clear to me because I do not know that tradition from within. It would appear that entering into a new relation with the Roman Catholic Church on the basis of the Final Report would imply considerable soul-searching. Perhaps some persons and groups, undisturbed under the present Anglican modus operandi, would have to make difficult decisions about the ecclesial values to which they give priority. It probably would also be necessary for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to decide whether they want to enter into a new relationship with Rome as one communion with a global identity of its own and a real measure of autonomy, or whether each Church is to go its own way, and work out appropriate relationships on a local basis. In the first case the unifying role now played by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lambeth Conference would likely be bolstered by a real measure of juridical power. In the second case the separate identity of the Anglican communion within the Great Church would be less clear, and, to my mind at least, we would set aside an unparalleled opportunity to offer witness to the world on how to handle human diversity creatively and magnanimously.

The steps which Roman Catholics might have to take are more vividly present to me. If Anglicans are willing to accept a universal primacy which bears responsibility for the unity of the Churches and has the authority that corresponds to this responsibility, a universal primacy which treasures and protects the diversity with which the Lord has gifted his Church, then it is incumbent upon the Catholic partner in this reconciliation to take the practical steps needed to implement this vision. This will involve going back to the more informal role which the Bishop of Rome exercised in the first millenium, but to do this only as an instance of "reculer pour mieux sauter": a new reality would be created, rooted in the traditional values of collegiality and subsidiarity central to the Great Church of the first millenium, but also responsive to the incredible planetary closeness brought about by modern means of communication and to the patterns of leadership which that closeness both calls for and makes possible.

One of the by-products of our age has been bureaucratic centralization, the imposition of an impersonal uniformity in the vain hope of mastering the

incredible complexity of our age. In his critique of the structures of both capitalism and communism Pope John Paul II has implicitly called for us to overcome this secular and dehumanizing impersonalism. In this he is part of a strong current of opinion concerning the present socio-political scene, which deplores the inhumanity of our techno-bureaucracy, which proclaims that small is beautiful, which invites us to explore the alliance of modern technical means with a humanly scaled and ecologically sound environment. To the extent that either of or both our churches give into contemporary centralizing trends, their strictures against totalitarianism become inauthentic.

Centralization has been a highly significant theme in the Roman Catholic church during most of the second millenium and above all since Vatican I. Within it resides a temptation away from kenosis towards inauthenticity. But at the same time if we are to act locally, each one deeply in touch with the pitfalls and possibilities of one's own situation -- and this is meant to apply to our two Communion and their local churches -- we should also provide for ourselves effective institutions that will help us think out and coordinate our efforts on a global scale. The challenge of Anglican Roman Catholic unity dovetails in a striking way with the challenges of our age. If as Churches we are able to meet the ecumenical challenge, the witness we give to our age will be all the more incisive and credible.

The precise lineaments of a Church renewed by full Anglican Roman Catholic partnership are beyond our ken. One can only offer a tentative and incomplete sketch. The 20th century pope who was above all seen as the builder of communion was John XXIII. He did not tie up his energy in justifying his own right to be obeyed and followed, in restricting initiatives from below lest they give rise to a messy and ambiguous pluralism. In a simple and transparent way he led, and others followed, not just with their lips but with their hearts. People of all faiths and denominations were inspired and guided by him as a universal shepherd. The Council which he called reemphasized the genuinely traditional values of collegiality and subsidiarity, and on many fronts evidenced the Church's sincere wish to recognize what is not itself. John XXIII offers us a model for a renewed papal office both universal in scope and outreach and respectful of the particular, willing to make room for what is new and different, trusting more in the ways of the Spirit than in the fearful expertise of an entrenched bureaucracy.

John XXIII opened up an arduous path, and his successor Paul VI admirably orchestrated the implementation of that path. However conversion does not come without a struggle, especially when matters touching the heart of an institution's functioning are at stake. A wave of conservatism, of nostalgia for the good old times, of retrenchment, is now affecting the Church as well as secular society. One senses a fear, a reluctance to consistently remake the administrative structures of the Church according to the Council. Central to such a remaking would be the willingness of the Holy See to countenance

and consistently operate within structures which embody not the presumption that decisions of any real significance (e.g. the nomination of bishops) cannot be entrusted to the local level but must be reserved to itself, but rather the presumption that the Holy Spirit does operate in the local Churches. This would imply the need for a specific and carefully documented warrant before the central authority involves itself in local affairs. The role of the centre is not to stifle the periphery but to enable it to lead its own life. It should take action only where the global witness and action of the Church is endangered. Can anyone fault Anglicans for a reluctance to come under the purview of the central administrative organs of the Catholic Church as they currently function?

Those who wield administrative power find kenosis especially difficult: they abhor the messy complexity which ensues when people are allowed to go their own way rather than follow carefully worked out specifications. The present state of both church and secular society amply demonstrates the illusion which lurks in such an attitude. So often the treasured norms and procedures devised in a central office end up existing in filing cabinets only: in reality people tend to go their own way and do their own thing, disrespecting an authority which they feel is remote and in some cases has discredited itself. Civil power can exact a measure of outer compliance, but less so than before. The sheer complexity of social, political and economic relationships makes our societies at heart powerless and plural, especially in matters of moment. <9> Those who feel a chasm between their own often confused but sincere efforts to lead a decent life and what goes on in our Church headquarters and curias and chanceries quietly go their own way, often right out the door.

The complexity of our world is so intractable that only by patiently entering into and empathizing with the myriad initiatives, concerns, forces which surround and stimulate us, will we achieve the unity within plurality we long for. This just as true of ecclesiastical society. In this context the undefined subtleties and organizational pitfalls of Anglican Roman Catholic reunion, horrifying to the lover of clear and distinct ideas, are a sign of the times, an invitation to the Church that it share the condition of the world to which it is sent and learn newer and better ways of speaking to it out of the treasure of the Gospel.

This move towards a relative decentralization applies to the entire Church, including the Roman Catholic, because we are all living in the same world. However it does not preclude the possibility of different ways of relating to the universal primate, respectful of earlier traditions while going beyond them.

A real "yes" to the Final Report of ARCIC I, and to whatever conclusions are reached by ARCIC II, would imply far-reaching structural change with incalculable consequences for both sides. That "yes" will be difficult. Thus we need to be especially attentive to the process of coming to it, to devise and implement a policy of strategic gradualism. Better partial kenosis leading to partial communion than no movement at all in each other's direction. Our two Churches ought to be invited to say "yes" to the more circumscribed and limited objectives which they see as concretely possible to them right now, with the expectation that living in the new situation thus brought about will generate the new data and feelings which will make the final "yes" feasible and natural. To take partial steps is not weakness but simply an adaptation to the laws of human pedagogy, yet another example of kenosis.

What are some possible transitional steps? I will explore two kinds of steps, the first of a more personal and experiential nature, probably less difficult to implement, but necessary if we are to solidly undergird juridical steps towards partial communion which I will then offer for consideration.

a) Already at all levels of Church polity Anglicans and Roman Catholics are beginning to take seriously the presumption that where there is no reason to go our separate ways we ought to be, pray, and act together. Individual bishops and groups of bishops, dioceses, parish communities, smaller groups of committed Christians, including official dialogue groups on the international and national levels, are reaching out to each other and finding that their spiritual quests and their pastoral contexts converge to a remarkable degree. They are forging the bonds of community in Christ. By sharing with someone over a period of time in all dimensions of the Christian life, the witness of that other's faith, even in matters which thus far have been sources of real or apparent division, is no longer met with a query about whether we can really mean the same thing when we subscribe to the same formulas, but with heartfelt trust in and appreciation of each other's word. Experience of one another at the deepest levels of our commitment is indispensable: we will never create the necessary climate for unity simply by analyzing each other's texts and going over the terrain of our past. Faith in God's word does not lead us to unity unless it is embodied in our faith in each other's word. Anglicans and Roman Catholics are beginning with respect to each other to nurture the gift of this inter-personal and inter-ecclesial faith. The first step simply consists in continuing this process more deliberately, intensely, and systematically, bringing to the center of our concern the dimension of shared spiritual experience which will quicken the dead bones of academic debate into a living breathing dialogue.

b) The next step is a much more difficult one. It would consist in the Roman Catholic Church taking the juridical steps needed to bring to a greater degree of parallelism the recognition which our two churches presently give

to one another. The Churches of the Anglican Communion do not withdraw recognition from the sacraments of ordination and eucharist celebrated in the Roman Catholic Church. The converse is not true because of the decision of Apostolicae Curae in 1896, which, in the peremptory language of that period, declared Anglican orders null and void, or, in canonical language, invalid.

Newer insights in sacramental theology^{<10>} offer a distinction which was not current in 1896, but which can significantly lift the burden of reassessing the 1896 decision today. This distinction offers a more acceptable way of understanding the 1896 decision, one which was neither affirmed or denied at that time, but which from the retrospective standpoint of the one who does genuine history is quite pertinent. This distinction builds upon the easily grasped point of logic that it is quite different to claim sufficient evidence to say that something is not so (e.g. atheism: I know God does not exist), and to claim insufficient evidence to say that something is so (e.g. agnosticism: I don't know if God exists). This allows to construe Apostolicae Curae in a different way: to judge Anglican orders invalid does not imply sufficient evidence that the sacramental gestures of ordination and eucharist (sacramentum tantum) posed by Anglicans do not issue forth in the intended reality, be it the res et sacramentum (real presence, indelible character) or the res sacramenti (sacramental grace). That would be to arrogate to oneself the standpoint of God who alone inwardly judges, indeed constitutes, the graced reality of our hearts and the sacramental efficacy of our actions. On this view the 1896 judgement of invalidity finally does no more than bespeak insufficient evidence on this point, leading the Church to say that whether the reality is there or not -- that judgement is left to God -- it does not consider itself authorized to officially recognize those orders and eucharistic celebrations as having taken place, in other words, to recognize them as valid.

This re-interpretation makes the eventual reversal of the non-infallible Apostolicae Curae less traumatic: the Roman Catholic Church would be opening itself to new data and theological perspectives, the lack of which prevented it from issuing a prudential judgement recognizing Anglican orders in 1896, the presence of which would allow it to make that judgement today.

It is not my purpose to survey the new theological perspectives and evidence which to my mind now justifies the Roman Catholic Church making a positive judgement on Anglican orders. A broader understanding of apostolic succession and of the role of sacramental intention, together with a better knowledge of the circumstances alleged in Apostolicae Curae, are important factors bearing on this reassessment.^{<11>}

What I would like to bring out is the experiential component which in a practical matter such as this must accompany the more technical/ theological component.^{<12>} The Holy See as such has not as yet found sufficient evidence

to recognize Anglican orders, but a many Catholics, probably a good majority of those who have had extended contact with Anglicans, spontaneously recognize the Anglican priest before them as a priest and the Anglican eucharist as a genuine celebration of the Lord's supper. The immediate discernment which enables my faith to recognize the faith of another, my commitment to the Lord Jesus to affirm that of another person, my Spirit-empowered service to rejoice in that of another person, is a genuine gift. <13> Even if one should be unable to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that all the conditions of form and intention for the valid ordination of these Anglicans were met down through the centuries, is such a proof the only avenue to recognizing this validity? Whether there is sufficient evidence of a technical nature or not, I not only may but usually am called to act in such matters out of a prudential judgement based in large part upon the claims of the person and the evident coherence of these claims with his or her actions, life, and beliefs, all of these giving expression to a genuine inner faith reality which I readily discern. Indeed if as a Roman Catholic priest I meet someone who wants to be recognized as a Roman Catholic priest, I do not immediately ask him for iron-clad guarantees that each ordaining prelate all the way back in the line of his succession was not withholding his intention to ordain or afflicted by some defect of form. To require metaphysical certainty in a matter such as this is unreasonable and inhuman.

Indeed the human and prudential approach urged by the charity of Christ is deeply traditional. One ought not to allow one's suspicion or knowledge of another's unworthiness or unorthodoxy to impugn the reality of the sacraments of which that other is a minister. God's grace is not to be measured out by human pettiness. This was the path Augustine took against the Donatists. Such should be the magnanimity of the Catholic Church as it reassesses the validity of Anglican orders and eucharist. The presumption should be favour of the graced reality of Anglican life and ministry as directly perceived by Catholic believers, priests, and bishops. The Catholic Church may not know how the Lord has been present to the Anglican Churches in their complex history of sin and grace, faith and unfaithfulness, how the efficacy of Christ's sacraments has been handed on to them during the four centuries of their pilgrimage, but does its own vaunted theological and canonical clarity plumb the depths of how the Lord has been present to it, in the midst of its own history of sin and grace, faith and unfaithfulness?

There is no use hiding the fact that a highly significant obstacle to the Roman Catholic Church recognizing Anglican orders is the approval of the ordination of women by many of the Churches of that communion. Would not Roman Catholic recognition of Anglican orders ipso facto imply the recognition that in principle women can be validly ordained to the priesthood? Is not such a recognition unthinkable in the light of the reiterated statements by the Roman magisterium in recent years? That some Anglican churches have decided to refrain from ordaining women can be seen as an ecumenically sensi-

tive gesture in the context of the closeness we have achieved since Vatican II. That other Anglican churches have authorized the ordination of women is their response to the needs of the pastoral situation, to their understanding of what is normative in the tradition, and to the experience of women who are pastorally active in their church and feel called to serve the Lord and his church as priests, a response they judge to be right and proper in the power of the Holy Spirit who constantly evokes new life within the church.

This issue is a particularly thorny one. I simply offer a few remarks in the hope that they may be pertinent:

i) The proper resolution of this question within the Roman Catholic Church in great part hinges upon an adequate methodology. That women have never been ordained before is an argument that carries considerable weight in that Church. However such an argument is not of itself conclusive, since, generalized, it would preclude there ever being a new beginning, a first time for anything in the Church. In addition to searching the tradition and seeking to distinguish its true substance from the socio-cultural context in which it has been properly or improperly embodied down through the ages, we must also discern the experience of the Spirit converting and calling the hearts of men and women in the Church, and resolutely face the pastoral challenges which emerge in each age. Only then will we be able to tell what is a departure from the Lord's will as manifested through the ages and what is a failure of courage to be creative in the Spirit.

ii) Willy-nilly the Roman Catholic Church is faced with two inescapable facts: 1) Christ's mandate for Christian unity brooks no hesitation or compromise; and 2) some of the Churches, including Churches of the Anglican communion, with which it is called upon to enter into unity, have taken the step of ordaining women to the priesthood, a step which in the present climate of the Western world, which has become very sensitive to the equality of men and women, would be very difficult to reverse. If the ordination of women ends up being the crucial stumbling-block to Anglican Roman Catholic reconciliation, we would have a universal church divided in terms of male and female. On one side of the divide many women would feel supported and empowered in the fulness of ministry, on the other deprived and relegated to the periphery. Such a new situation would have to be measured up against Paul's strongly stated principle that in Christ Jesus there is to be neither slave nor free, Jew nor Greek, male nor female (Gal 3:27-28).

iii) For Roman Catholics the present canonical strictures against the ordination of women are clear even though many see the theological arguments adduced against ordaining women as subtle and not totally convincing. In the quest for a resolution that will unite rather than divide, we need a supplement of clarity. Here the gift by which we discern the texture of our experience should play a role of great importance. As Anglicans and Roman Catho-

lives live, pray, share the burdens of a difficult mission, not separately but side by side, men and women in lay ministry, men and women priests, the authenticity of this new practise of ordaining women to the priesthood will slowly be tested out, and appropriate conclusions for both Churches drawn.

c) Along with the partial step of recognizing the validity of Anglican orders, a number of other partial juridical steps can be taken, some concomitantly, others only after Anglican orders have been recognized:

1) A recognition by the Roman Catholic Church of Anglican orders would bring the members of the Anglican Church to a status similar to that of the Eastern Churches not in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church, and make possible the application of a less restrictive set of rules for inter-communion. <14> An agreement regulating this matter with the Anglican communion as a whole or with its constituent Churches would appear relatively feasible once such recognition has taken place.

ii) Such a recognition would make easier the resolution of the painful issue of mixed marriages and the promise to be made by the Catholic partner to do what lies within his or her power to have children brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. There is considerable precedent within the Roman Catholic Church for interpreting the promise to do what lies within one's power in terms of a moral and humanly contextualized possibility rather than in terms of a metaphysical possibility, which means that in practise decisions regarding the upbringing of children fully take into consideration the corresponding obligation of the Anglican partner with regards to the upbringing of children in the Anglican tradition, as well as the overall context of the marriage. However in practise an unwelcome unevenness remains. What is more important, it would be far better to formulate any required promise in broader Christian and baptismal terms, making it possible for both partners in conscience to take it, and to seek the best approach to fulfilling their responsibility towards their children in much the same way that they would under the more enlightened interpretation of the promise currently demanded by the Roman Catholic Church.

The path to full communion will be a very difficult one. We need to continue to loyally question our own and each other's traditions, but also to discern what the Lord is telling us as we grow in experience of each other -- to my mind this is of critical importance, given the impossibility of reaching total clarity through a study of our traditions alone -- and to respond realistically to the challenges of the age in which we are both inserted.

If our remarks have clarified the vital connection between the deeply human patterns of dialogue groping and trust which are at the center of Anglican Roman Catholic reconciliation, and the crucial Christian imperative of kenosis, then they have achieved their intended effect.

Letting go and trusting, recognizing that the Spirit speaks not only in "us" but also in "them", is an integral part of the kenosis to which Anglicans and Roman Catholics are both called. Our response to this call ought to be marked by an open-ended readiness to accept whatever new realities the Lord wants to awaken within his Church. The first apostles and leaders of the primitive Church did not have a blue-print of the Great Church as it would exist a hundred years after their deaths. They were ready to be led by the Spirit, trusting that when the time came they or their successors would know what to endorse and what to reject. Are we willing to trust that the Spirit is present in our 20th century ecumenical groping? Are we requiring more clarity for the next step than the Lord wants us to have? Are we unwilling in this crucial area to make do with seeing through a glass darkly?

NOTES

1. R. Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Lives, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times, Paulist Press, New York, 1979, pp. 87-88.
2. Gerd Theissen, The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth, Fortress, Philadelphia, pp. 102-ff.
3. Wayne Meeks, The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul, Yale University Press, New Haven, pp. 131 ff.
4. Meeks, op. cit., ch.2, esp. 73; SSPC ch.2, esp. 69, 106 ff.
5. Meeks, op. cit., 73.
6. In more theological terms, Paul is not talking about a process in which Christ exchanges the form of God for the form of man, but rather one in which being in the form of God he takes on the form of man.
7. For a fuller development of this topic, with reference to contemporary psychological literature, see my article "Kenosis Old and New" in The Ecumenist, 1974, pp. 17-21.
8. I have not been able to find any similar recognition of the role of the universal primate in Orthodox-Catholic documents. This might lead us to give a different appreciation to the common notion that that the Orthodox Churches are closer to the Roman Catholic Church than are the Anglican ones.
9. Cf. James Ogilvy, Many Dimensional Man: Decentralizing Self, Society, and the Sacred, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977, especially Chapter One.
10. Cf. F.J. van Beeck, Grounded in Love: Sacramental Theology in an Ecumenical Perspective, Washington, University Press of America, 1981, chapter 2, Validity and Invalidity, pages 41-56, esp. p. 48. Van Beeck quotes John Coventry as calling for thorough research into the notion of sacramental validity.

The New Code does not settle these issues, but is open to a more subtle and flexible approach to validity and invalidity than the one which seems to have prevailed at the time of Apostolicae Curae, as is evidenced in the following:

a) The Code puts the onus of proof on the one who would cast doubt upon the validity of baptism performed in a non-Catholic ceremony (Canon. 869,]2) A fortiori this onus would apply to the one who would not only express a doubt about a previous baptism but positively refuse to recognize its reality.

b) Canon 844 is most germane to the issue of Anglican Orders. In the first place that canon presupposes the familiar distinction between what is done lawfully/ unlawfully and what is done validly/ invalidly. This distinction very easily fits into the external forum approach to validity. A valid but unlawful sacramental gesture is one which the Church is willing to recognize as having taken place even though there is some derogation from the norms affecting that gesture. An invalid sacramental gesture is one which the Church is not willing to recognize as having taken place, since the prima facie defective elements are so notable that it refuses to issue a positive judgement confirming the inner reality of the sacramental gesture.

c) Canon 844 makes a distinction between those separated churches whose sacraments of Penance, Eucharist, Anointing (and Orders) are recognized as valid (J2) and those where such recognition is not forthcoming. How does one know whether a Church's sacraments are valid or not? The eastern churches separated from Rome are certainly judged to possess valid sacraments. But then the possibility is opened of the Catholic Church judging that other churches are in the same position as the eastern churches so far as the sacraments are concerned. Validity/ invalidity here is closely bound up with the Church's judgement. That judgement is stated not in internal forum terms of whether the sacramental grace or character is present or absent but in external forum terms of whether that Church stands in a position of equivalency with the Eastern Churches (and the Roman Catholic Church) in possessing sacraments recognized as valid (J3). This is in continuity with the Decree on Ecumenism of Vatican II which, rather than making a distinction between the Churches of the East and the Ecclesial Communities of the West, referred to the Churches of the East and the Churches and Ecclesial Communities of the West (Par. 19).

d) Canon 844 singles out those churches whose sacraments are declared to be valid and says nothing about the sacraments of the others being invalid. Hesitancy to make a judgement of invalidity would appear to presuppose the internal forum notion of invalidity. But if that presupposition is accurate then the pointed refusal to issue a judgement of invalidity indicates the unwillingness of the Church to stand behind the position that in those cases the sacramental gesture is definitely devoid of reality.

The underlying theology of Canon 844 is not totally clear, but it does offer a framework helpful for the reevaluation of Anglican Orders.

11. A recent articulate proponent of the official Roman Catholic view of Anglican orders, F. Clark, writing in the New Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume 1, p. 696-698, claims that the defective "native character and spirit of the Ordinal" is central in the argument of Apostolicae Curae:

When the (Anglican ordination) rite is judged in its total context, historical and theological, it is plain that none of the formulas it contains, even those which expressly include the words "priest" or "bishop", can serve to convey the essential sacramental signification required for transmitting the Catholic priesthood (696).

The work of the Anglican Catholic dialogue casts a substantial doubt on this interpretation of the "native character and spirit of the Ordinal". In the light of our present convergence on the very issues of eucharist and ministry, is it so clear that the Anglicans and Roman Catholics of earlier days were attacking precisely what their opponents were defending? The Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue gives a powerful impetus to leave behind our more superficial separate chronicles of the events which led to the separation of Canterbury from Rome, to a penetrating common account. Real history is only possible when the smoke of controversy has died down. This common account can sift out deeply held intentions and meanings, inaccessible at the time, from the unfortunate exaggerations, simplifications, and caricatures to which the heat of controversy led the protagonists of that unhappy period of history, and from the latent presuppositions which made it difficult for them to really dialogue with each other. It can distinguish between what pertains to one or other individual who was especially instrumental in promoting hard and fast division, from what pertains to the overall movement of two different

Christian communities.

12. I am coming out of a position based on Lonergan's Method in Theology. A panoply of eight functional specialties must be brought to bear on theological issues. The point can be put more simply. Unless theology, and this applies to the ramifications of theology for Church life as well, is based upon a correct reading of the authentic tradition, is open to the ongoing conversion experience of the theologian himself and of the Church, and is responsive to the apostolic challenges of the day, it will not carry forth and further unfold the authentic tradition.

13. The episode related in Acts 10:44-48 has some bearing on this point. There was among Peter and the believers assembled at the house of Cornelius an immediate and spontaneous inclination to believe that the Holy Spirit had been poured out upon certain pagans. Peter and the believers could have argued that since the proper procedures had not been followed, what they saw was not the effect of the Holy Spirit, but some kind of illusion. But instead they yielded to the evidence before them, they were open to having their views of how God acts expanded even though the conclusions for ecclesial order would be difficult to implement peacefully. Similarly when Jesus' disciples were upset that others were expelling demons in his name, his attitude was not the legal a priori one of "he who is not for us is against us" but the welcoming a posteriori one of "he who is not against us is for us." Both episodes manifest a willingness to discern the existence of a graced reality on immediate terms, without having some kind of prior juridical guarantee about it.

14. Cf. the new Code of Canon Law, Canon 844, especially Nos. 3 and 4.

A BRIEF EXCURSUS ON VALIDITY

There appear to be two possible approaches to the basis for a clear and unambiguous distinction between sacramental validity and invalidity?

a) Internal Forum Approach: This basis could be the presence or absence of the inner reality (res et sacramentum) directly symbolized by the visible gesture (sacramentum). Validity would mean that the inner reality is judged to exist and the outer gesture is judged to be authentic, worthy of being recognized as such by the Church. Invalidity would mean that the inner reality is judged not to exist and the outer gesture judged to be an empty imposture, in spite of what may be the good intentions of the ones who pose it. In either case the sacramental gesture might be fruitful, God bestowing the inner grace (res) of the sacrament.

b) External Forum Approach: This basis could be the presence or absence of the Church's positive judgement that the inner reality corresponding to the outer gesture is present. Validity would mean that the Church considers that it has sufficient evidence to make a morally certain judgement that the inner sacramental reality is there and the outer gesture is worthy of recognition as authentic. Invalidity would mean that the Church does not consider the evidence sufficient to warrant such a positive judgement; thus, whether in the eyes of God the inner reality is there or not, the Church is not willing to recognize the outer act as authentic, as having a real inward effect. As we saw in the article, invalidity under a) is equivalent to atheism (I know that God does not exist), and under b) to agnosticism (I do not know whether God exists.)

The precise meaning of validity/ invalidity is nowhere nailed down in the new Code of Canon Law. Thus it is left to be deduced from the context in each case (Cf. Canon 17). In some cases invalidity may appear to pertain to the inner forum sacramental reality, as when the Church, going beyond a judgement of doubt about the validity of a previous baptism, calls for absolute baptism or rebaptism rather than conditional rebaptism. (Interestingly enough -- and there is no reason not to apply this principle to sacraments other than baptism -- the Church puts the onus of proof on the one who would wish to cast doubt upon the validity of baptism performed in a non-Catholic ceremony (Canon. 869, *2) A fortiori this onus would apply to the one who would wish not only to express a doubt about a previous baptism but to positively refuse to recognize its reality.) In other cases the external forum approach to validity/ invalidity appears to be appropriate. Since Canon Law as such pertains to the external forum, one would normally presume the aptness of the external forum approach to validity/ invalidity unless there is strong evidence to the contrary.

Canon 844 is the one which is most germane to the issue of Anglican Orders. It appears to be somewhat ambiguous on the matter of internal versus external forum approaches to invalidity, though the preponderance of the evidence seems to point in the direction of external forum invalidity. In either approach it holds back from a clear judgement of internal forum invalidity.

In the first place that canon presupposes the familiar distinction between what is done lawfully/ unlawfully and what is done validly/ invalidly. This distinction very easily fits into the external forum approach to validity. A valid but unlawful sacramental gesture is one which the Church is willing to recognize as having taken place even though there is some derogation from the norms affecting that gesture. An invalid sacramental gesture is one which the Church is not willing to recognize as having taken place, since the prima facie defective elements are so notable that it refuses to issue a positive judgement confirming the inner reality of the sacramental gesture.

In the second place the canon makes a distinction between those separated churches whose sacraments of Penance, Eucharist, Anointing (and Orders) are recognized as valid (*2) and those where such recognition is not forthcoming. In the first case Catholics may receive them from non-Catholic ministers and in the second case not. In the first case non-Catholics may receive them from Catholic ministers under less stringent conditions, in the second case under more stringent ones. How does one know whether a Church's sacraments are valid or not? The eastern churches separated from Rome are certainly judged to possess valid sacraments. But then the possibility is opened of the Catholic Church judging that other churches are in the same position as the eastern churches so far as the sacraments are concerned. Validity/ invalidity here is closely bound up with the Church's judgement. That judgement is stated not in internal forum terms of whether the sacramental grace or character is present or absent but in external forum terms of whether that Church stands in a position of equivalency with the Eastern Churches (and the Roman Catholic Church) in possessing sacraments recognized as valid (*3).

In the third place, the canon avoids the term 'invalid' with respect to the sacraments of those Churches who are not in the same position as the Eastern Churches. It simply singles out those churches whose sacraments are declared to be valid and says nothing about the sacraments of the others being invalid. Hesitancy to make a judgement of invalidity would appear to

presuppose the internal forum notion of invalidity. But if that presupposition is accurate then the pointed refusal to issue a judgement of invalidity indicates the unwillingness of the Church to stand behind the position that in those cases the sacramental gesture is definitely devoid of reality.

The underlying theology of canon 844 is not totally clear, but it certainly does offer a framework helpful to the re-evaluation of Anglican orders.