

ARCIC

An Open Letter to the Anglican Episcopate

An Evangelical Open Letter about the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, addressed to all the Archbishops and Diocesan Bishops of the Anglican Communion

Easter 1988

NOTES

- (1) This Open Letter was commissioned by the Executive Committee of the Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion, and comes to you with the goodwill of its Council.
- (2) It is hoped that archbishops and bishops will read the full text, but, for those who cannot find the time, a summary has been added as Appendix I.
- (3) Appendix II contains the list of Anglican evangelical leaders who have signed the Open Letter. In doing so, they have indicated their agreement with its thrust and substance, while not necessarily wishing to endorse every detail of it. They have not seen the summary.
- (4) No members of ARCIC I and II have been invited to sign, since the Letter relates to their work.
- (5) Since the Open Letter is addressed to the archbishops and diocesan bishops of the Anglican Communion, it has not been deemed appropriate to invite any of them to sign it. Nevertheless, some have been given the opportunity to express their general sympathy with its viewpoint and their hope that its concerns will be carefully considered both at the Lambeth Conference and in the ongoing work of ARCIC II. Their names are listed separately in Appendix III, together with one or two assistant bishops and a consultant who have been invited to the Lambeth Conference.
- (6) Those listed in Appendices II and III have acted purely *in their personal capacity*.

THE TEXT OF THE LETTER

A. Introduction

1. An Open letter, signed by 125 Anglican evangelical leaders, was addressed in June 1977 to the Anglican episcopate. It concerned relations between the Anglican Churches and the Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholic and Ancient Oriental Churches.

Over 10 years later, with the agenda of the 1988 Lambeth Conference in mind, 511 Anglican evangelical leaders from 35 countries address this Open Letter to the worldwide Anglican episcopate. It focusses entirely on the ARCIC enterprise.

2. The Bishops at the 1978 Lambeth Conference described the first three ARCIC statements as 'a solid achievement'. Taking them as a whole, we agree with this judgment. We also venture to echo the appreciation expressed in 1982 by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope for the 'dedication, scholarship and integrity' of the Commission's members.

3. We are aware of the 'ecumenical impatience' of some who regard our church leaders as unnecessarily dragging their feet, and of others who dismiss our continuing separation as a sixteenth century European squabble which need not inhibit them. At the same time, the Anglican provinces which have so far responded to the Anglican Consultative Council's questions about ARCIC, while seeking generally to be positive, have expressed important reservations, anxieties, criticisms, and requests for clarification and elaboration, many of which we share (see *The Emmaus Report, 1987*).

4. We ourselves are strongly committed to the quest for both the unity and the purity of the church, indeed for 'that unity in truth for which Christ prayed', as Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey put it in their Common Declaration of March 1966. So we are grateful that ARCIC has said from the beginning that there are some 'essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits of no divergence' (*Ministry*, para. 17) and that 'the achievement of doctrinal agreement . . . is central to our reconciliation' (*Final Report*, conclusion p.99).

5. A crucial question, therefore, is how we are to distinguish between these 'essential matters', on which there must be unity, and those 'matters indifferent' (*adiaphora*), in which we should give each other liberty. For we look neither for a rigid uniformity in all matters, nor for an unlimited pluralism, but for a principled comprehensiveness. And must we not add that the 'principle' or criterion of a true comprehensiveness is Holy Scripture, since those doctrines which are demonstrably taught by Scripture (and only those) must be regarded as primary and essential? Our Anglican formularies unequivocally affirm this. We also note the Roman Catholic bishops' acceptance at the Second Vatican Council of 'two streams' of revelation in place of Trent's 'two source' view. We understand this to imply that tradition, being the church's developing interpretation of Scripture, always stands in dependence upon it. If so, is this not a significant move towards the recognition that Scripture has a normative authority over tradition?

6. It is because the ARCIC documents do not express this perspective with sufficient clarity that we believe it necessary to press the question we asked in the 1977 Open Letter, namely whether both churches 'are yet sufficiently ready to test all their traditions of teaching and practice by Holy Scripture, as we know we are bound to test ours, in order to correct what the theology of the Bible will not justify'. The supremacy of Scripture was the formative principle of the Reformation. We could never ourselves surrender it. We are convinced that its unambiguous acknowledgment by our two churches would both express our loyalty to Christ (who himself subordinated tradition to Scripture) and greatly accelerate our progress towards an acceptable unity.

7. We seriously wonder, therefore, whether the right question has been put to the churches, namely whether the first four ARCIC statements are on the one hand 'consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans' and on the other 'consonant in substance with the faith of the Catholic Church'. For the two churches can reply only by comparing ARCIC's work with their own foundation documents (especially the 39 Articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent). But to do this is surely to contradict ARCIC's basic methodology, which is to go *behind* the sixteenth century debates and definitions, and to re-examine earlier teaching, and especially that of Scripture. The Commission followed this principle most notably in its fresh evaluation of the Petrine texts. *Observations*, however, did not. This document, the critique of the *Final Report* issued in 1982 by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in Rome, declared ARCIC's teaching in certain crucial areas to be incompatible with Catholic dogma as defined by earlier Councils like Trent and Vatican I. We respectfully ask, therefore, what is the status of *Observations*? Cardinal Willebrands has explained, in his essay *Anglicans, Roman Catholics and Authority* (1987), quoting what he had said in 1983, that it had been decided both that the ARCIC Report should be sent to the episcopal conferences and that the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith should be asked to send its experts' observations 'as a contribution to the dialogue and as a help to Catholics in reading the document with discernment'. Although *Observations* is here called no more than 'a contribution', and although the response of the Bishops' Conferences has been more positive than the Sacred Congregation's, it was nonetheless officially commissioned, so that we need to be told how much authority it has in the Roman Catholic Church's evaluation of the Final Report.

More important, what is the status, in regard to the work of ARCIC, of those documents which helped to define our two churches' identities? It is well known that Anglican Evangelicals value the 39 Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal, because they seem to us to enshrine biblical truth, especially in relation to such vital doctrines as salvation, the church and the sacraments. We do not regard these formularies as infallible, however. Insofar as biblical truth may be expressed more clearly, we are ready to see them improved and even replaced. We wonder whether Roman Catholics can say something comparable about Trent and Vatican I?

8. Our main criticism of the ARCIC I statements, therefore, is that they are not radical enough. That is, they do not subject our Anglican and Roman inheritance to a sufficiently rigorous *biblical* scrutiny. They betray a reluctance to allow the Spirit of God through the Word of God to challenge beliefs and practices which have been hallowed by centuries of tradition. But must we remain for ever prisoners of our past? Only Scripture can set us free.

9. As we venture to share with our bishops some of the conscientious problems which we have with the ARCIC documents, we wish to clarify our aims and motives. We have tried to write, as we hope we will be read, in a spirit of Christian humility and charity. We are far from claiming that our judgments are always right; we are open to correction. We also recognise the integrity of those who, having wrestled with the same issues, have reached different conclusions. So there is need and room for further discussion. We know that eucharistic hospitality between our two churches is already in some situations being practised. But closer union must surely depend on closer agreement. And we are convinced that the Holy Spirit of truth and love is able to bring us to this. We plead, therefore, against premature decisions and for more time in which the dialogue may develop.

B. The Five ARCIC Statements

. . . B.1 Eucharistic Doctrine

1. There is much in ARCIC 1's first Agreed Statement which we welcome. We are particularly thankful for the unequivocal statement in para. 5 that 'Christ's death on the cross . . . was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world' and that 'there can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished once for all by Christ'.

2. We agree that ARCIC's understanding of *anamnesis* or 'memorial' ('the making effective in the present of an event in the past', para. 5) does not necessarily compromise the once-for-all nature of Christ's atoning sacrifice (*Elucidation*, paras. 3, 5), for it draws a clear distinction between the historical event and the sacramental action. At the same time we share the misgivings expressed by some provinces. For the Commission's use of the word is controversial; it is made to bear a weight which is not justified by Scripture.

3. We have two grave problems with the text.

The first concerns the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. We agree that the eucharist is 'no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance' (para. 5), for it is also a proclamation of, and indeed a participation in, Christ's sacrifice. In what sense, however, do we participate? The ARCIC phrase is that we both participate in the benefits of his passion and 'enter into the movement of his self-offering' (last sentence of para. 5, repeated in *Elucidation*, para. 5). To us, however, there is a serious confusion here between two kinds of participation, which seem to be mutually incompatible. We do indeed share in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice (1 Cor. 10.16), and offer ourselves to him in gratitude for it; but we cannot share in the offering of

it, or even be drawn up into the movement of it. For we cannot see how the offering of ourselves, being a response to Christ's self-offering, can be simultaneous with it or part of it.

4. We understand the desire to 'identify' with Christ, for by God's grace we are 'in Christ', united to him and drawing our life from him, like branches in the vine and limbs in the body. In consequence of this identification, we are said to 'share in his sufferings', enduring for his sake the world's opposition, as a condition of sharing in his glory (e.g. Rom. 8.17; 2 Cor. 1.5; Col. 1.24; Heb. 13.12f.; 1 Pet. 1.20f.; 4.12ff.; Rev. 1.9).

Never, however, does the New Testament speak either of us offering ourselves 'in Christ' or of Christ uniting us with himself in his own self-offering. Instead, it portrays him both as our example, so that we are to give ourselves in love *like* Christ, who loved us and gave himself up for us (Eph. 5.2), and as our mediator, so that *through* him we should continually offer to God our sacrifice of praise (Heb. 13.15). Indeed, it is only through his perfect self-offering that ours becomes acceptable. But to offer ourselves to God *like* Christ, *through* Christ and *in response* to Christ is not to do so *in* him or *with* him in his own sacrifice. That language does exactly what ARCIC agrees we must never do: it obscures the fundamental fact of the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice (para. 5). According to *Observations* ARCIC's formula is not definite enough, for it does not clearly express 'a participation of the Church, the Body of Christ, in the sacramental act of her Lord, so that she offers sacramentally in him and with him his sacrifice' (B.1.1.). We believe it is essential for ARCIC to disassociate itself from this interpretation. Talk of 'identification with' Christ in his self-offering or of 'participation in' the movement of it is at least confusing, at worst pelagian. For the sake of theological clarity and spiritual health we urge that the distinction between Christ's sacrifice and ours must be preserved, lest the perfect and the tainted, the atoning and the eucharistic, the divine initiative and the human response be confounded with one another.

5. Our second problem concerns the real presence of Christ. We ourselves strongly affirm that at every Eucharist Jesus Christ is himself personally and objectively present, ready to make himself known to us through the breaking of bread and to give himself to us so that we may 'feed on him in our hearts by faith'. But we reject any notion of substantial change in the elements themselves, and we affirm that such a change is not necessary for the full reception of Christ. Even though the word 'transubstantiation' is relegated to a footnote (p.14), what the word has stood for is still retained, namely 'a change in the inner reality of the elements'. The *Elucidation* clarifies both that the change envisaged is not a material one, and that Christ's presence is not limited to the elements (para. 6). Nevertheless, we cannot accept the simple, unexplained statement that before the eucharistic prayer there is merely 'bread', while afterwards there is 'truly the body of Christ' (p.21). What we can accept is what Hugh Latimer said at his last trial: 'that which before was bread now has the dignity to exhibit Christ's body. And yet the bread is still bread, and the wine is still wine, for the change is not in the nature but in the dignity'. This has been called 'trans-signification' (not least by some Roman Catholic theologians), as distinct from 'transubstantiation'.

We also believe that Christ's body and blood are 'verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' (Catechism), that 'the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith' (Article XXVIII), that those lacking 'a lively faith . . . in no wise are . . . partakers of Christ' (Article XXIX) and that therefore 'the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' (Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* V 67:6).

One of the reasons why we oppose the notion of a substantial change is that such teaching lays itself open to the cultus related to the consecrated elements, especially Adoration and Benediction, whose absence *Observations* notes, declaring that 'the adoration rendered to the Blessed Sacrament is the object of a dogmatic definition in the Catholic Church' (B.I.3). Respectfully but firmly we reject this, as also ARCIC's attempt to defend it in *Elucidation* paras. 8, 9. We are greatly disturbed by the cultus relating to the reserved sacrament, in whatever form and in whatever church it is practised.

. . . B.II. Ministry and Ordination

1. We are glad that ARCIC I's second Agreed Statement begins with 'the life and self-offering of Christ' as the perfect model of ministry (para. 3), recognizes the uniqueness of the ministry of the apostles (para. 4), acknowledges the Holy Spirit as the source of the diversity of ministries evident in the New Testament (para. 5), and declares some form of oversight 'an essential part' of the church's life from the beginning, with a threefold pastoral ministry emerging clearly in the post-apostolic period (para. 6).

2. We agree with those critics, however, to whom this statement has seemed to have 'too clerical an emphasis' (*Elucidation*, para. 1). The priesthood of all believers is acknowledged (para. 7), but not their ministry. Moreover, in so far as the ministry of the laity is mentioned, it seems to be exercised in the church; the ministry of God's people as servants and witnesses in the world is overlooked.

3. It is conceded that the New Testament uses a variety of images to describe ministerial function (para. 8), but never calls ministers 'priests' (para. 13). Yet the Commission did not face the implications of this fact, namely that no special priesthood attaches to ordained ministers which is not also shared by lay ministers, except when 'priest' is being used in its etymological sense of 'presbyter', the only sense in which the Anglican Reformers retained it. Instead, the Commission defend their concept of ministerial priesthood on the ground that 'Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in these (sc. ordained) ministers and used priestly terms in describing them' (para. 13). The reason for this was eucharistic, namely that the presiding minister, reciting Christ's words and distributing Christ's gifts, 'is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice' (para. 13). We regret that we cannot accept this reasoning: it originated in the third century and lacks any biblical warrant. We disagree that 'the essential nature of the Christian ministry . . . is 'most clearly seen in' the eucharistic celebration (para 13 cf. *Elucidation* para. 2), and we entirely reject the statement of *Observations* that 'the priestly nature of the ordained ministry depends upon the sacrificial character of the Eucharist' (B.II.1). To be sure, the public worship of the people of God was from the earliest

subapostolic period led by the bishop or presbyter, who could therefore be regarded as their representative. Yet in this common praise he was not exercising a priestly function which they did not share; he and they belonged equally to the 'holy priesthood offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. 2.5). Instead, the distinctive nature of the ordained ministry, according to the New Testament, is surely pastoral oversight, which is mainly exercised by the ministry of the word, to which the ministry of the sacraments also belongs. The primary movement of ministry is not towards God (in offering) but towards human beings (in proclamation and service), because that is the primary movement of the word and sacraments.

4. We note the statement that Christian ministers, particularly in presiding at the eucharist, are 'representative of the whole church in the fulfilment of its priestly vocation', but do not understand the corollary that 'their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood, but belongs to another realm of gifts of the Spirit'. We ask for clarification.

5. There could, of course, be no reunion between Rome and Canterbury without a mutual recognition of ministries, and that is not possible until Pope Leo XIII's bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), which declares Anglican ordinations 'completely null and void', is revoked. This papal judgment rested on two alleged 'defects' in Anglican ministers, the first of 'intention' (the bishop did not intend to ordain priests who would offer the sacrifice of the mass) and the second of 'form' (the Ordinal of 1552 contained no reference to eucharistic sacrifice). ARCIC I expressed the view, however, that the whole issue had been put in 'a new context' by its 'agreement on the essentials of eucharistic faith with regard to the sacramental presence of Christ and the sacrificial dimension of the eucharist, and on the nature and purpose of priesthood, ordination and apostolic succession' (*Ministry and Ordination*, para. 17; *Elucidation*, para. 6). Cardinal Willebrands commented favourably on this in his letter to the co-chairmen of ARCIC II (13 July 1985), and added that what the Roman Catholic Church sees as the two defects of intention and form could possibly be removed if ARCIC I's doctrines of eucharist and priesthood are both accepted by the two churches and seen to be expressed in the Anglican Ordinal (*Anglican Orders in a New Context*). But it is precisely in these areas of eucharistic presence, sacrifice and priesthood that full agreement continues to elude us.

6. Related to the question of priesthood is the debate on the full ordination of women, which the co-chairmen of ARCIC II in their reply to Cardinal Willebrands (14 January 1986) called 'a fresh and grave obstacle to reconciliation of ministries'. We have to confess that we evangelicals are as divided on this issue as other Anglicans. We are glad to hear that ARCIC II has been requested to study it.

... B.III Authority in the Church I

1. It is particularly welcome to us that the first Statement on *Authority in the Church* begins with the clear confession that Jesus Christ is Lord, to whom God has given all authority, and further affirms that 'the Holy Spirit keeps the Church under the Lordship of Christ' (I para. 7).

2. We regret, however, that the Statement proceeds at once to the topics of 'Christian Authority' and 'Authority in the Church'. For the essential New Testament corollary to the authority of Christ is not the authority, but rather the humility, of his people, as exemplified by him in his incarnation and ministry. It seems to us a serious omission that the Statement nowhere refers to the warnings of Jesus against the abuse of authority (e.g. Mk. 10.42ff.; Mt. 23.1ff.); such behaviour belongs to the world, he said, adding 'not so with you'. In his kingdom greatness is to be measured by service not rule, by slavery not authority. We know, of course, that other passages in the New Testament allude to the place of authority (e.g. 1 Thess. 5.12f.; Heb. 13.7, 17, 24). Yet this has to be seen in the light of the new and modest style of leadership which Jesus introduced.

3. When we come to the question how Christ exercises his authority in the church, we find an inconsistency in the Statement, which it seems to us urgent to resolve. At times Scripture is accorded the supreme place which it has in our historic Anglican formularies, and which we believe Rome also now recognizes, or is very close to recognizing. Thus the church may 'translate' or 'restate' the faith, and 'make judgments' in times of crisis, but only if these are 'consonant with the apostolic witness recorded in the Scriptures', that is, 'consonant with Scripture' itself (paras. 15 and 19). The *Elucidation* emphasizes this, although here 'the primary norm' is said to be Jesus Christ as 'set forth and interpreted in the New Testament writings' (para. 2). At other times, however, Scripture is toppled from its supremacy into being only 'a normative record' (para. 2), and bracketed with other authorities, so that in both our traditions, it is said, 'the appeal to Scripture, to the creeds, to the Fathers, and to the definitions of the councils of the early Church is regarded as basic and normative' (para. 18). But we must insist that this is not Anglican, nor (at least since Vatican II) does it seem to us to be truly Roman. Tradition is exceedingly important for the interpretation of Scripture, but an appeal may always be made from tradition back to the Scripture it claims to interpret. Can we not agree that it is first and foremost by his word that Christ rules his church? We do not see any possibility of the reformation and reunion of our churches unless they are both ready to test their traditions by Scripture and, if Scripture requires it, to modify and even abandon them.

Of course Paul wrote of his teaching as 'tradition' (*paradosis*), which he had himself received and in his turn passed on to the churches (e.g. 1 Cor. 15.3ff.; 2 Thess. 2.15; 3.6; cf. 2 Tim. 2.2; 1 John 2.24; 2 John 9ff.). But, as Oscar Cullmann has argued, a clear line has to be drawn between apostolic and post-apostolic traditions. The former are the foundation, the latter the super-structure. Hence the need, which the early church perceived, to determine the New Testament canon. What the ARCIC statement means by tradition is the church's post-apostolic teaching, and it is in this sense that we too are using the word.

4. The two views of tradition, which the *Elucidation* describes and declares to be not necessarily contradictory (para. 2), seem mutually incompatible to us, unless the 'revelation' mentioned three times in relation to the second view refers to the biblical revelation. Apart from this, what needs to be clarified is that, *however tradition is viewed*, it must be

made subordinate to Scripture. The failure of the Commission to grasp the nettle of the Marian dogmas is a case in point, those of her Immaculate Conception (1854) and of her Bodily Assumption (1950). It is acknowledged that they 'raise a special problem for those Anglicans who do not consider that the precise definitions given by these dogmas are sufficiently supported by Scripture' (*Authority in the Church II*, para. 30). When the dogma of the bodily assumption was promulgated in 1950, however, Archbishops Geoffrey Fisher and Cyril Garbett were much more outspoken in the statement they issued: 'The Church of England renders honour and reverence to the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ. But there is not the smallest evidence in the Scriptures or in the teaching of the early church of belief in the doctrine of her bodily assumption. The Church of England refuses to regard as requisite for a saving faith any doctrines or opinions which are not plainly contained in the Scriptures' (17 August 1950).

5. Further clarification is needed of the Commission's Statement and *Elucidation* on the authority of general councils. Although we ourselves believe in God's continuing, providential care of his church, we do not conclude from this that its decisions, when it meets in ecumenical council, 'exclude what is erroneous' (para. 19). Rather we confess (with our Anglican forefathers) that councils 'may err, and sometimes have erred', since not all their members are 'governed with the Spirit and Word of God' (Article XXI). Indeed, according to its *Elucidation*, the Commission seems to agree. It is neither declaring that councils cannot err, it says, nor denying that some have (para. 3). Their judgments are inerrant only if they (a) relate to 'fundamental matters of the faith', (b) are clarifications of Scripture, not additions to it, and (c) are 'faithful to Scripture and consistent with Tradition'. If these second and third qualifications indicate the priority of Scripture over tradition, as they appear to, then the inerrancy of councils has become a phantom. For now their decisions exclude what is erroneous only if, by being biblical, they exclude what is erroneous. So we hope the Commission is saying that the decisions of councils are open to correction by Scripture, and that they have no binding authority 'unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture' (Article XXI).

6. Similarly, the claim to papal infallibility must surely be subject to the supreme authority of Scripture. For if the two supposed infallibilities (of church and pope) were unqualified, they would be among the most important truths of Christianity. But Scripture says nothing about either. Its silence is eloquent.

. . . B.IV. Authority in the Church II

1. The fourth report of ARCIC 1 (*Authority in the Church II*), in which the delicate subject of papal primacy is considered, contains much that we applaud. To begin with, there is a fresh and courageous re-examination of the Petrine texts, on which the claim to papal primacy has traditionally been based. As a result, the honest admissions are made that, although Jesus gave Peter a position of special importance, it was 'a leadership of service', it did not isolate him from the other apostles (para. 5), 'the New Testament contains no explicit record of a transmission of Peter's

leadership' (para. 6), and it offers 'no sufficient basis' for a universal primacy of the bishop of Rome, even if it is held that this is God's purpose and not contrary to the New Testament (para. 7). We welcome the candour of these statements. We also note, however, that they are unacceptable to the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, who insist on the assertion of Vatican I that 'the apostle Peter . . . received immediately and directly from Jesus Christ our Lord a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction' (*Observations*, B.III.1).

2. Two particular questions concern us. The first relates to the ground on which an acceptance of Roman primacy might be based, and the second to the form which such a primacy, if accepted, might take.

First, the basis. Having conceded that the Petrine texts are insufficient, the Commission resorts to historical and pragmatic alternatives. It is, of course, a fact of history that gradually the primacy of the Roman see developed, and that this came to be seen by many as the guidance of the Spirit and 'a gift of divine providence' (para. 13). This could never be proved, however, for some church history (not least, the history of the papacy) has exemplified a deviation from God's will, rather than a conformity to it. The Commissioners' other argument is that 'like any human community the Church requires a focus of leadership and unity' (*Ministry and Ordination*, para. 7); it is 'needed' to safeguard the church's faith and unity. But is this not the reasoning rather of secular than of Christian minds? The church as the divine society is not 'like any human community' that it should model itself on the patterns of the world. The oversight of the local church is different; it is God's plainly revealed purpose and provision (e.g. Acts 14.23; 20.28; Eph. 4.11 ff.; 1 Tim. 3.1 ff.; Tit. 1.5 ff). But nothing similar is envisaged in the New Testament for the world-wide church. On the contrary, the church's supreme head is Christ himself, to whom universal authority has been given, and who rules his people by his word and Spirit. We are not at all convinced that an earthly pastor with universal oversight is desirable, let alone necessary.

3. Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that these scruples could be overcome, and that the Anglican Communion were to recognize the papal primacy, what form might it take? It can be maintained that already Vatican I's declaration of infallibility and universal jurisdiction has been modified by Vatican II's emphasis on collegiality, and that—at least in theory—the primatial authority is intended to 'support', not 'override', the ministry of the bishops (I para. 12). Nevertheless, the Commission is right to voice Anglican fears of both Vatican centralization and papal autocracy (para. 19). At the beginning of any realistic consideration of papal primacy, Anglicans would want to secure explicit assurances that it would involve neither 'the suppression of . . . traditions which they value' nor 'the imposition of wholly alien traditions' (para. 22).

4. Although we do not believe that the New Testament envisages any visible, human authority figure as head of the church, what we could contemplate, as not incompatible with the New Testament, would be a leadership somewhat similar to the role exercised by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the world-wide Anglican Communion, expressing historical continuity, visible unity, personal affection and a ministry of brotherly

support, but not infallibility or universal jurisdiction. Similarly, within the fellowship of autonomous Orthodox Churches the Ecumenical Patriarch possesses neither infallibility, nor universal jurisdiction, nor even 'primacy', but rather a certain 'seniority' which 'is to be understood in terms not of coercion but of pastoral service' (*Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue*, the Dublin Agreed Statement 1984, paras. 21-30). As a first step towards such a servant-image, which is already expressed in the title 'servant of the servants of God', we dare to hope that the Pope will renounce such other traditional titles as 'the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church'. We would welcome such a gesture; it would reassure us that a reformed and remodelled primacy might be possible and acceptable. But *Observations* gives us little hope. Instead, it asserts the Pope's intrinsic power of jurisdiction, and quotes Vatican II's reference to his 'full, supreme and universal authority over the whole Church' (B.III.2).

. . . B.V. Salvation and the Church

1. We have studied with particular interest ARCIC's fifth Statement, produced by the second Commission and published last year with the title *Salvation and the Church*. This is because of the crucial importance of the sixteenth century dispute over justification, which is why we have been among those who have pressed that the topic must be included on ARCIC's agenda. We are grateful that it now has been.

2. We value the biblical clarity of this report. We are specially grateful that the doctrine of salvation was recognized as being 'so central to the Christian faith that, unless there is assurance of agreement on this issue, there can be no full doctrinal agreement between our two Churches' (*Preface*). We also rejoice in the repeated emphasis that God's action in sending Christ and in bestowing salvation is 'pure unmerited gift' (paras. 1, 24).

3. The Commission has performed a valuable service in clarifying four areas of misunderstanding, namely the relations between justifying faith and assurance, between justification and sanctification, between faith and good works, and between salvation and the church. Generally speaking, we welcome these clarifications. At the same time, since 'observations and criticisms' are requested, we would appreciate amplification in five areas.

4. First, since 'faith' is expounded in relation to the dispute over assurance (paras. 4 and 9-11), no actual definition of faith itself is given. We miss the Reformers' emphasis that *fides est fiducia* ('faith is trust') and Hooker's that the value of faith lies not in itself but in its object, Jesus Christ.

5. Secondly, although the terms 'justification' and 'sanctification', imputed and imparted righteousness, are helpfully unpacked, and the link between them is declared to be 'indissoluble' (paras. 5, 15), we consider that the last four declarations of para. 15 are overstated and that its opening statement is misleading. Although indissoluble, justification and sanctification are neither identical, nor simultaneous. To spell out the differences between them would be conducive to further clarity,

especially that justification relates to our standing before God, is instantaneous and admits of no degrees, whereas sanctification (in its main New Testament sense) concerns our character, is gradual and progressive. This clear distinction between the two concepts becomes blurred whenever we overlook the fact that the New Testament uses the verb to 'sanctify' in relation to God's people in two ways, namely (a) to set apart for God's service, usually in the perfect tense, in which sense all those justified were simultaneously sanctified (e.g. Acts 20.32; 1 Cor. 1.2; 6.11; Heb. 10.10) and (b) to make holy in character and conduct, in which sense sanctification is a subsequent process of transformation into the image of Christ (e.g. 2 Cor. 3.18; Eph. 5.26; 1 Thess. 4.3; 5.23).

6. Thirdly, we are not ourselves persuaded that the Reformation divide over justification was altogether due, as the Commission implies, to misunderstandings on both sides. There were also real and deep disagreements. These related not only to the meaning of the verb to 'justify', whether it signifies to 'pronounce' or to 'make' righteous, but also to its ground, whether the righteousness on the basis of which God justifies us is outside or inside us, extrinsic (being Christ's) or intrinsic (being ours). The Reformers insisted on the former, since our righteousness is tainted and only Christ's is perfect, whereas the Council of Trent explicitly rejected this. So what has happened to the anathemas of Trent? The nature of justifying righteousness was and still is an issue of serious disagreement, which cannot be settled by clarification alone. ARCIC II did not directly address it. Even the much longer and fuller report of the American Roman Catholic-Lutheran dialogue, *Justification by Faith* (1983), was not able to resolve it. Yet it cannot be avoided.

7. Fourthly, although we welcome descriptions of Christ's atoning work as 'definitive' (para. 10) and 'once-for-all' (para. 27), we would like to see an elaboration of the Atonement, since the New Testament consistently speaks of the Cross (culminating of course in the Resurrection, e.g. 1 Cor. 15.17; Rom. 4.25) as the ground of our justification. In addition, the context of justification, namely the law and judgment of God (para. 18), needs to be developed.

8. Fifthly, if (as ARCIC claims) the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone is now believed by both Roman Catholics and Anglicans, it is important that the Commission gives credibility to its Statement by spelling out its implications, and especially how it relates to such authorized Roman Catholic beliefs and practices as purgatory, penance, indulgences, prayers and masses for the dead, and the 'mediatorial' role of Mary and the saints. Another area of grave concern, as is rightly pointed out in the Preface (p.7), is 'the salvation of those who have no explicit faith in Christ'; in view of the apparent universalism of some recent Roman Catholic statements, this requires urgent consideration by ARCIC.

9. Further, there seems to us to be a considerable gap between theory and practice. Much nominal Anglicanism is sadly devoid of the joy of the justified. And much popular Roman Catholicism, perhaps especially in Southern Europe and Latin America, shows few signs of having grasped that justification is by grace alone through faith alone, without works. If,

then, we are to find this report believable, both our churches need to be seen to preach and teach the good news of God's free grace, which ARCIC says we believe, and to make this doctrine the touch-stone of our churches' faith and life. We humbly request our bishops to set an example.

C. Conclusion

1. We are glad that the ARCIC enterprise is an ongoing process, and we urge patient perseverance, until 'real and tested theological agreement' is reached (*Open Letter* 1977, para. 3). We anticipate that ARCIC II will review ARCIC I's four statements in the light of the responses of both churches to them, and we hope that at the same time they will find a way to incorporate into the main text of each statement the material now contained in its *Elucidation*. We are also grateful that they have invited, in relation to *Salvation and the Church*, 'observations and criticisms made in a constructive and fraternal spirit'. We request that in their task of revising all five statements, they will be asked to take the contents of this Open Letter into consideration.

2. We also consider it essential that ARCIC II will make a statement about the form which any official relationship between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church might take. What is in mind when the expression 'full visible communion' is used (*Final Report*, Introduction, para. 9)? How could the Anglican Communion be 'united not absorbed', as Cardinal Mercier put it in 1925? And what are the limits of acceptable diversity in such a union without absorption, as Archbishop Runcie asked in 1981? We hope ARCIC II will explore the possibility of something similar to the 1931 Bonn Agreement between Anglicans and Old Catholics, which based full communion on agreement in primary doctrines, while tolerating disagreement in secondary matters. This would seem to be compatible with ARCIC's own principle of unity in those essentials which can admit no divergence.

3. The possible reunion between the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches is rightly described as a 'reconciliation'. But reconciliation between two parties previously at enmity demands repentance on both sides. Such repentance should begin with profound regret over attitudes of pride, intolerance and rancour which have exacerbated our differences, and in which we admit with shame we have ourselves shared. Do we not need, however, to repent of some past (and continuing) opinions, teachings and statements, as well as of past attitudes and actions? Do we not have to confess that in some areas 'we were wrong'? Can our two churches bring themselves to say this? There can be no genuine reunion without reformation, no reconciliation without repentance.

Easter 1988

APPENDIX I—A SUMMARY OF THE OPEN LETTER

A. INTRODUCTION

1. An Open Letter was addressed to the Anglican episcopate in 1977 by 125 evangelical leaders; this Letter focusses on the work of ARCIC.
2. We express our appreciation of the Commission's integrity and achievement.
3. We are aware of widespread 'ecumenical impatience', but believe that the disquiet expressed by some in *The Emmaus Report* (1981) must be taken seriously.
4. We are ourselves strongly committed to the quest for 'unity in truth', and agree with the ARCIC principle that essential doctrine 'admits of no divergence'.
5. We look for a principled, biblical comprehensiveness, which insists on unity where Scripture is plain and allows liberty where it is not. We believe that both churches could accept this principle.
6. The supremacy of Scripture was the formative principle of the Reformation, and we could never ourselves surrender it.
7. We wonder if the right question has been put to our churches, namely whether the ARCIC statements are 'consonant in substance' with the faith of Anglicans and of the Roman Catholic Church, instead of asking whether they are agreeable to Scripture.
8. Our main criticism of the ARCIC I statements is that they betray a reluctance to allow the Spirit of God through the Word of God to challenge our inherited beliefs and practices.
9. We write, and hope we will be read, in a spirit of humility and charity. There is need and room for further dialogue.

B. THE FIVE ARCIC STATEMENTS

I Eucharistic Doctrine

1. We welcome the unequivocal statement that Christ's sacrificial death was perfect, and cannot be repeated or added to.
2. Although ARCIC's understanding of *anamnesis* or 'memorial' does not necessarily compromise the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice, it is ambiguous and lacks full biblical support.
3. We agree that in the Eucharist we participate in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, but we cannot agree that we participate in the offering of it, or 'enter into the movement of his self-offering'.
4. The New Testament tells us to offer ourselves like Christ, through Christ and in response to Christ, but not to offer ourselves in him or with him. We urge that the distinction between Christ's sacrifice and ours must be preserved, lest the perfect and the tainted, the atoning and the eucharistic, the divine initiative and the human response be confounded with one another.
5. Jesus Christ himself is indeed personally and objectively present at the Eucharist, ready to give himself to his people. We also accept that the elements are changed in significance, but reject that they are changed in substance. The real presence of Christ is 'not . . . in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament' (Hooker).

II Ministry and Ordination

1. We welcome this Statement's teaching on Christ as the model of ministry, on the Holy Spirit as the source of diverse ministries, and on the pastoral oversight of the church as being indispensable.
2. The Statement's emphasis is too clerical, however; the ministry of the laity in the world is overlooked.
3. Although the Commission acknowledges that the New Testament never calls ministers 'priests' (as opposed to 'presbyters'), it has not faced the implications of this fact, namely that no special priesthood attaches to ordained ministers which is not also shared by the laity. ARCIC's attempt to argue for a ministerial priesthood in relation to the Eucharist lacks biblical warrant. The distinctive nature of the ordained ministry is pastoral, not priestly.

4. We do not understand ARCIC's statement that ministerial priesthood derives not from 'the common Christian priesthood' but from 'another realm' of spiritual gifts, and ask for clarification.
5. Reunion between Rome and Canterbury is not possible until Pope Leo XIII's bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), which declared Anglican ordinations 'completely null and void', is revoked. ARCIC claims that this issue has been put in 'a new context' by its Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry, because these remove the alleged 'defects' on which the papal judgment rested. This is a premature claim, however, because it is precisely in these areas of eucharistic sacrifice and priesthood that full agreement continues to elude us.
6. The full ordination of women has been called 'a fresh and grave obstacle to reconciliation of ministries'. We are ourselves divided over it and are glad that ARCIC II has been asked to study it.

III Authority in the Church I

1. We welcome the clear confession that Jesus Christ is Lord, possessing universal authority.
2. We regret, however, that the Statement proceeds at once to Christian authority instead of to Christian humility. The absence of any reference to Jesus' warnings against the abuse of authority is a serious omission.
3. We believe that Christ rules his church primarily by his word. But the ARCIC Statement oscillates between regarding Scripture as the supreme norm and bracketing it with other norms. This inconsistency needs to be ironed out. Reformation and reunion depend on testing—and where necessary changing—our traditions according to Scripture.
4. The two views of tradition, which ARCIC describes, seem to us to be mutually incompatible. In any case, however tradition is viewed, it must be made subordinate to Scripture. The Commission failed to do this in relation to the Marian dogmas.
5. Although we believe in God's providential care of his church, we do not conclude from this that its decisions, when it meets in ecumenical council, 'exclude what is erroneous'. True, the *Elucidation* explains that a council's judgments are inerrant only if they relate to fundamentals, clarify Scripture and are faithful to it. But this implies that some council judgments are not faithful to Scripture, in which case they are erroneous. We much prefer the candid assertion of Article XXI that councils 'may err and sometimes have erred', and that their decisions have authority only if 'it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture'.
6. In the same way the claim to papal infallibility must surely be subject to the supreme authority of Scripture.

IV Authority in the Church II

1. We welcome this report's re-examination of the Petrine texts and honest admission that they provide no basis for a universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome.
2. The Commission then argues for the papal primacy from its historical development, although not all history can be interpreted as divine providence. Its second argument is that the church 'like any human community' needs a focus of 'leadership and unity'. But the church is not 'like any human community'; it is the divine society. The New Testament plainly envisages human oversight for the local church, but for the worldwide church it speaks only of Christ as its head.
3. The Commission is right to voice Anglican fears of both Vatican centralization and papal autocracy, and to seek explicit assurances that papal primacy (if it were to be recognized) would mean neither the suppression of valued traditions nor the imposition of alien ones.
4. What we could contemplate, as not incompatible with the New Testament, would be a leadership similar to that exercised by the Archbishop of Canter-

bury in the Anglican Communion and by the Ecumenical Patriarch in the Orthodox Churches, which involves neither infallibility, nor universal jurisdiction, nor even 'primacy', but a seniority expressing historical continuity, visible unity, personal affection and brotherly support.

V Salvation and the Church

1. We are grateful that the doctrine of justification has been added to ARCIC's agenda.
2. We value the biblical clarity of this report, the recognition that agreement on the doctrine of salvation is essential, and the repeated emphasis that salvation is 'pure unmerited gift'.
3. The Commission has done well to clarify four areas of misunderstanding. We would appreciate amplification in the following five areas.
4. Faith needs to be defined, indicating that its nature is trust, and that its value is located in its object, Jesus Christ.
5. We agree that justification and sanctification are 'indissoluble', but the differences between them need to be further developed, especially that justification relates to our standing before God, is instantaneous and admits of no degrees, whereas sanctification concerns our character, is gradual and progressive.
6. The Reformation divide over justification was not due only to misunderstanding, as ARCIC II implies. There was a specially deep disagreement over whether the righteousness, on the basis of which God justifies us, is outside us (being Christ's) or inside us (being ours). The Reformers insisted on the former, but the Council of Trent explicitly rejected this. ARCIC II did not directly address this issue, but it cannot be avoided.
7. We welcome the descriptions of Christ's atoning work as 'definitive' and 'once-for-all', but we would like to see an elaboration of the Atonement, since it is the ground of our justification.
8. If justification by grace alone through faith alone is now believed by both our churches, its implications need to be spelled out, especially in relation to such authorized Roman Catholic beliefs and practices as purgatory, penance, indulgences and masses for the dead.
9. In both churches we discern a gap between theory and practice. Neither nominal Anglicanism nor popular Roman Catholicism seems to manifest the joy of the justified. If this report is to be credible, therefore, both churches need to preach and to exhibit the good news of God's free grace. We request our bishops to set an example.

C. CONCLUSION

1. We are glad that the ARCIC enterprise is an ongoing process. We urge patient perseverance until 'real and tested theological agreement' is reached. And we request that, while the Commission is revising the five Statements, they will be asked to take the contents of this Open Letter into consideration.
2. We consider it essential that ARCIC II will make a statement about the form which 'full visible communion' might take. Will any 'union without absorption' be based on agreement in primary doctrines, while tolerating disagreement in secondary matters?
3. A possible reunion between our churches has rightly been called a reconciliation. But there can be no reconciliation without repentance on both sides.

APPENDIX II

Signatories of the Open Letter

(who have indicated their agreement with its thrust and substance, while not necessarily wishing to endorse every detail of it)

AFRICA

East Africa

KADEGE, Canon Richard A.	Parish Priest; Theological Educator, Tanzania
MAWIYOO, Rev. Samuel T.	Assistant Provost, All Saints Cathedral, Nairobi, Kenya
MTETEMELA, Rt. Rev. Donald	Assistant Bishop, Central Tanganyika
MUGISHA, Ven. Canon Ephraim	Archdeacon of Muyere, Uganda
MUTEBI, Canon Wilson	Namirembe Diocesan Secretary, Church of Uganda
NGHAMBI, Rev. Obadiah	Principal, Chamuhawi Bible School, Tanzania
PRENTICE, Canon Hugh K.	Acting Principal, St. Philip's Theological College, Kongwa, Tanzania
RUKIRANDE, Rt. Rev. Dr. W.	Assistant Bishop of Diocese of Kigezi, Uganda
RUTIBA, Rev. Dr. Eustace G.	Head of Religious Studies, Makerere University
SENDEGEYA, Rev. Fareth S. N.	Lecturer, St. Philip's Theological College, Tanzania
SSEKKADDE, Canon Samuel B.	Principal, Uganda Martyrs' Seminary, Namugongo
TAYLOR-PEARCE, Dr. J. E. Modupe	Principal, Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology, Kenya

Southern Africa

BELL, Rt. Rev. Joe.	Presiding Bishop, Church of England in South Africa
HAMMOND, Herbert	Trustee, Church of England in South Africa
HILL, Rev. Brian	Member of Liturgical Committee, CPSA
HERSHENSOHNN, Rev. M. J.	Rector, Holy Trinity, Newcastle, South Africa
HOFMEYER, Rev. J. M.	Registrar, Church of England in South Africa
NEILL, Rev. T. J.	Rector, St. Luke's, Greendale, Harare, Zimbabwe
PURSER, Rev. Alan	Rector, Diocese of Johannesburg, South Africa

West Africa

AKINLA, Prof. Oladele	Retired University Teacher, Nigeria
BAIKIE, Prof. David A.	Vice-Chancellor, Bishop's Nominee, Kaduna Diocese
IDOWU-FEARON, Very Rev. Josiah	Provost of Kaduna, Nigeria
JONAH, Prof. Daniel	Adjunct Professor of Mathematics, University of Sierra Leone
JONES, Rev. Emile K.	University Lecturer and Doctoral Student
JONES, Prof. W. S. Marcus	Law Professor, University of Sierra Leone
OLADUNJOYE, Canon James	Chaplain, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ife, Nigeria
OLAOPA, Samson O.	Member of Episcopal Church, Liberia
THOMAS, Rev. Emerson	Graduate Student, Wheaton College, USA (from Sierra Leone)

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

ELDRIDGE, Rev. Ernest D.	Associate Rector, St. John's, Shaughnessy, Vancouver
GARDENER, Very Rev. Michael G.	Dean, St. Jude's Cathedral, Frobisher Bay
GREEN, Rev. Prof. Michael.	Theological Teacher, Author, Evangelist
HAYES, Prof. Alan L.	Wycliffe College, Toronto
MASON, Rev. Dr. Peter.	Principal, Wycliffe College, Toronto
MOORE, Rev. Peter C.	Rector, Little Trinity Church, Toronto
PACKER, Rev. Dr. James I.	Professor of Theology, Regent College, Vancouver
PATTERSON, Douglas A. M.	Vice-Chancellor Emeritus, Diocese British Columbia
PELL, Rev. Dr. Archibald J.	Rector, Holy Trinity Cathedral, New Westminster
POWELL, Prof. Colin	Member Provincial Synod, Rupert's Land
QUINN, Ven. Harry C.	Archdeacon of St. John, New Brunswick
ROBINSON, Rev. Harry S. D.	Rector, St. John's, Shaughnessy, Vancouver
ROGERS, Rev. George H.	Incumbent, St. Matthias Parish, Vancouver
SISSMORE, Rev. David.	Principal, Arthur Turner Training School
SMITH, Very Rev. Jerry.	Dean of Diocese of Moosonee
TYNDALE, Dr. V. S. C. (Tony)	Wycliffe College Faculty, Mission Executive
WEBSTER, Rev. Dr. John B.	Theology Professor, Wycliffe College, Toronto

USA

BASINGER, Rev. James A.	Secretary, Fellowship of Witness
CHAPMAN, Rev. Geoffrey W.	Associate Rector, Truro Episcopal Church, Fairfax, VA
CLARK, Martin B.	Trustee, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
CORNES, Rev. Andrew	Rector, Ascension Church, Pittsburgh
D'ARCY, John Jr.	Chairman, Chicago Sunday Evening Club
DAVIS, Prof. Jim	Professor of NT, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
FAIRFIELD, Rev. Prof. Leslie P.	Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
FLICKINGER, Rev. Bruce A.	Presbyter, Diocese of Minnesota
GUEST, Rev. Dr. John	Rector, St. Stephen's, Sewickley, Author, Evangelist
HAUGAN, Rev. Harald K.	Rector, All Souls, Jacksonville, Florida
HOWE, Canon John W.	Rector, Truro Church, Fairfax VA
HUGHES, Rev. Dr. Philip E.	Theological Professor and Author
JONES, Rev. Thomas G.	Parish Priest; Delegate to General Convention
KELSHAW, Rev. Dr. Terence	Professor of Pastoral Theology, TESM
KITTS, Rev. Joseph.	Assistant Rector, Truro Episcopal Church
LEATON, Edward K.	Trustee, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
MURPHY, Rev. William L.	Rector, St. Francis', Rutherfordord, North Carolina
NOLL, Rev. Dr. Stephen F.	Theology Lecturer, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
OATES, Rev. Thomas N.	Rector, Church of the Good Shepherd, Richmond, VA
OLIVER, George S.	Treasurer and Trustee, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry

OSMUN, Rev. Andrew	Rector, St. Luke's, Chester, Vermont
PRICHARD, E. A.	Chairman, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
PRICHARD, Canon Thomas M.	Director of SAMS—USA
RODGERS, Very Rev. John H. Jr.	President/Dean, Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
SCHRODER, Rev. Edward (Ted) A.	Rector, Christ Church, San Antonio, Texas
SMITH, Dr. Stephen M.	Associate Professor of Theology and Ethics
TYLER, J. Coleman	Organist/Missions Director, St. Stephen's, Sewickley
WELD, Rev. George F.	Vice-President, Fellowship of Witness
WILSON, Rev. Donald R.	Former Secretary, Fellowship of Witness
YATES, Rev. Dr. John W.	Rector, Author, Church Renewal Spokesman
ZAHL, Rev. Paul F. M.	Rector, St. Mary's, Scarborough, New York

SOUTH AMERICA

AREVALOS, Rev. Jorge	Pastor, Asuncion, Paraguay
BARRETT, Ven. Stephen G.	Archdeacon of Northern Argentina
BUSTOS, Rev. Julio	Regional Director, Arcediano, Chile
CAVALCANTI, Rev. Prof. Robinson	Author, Professor of University of Pernambuco, Brazil
CLARKE, Rev. Peter J.	CMJ Missionary in Argentina
COBB, Rev. John	Lecturer, Comunidad Teologica Evangelica, Santiago, Chile
JACQUIER, Rev. Oscar A.	Member, Provincial Executive Committee, Salta
JOHNSTON, Rev. Charles W. B.	Missionary Church Planter, Paraguay
MILLWOOD, Stephen G.	Missionary, Paraguay
RICHARDS, Dss. Elizabeth B.	Missionary, Paraguay
ROMERO, Rev. Cebero	Presbyter, Paraguay
THOMAS, Rev. Simon	Anglican Regional Director in Bolivia
VENABLES, Rev. Gregory J.	Headmaster, Anglican College, Paraguay

ASIA

East Asia

CHAU, Rev. E. Chuen-Shing	Sheng Kung Hui Kindly Light Church, Hong Kong
CHEW, Canon Dr. John	Dean, Trinity College, Singapore
CHIN, Rev. Moses Su Hyun	Parish Priest, Good Shepherd, Sandakan, Sabah
KOO, Rev. Tuk Su	Rector, St. Michael's, Sandakan, Sabah
POON, Rev. Dr. Nai-Chiu	Curate, St. Stephen's, Hong Kong
TAN, Jin Huat	Lecturer, Malaysia Bible Seminary
TAN, Ven. Teng Wai	Archdeacon of Singapore
VUN, Rev. Robert Yee Hin	Priest-in-Charge, St. Mark's, Lahad Datu, Sabah
WONG, Canon Dr. James	Vicar, Chapel of the Resurrection, Singapore
YONG, Very Rev. Canon Chen-Fah	Dean of All Saints Cathedral, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah

South Asia

ABEL, Lt. Col. Joseph	Advocate, Diocesan Council, Lahore Diocese, Pakistan
ALEXANDER, Very Rev. S. L.	Dean of Karachi, Pakistan
HOSEIN, Mrs. Mary	Headmistress, Trinity Methodist School, Karachi
ISAJAH, Rev. John A.	Secretary, Anglican Evangelical Fellowship of Sri Lanka
JASON, Rev. Dr. Noel	Presbyter, Church of South India
KYAW MYINT, Cdr. Michael	Evangelist, Missioner, Burma
MCDONALD, Nancy	General Secretary, Church of Burma
NICHOLLS, Rev. Dr. Bruce J.	Presbyter, Church of North India, Delhi
PEIRIS, Rev. Lakshman	Chairman, Anglican Evangelical Fellowship of Sri Lanka
SAMUEL, C. B.	Member, Church of North India
SAMUEL, Canon Dr. Vinay	General Secretary, Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion
SENG, Rev. Dinggri	Acting Principal, Emmanuel Theological College, Burma
WINTLE, Dr. Brian C.	Principal, Union Biblical Seminary, Pune, India

EGYPT and THE MIDDLE EAST

ADENEY, Canon Ronald E.	Retired, Israel CMJ
ATTALAH, Prof. Fouad N.	Lay Reader, Member of Central Synod, Egypt
BULMAN, Canon Michael T. A.	Director, Israel Trust of the Anglican Church
COLEMAN, Rev. Dr. John W.	English-speaking Chaplain, Egypt
CROOKS, Rev. Peter J.	Chaplain in Syria and Lebanon
KHOURY, Rt. Rev. Eliya	Assistant Bishop of the Jerusalem Diocese
SAWYER, Rev. Alfred	Rector, Christ Church, Jerusalem
SKINNER, Rev. Ray	Anglican Chaplain in Oman

OCEANIA

Australia

BETTERIDGE, Canon Maurice	Principal, Ridley College, Melbourne
BUTLER, Canon N. Barry	Theology Teacher, Nungalinga College, Darwin
CHAPMAN, Canon John C.	Director, Department of Evangelism, Sydney
CORNEY, Ven. Peter J.	Archdeacon for Evangelism, Diocese of Melbourne
KERR, Alan	EFAC Regional Secretary, Oceania
KNOX, Canon D. Broughton	Theological Professor
CRAWFORD, Rev. Peter	Secretary, EFAC (Australia)
FREWER, Rev. Ken	Missionary Society Secretary
GOODHEW, Rt. Rev. R. H.	Bishop of Wollongong, NSW
HALL, Ross	Personnel Secretary, Church Missionary Society
JENSEN, Rev. Dr. Peter F.	Principal, Moore College, Sydney
NEWING, Rev. Dr. Edward G.	Federal Secretary SAMS (Australia), Biblical Scholar
ROBERTS, Ven. Dr. Victor	Archdeacon of Wollongong, NSW
SHILTON, Very Rev. Lance R.	Dean of Sydney
SHORT, Rt. Rev. Kenneth	Bishop of Parramatta, Sydney
WALLACE, Rev. Tom	Director of Education, Diocese of Sydney

WARNE, Clifford Director, Anglican Television, Sydney
 WILLIAMS, Rev. Dr. John W. Director, Theological Education and Ministry, Melbourne

New Zealand

BRIGHTON, Les General Secretary, Latimer Fellowship
 CARRELL, Rev. Brian General Synod Member
 MATHIESON, Dr. D. L. Queen's Counsel, ex-Professor of Law
 MEADOWCROFT, Canon John G. Vicar, St. Matthew's Church, Dunedin
 WIGGINS, Rt. Rev. Maxwell L. Retired Bishop

EUROPE

Continental Europe

LEA, Ven. Brian Archdeacon in Northern France
 LINDSAY, Canon R. J. A. Chaplain, Anglican Church, The Hague
 RUSSELL, Alec Member of General Synod (Europe)
 WHEATLEY PRICE, Canon J. Chaplain, Christ Church, Amsterdam

England

ADAMS, Canon Raymond Team Rector, Ipsley, Redditch, Worcs.
 ADENEY, David W. Operational Director, TEAR Fund
 ALDIS, Rev. John A. Vicar, Holy Trinity, Leicester
 ALISON, Michael MP; Second Church Estates Commissioner
 ALLISTER, Rev. Donald S. Vicar, Christ Church, Birkenhead
 ANDERSON, Prof. Sir Norman Formerly Chairman, House of Laity, General Synod
 ANGEL, Rev. Gervais Director of Studies, Trinity College, Bristol
 APPLIN, Rev. David Overseas Director, TEAR Fund
 ASHTON, Rev. Mark H. Vicar, Round Church, Cambridge
 ATKINSON, Rev. Dr. David Fellow, Corpus Christi College, Oxford
 ATKINSON, Canon Prof. James Director, Reformation Centre, Sheffield
 AXTELL, Rev. Ron Rector, St. Peter's, Levenshulme
 AYRE, Canon James Rector of Cheadle, Cheshire
 BAILEY, Rev. Peter Vicar, St. Edyth's, Bristol
 BAKER, Rev. A. P. Chairman, Latimer House, Oxford
 BALL, Rev. John General Secretary, BCMS
 BANNISTER, Rev. Peter Rural Dean of Bridgewater
 BARCLAY, Rev. Ian Churches' Secretary, Evangelical Alliance
 BARHAM, Canon Kenneth L. Commissary to Archbishop Ndandali, Rwanda
 BARKER, Malcolm J. W. Elected Lay Member, CEEC
 BARLEY, Jack H. Mission Administrator; General Synod Member
 BAUCKHAM, Dr. Richard University Reader in Theology, Manchester
 BAXTER, Dr. Christina Registrar, St. John's College, Nottingham
 BECKWITH, Rev. Roger T. Warden, Latimer House, Oxford
 BEDFORD, Rev. Colin Rector, Toxteth Team Ministry, Liverpool
 BEGERNIE, Rev. Doreen Formerly Secretary, Ministry among Women, CPAS
 BENN, Rev. Wallace P. CEEC; Vicar of Harold Wood
 BENNET, Rev. Gordon Rector of Edgware, Middlesex
 BENNETT, Canon Arthur Author; CMS Vice-President
 BENNETTS, Rev. Colin J. Rural Dean of Oxford
 BERG, Canon Paul M. Vicar, Christ Church, Clifton, Bristol
 BERRY, Dr. Caroline Consultant Clinical Geneticist, London
 BERRY, Prof. R. J. Professor of Genetics, University College, London
 BEWES, Preb. Richard T. Rector, All Souls, Langham Place
 BIGGAR, Dr. Nigel Librarian, Latimer House, Oxford
 BIRCHALL, Mark D. Lay Vice-President, Southwark Diocesan Synod
 BISHOP, Rev. David H. R. General Synod Member
 BLISSARD-BARNES, Rev. C. J. Rector, Hampreston, Ferndown Stapehill, Dorset
 BODDINGTON, Rev. Alan Rector, St. Peter's, Farnborough
 BOOTH, Dr. David Psychology Reader, University of Birmingham
 BOOTH, Thomas General Synod Member
 BOREHAM, Rev. Harold Vicar of Felixstowe
 BOTTING, Canon Michael H. Chairman, Senior Evangelical Anglican Conference
 BOURNON, Canon John R. Canon Emeritus of St. Albans
 BOWEN, Rev. Roger W. Lecturer/Tutor, All Nations Christian College
 BRADSHAW, Rev. Dr. Timothy Doctrine Lecturer, Trinity College, Bristol
 BRAITHWAITE, Rev. A. A. Chaplain, Royal Navy (retired)
 BRAY, Rev. Dr. Gerald Tutor, Oak Hill Theological College
 BRENTFORD, Viscount Solicitor
 BRETHERTON, Canon Alan General Synod Member
 BRIDGER, Canon Gordon Principal, Oak Hill Theological College
 BRIGGS, Dr. Andrew Lecturer, Oxford University
 BROADBENT, Rev. Pete Polytechnic Chaplain; General Synod Member
 BROADHURST, Rev. Kenneth Vicar of Leyland
 BROADHURST, Mrs. Shirley Ann General Synod Member
 BRONNERT, Rev. Dr. David L. E. Area Dean of Ealing West
 BUBBERS, Rev. David General Secretary, Church Pastoral Aid Society
 BUCKLEY, Tim PRO, London Bible College
 BUNKER, Rev. Michael Vicar, St. James, Muswell Hill
 BURGESS, Canon Dr. H. J. Author, 'Enterprise in Education' (SPCK)
 BURNS, Canon Edward J. Vicar of Fulwood, Preston, Lancashire
 BURROWS, Rev. Reg. Vicar, St. Barnabas and St. Jude, Newcastle
 BYRNE, Rev. J. V. Vicar, St. Jude's, Southsea
 CAINE (nee BALDWIN) Rev. Joyce NSM and Author
 CASSIDY, Ven. George Archdeacon of London

CHAPMAN, Rev. Colin G.	Lecturer, Trinity College, Bristol
CHETWOOD, Nigel J.	General Synod Member
CLARK, John	Communications Secretary, CMS
CLARK, John Guthrie	General Synod Member
CLARK, Miss Kathleen C.	Assistant General Secretary, SAMS
COATES, Canon K. W.	Vicar of St. Helen's, Lancashire
COEKIN, Prof. John A.	Lay Reader and Church Leader
COHEN, Rev. David	General Director, Scripture Union
COHEN, Mrs. Marlene L.	Lay Training Officer, Diocese of Southwark
COLE, Rev. Michael	Chairman, South American Missionary Society
COLLINS, Preb. J. T. C. B.	Area Dean of Chelsea
COLLINS, Rev. Christopher D.	Vicar, St. John's, Tunbridge Wells
COOK, Rev. Peter	Vicar, St. Andrew's, Cheadle Hulme
COOMBS, Ven. Peter	Archdeacon of Wandsworth
CORDELE, Anthony	Parliamentary Assistant
COTTINGHAM, Rev. Peter J. G.	Vicar, St. Peter's, Derby
COTTON, Rev. Dick	Vicar, Christ Church, Chislehurst
COX, Mrs. Liza	General Synod Member (Ripon)
COX, Rev. Dr. Simon J.	Minister, Emmanuel Church, Cheadle Hulme
CRAIG, Hugh	General Synod Member
CRAY, Rev. Graham A.	General Synod Member (York)
DAIN, Rt. Rev. A. Jack	Retired Bishop, Sydney Diocese, Australia
DANN, Mrs. Jill	Vice-Chairman, House of Laity, General Synod
DART, John H.	Lay Member, General Synod
DAVIES, Rev. Bernard	Vicar and Rural Dean, Braintree
DAVIES, Rt. Rev. Howell H.	Vicar, St. Jude's, Wolverhampton
DAWSON, Ven. Peter	Archdeacon of Norfolk; General Synod Member
DAWSON, Mrs. Muriel Joyce	Christian Worker, York
DAY, Rev. Colin M.	Executive Officer to Anglican Evangelical Assembly
DAY, Mrs. Ruth	General Synod Member
DEAN, Tim	Editor, <i>Third Way</i>
DEARNLEY, Preb. Patrick W.	Archbishop's Officer for Urban Priority Areas
DELIGHT, Ven. John	Archdeacon of Stoke-upon-Trent
DELIGHT, Rev. Paul C.	Vicar, St. Peter Port, Guernsey
DE WAAAL, Canon Hugo	Principal, Ridley Hall, Cambridge
DOBBIE, Col W. I. C.	Army Officer
DOMINY, Rev. Peter	Rector of Broadwater, Worthing
DOW, Rev. Graham	Vicar of Coventry
DOWNHAM, Rev. Peter N.	Vicar, Greyfriars, Reading; General Synod Member
DRUMMOND, Rev. J. M. V.	General Director, CMJ
EDEN, Martyn	Dean, London Institute for Contemporary Christianity
ELPHICK, Rev. Robin	Rector of Frinton-on-Sea
ENTWISTLE, Rev. Frank	Publisher
EVANS, Prof. E. F.	Head of Department, Keele University
FIELD, Brian	General Synod Member
FIELD, Rev. David	Vice-Principal, Oakhill Theological College; Author
FILBY, Ven. William	Archdeacon of Horsham
FLAGG, Rt. Rev. Bill	General Secretary, SAMS
FLETCHER, Rev. the Hon. D. C. M.	Rector, St. Ebbe's, Oxford
FORWARD, Canon Ron	Vicar, St. Thomas's, Kendal
FRANCE, Rev. Dr. R. T.	Vice-Principal, London Bible College
FRANCIS, Canon E. W.	MBE, retired
FULLER, J. Baden	General Synod Member
GIDDINGS, Dr. Philip J.	General Synod Member
GILLET, Rev. David	Principal, Trinity College, Bristol
GODIN, Roger	General Synod Lay Member (Southwark)
GOLDSMITH, Martin	Lecturer, All Nations Christian College
GOODMAN, Rev. Derek G.	Vicar, St. Mark's, Woodthorpe, Nottingham
GRACEY, Howard	Consulting Actuary
GREEN, Canon Derek G. W.	East Region Co-ordinator, Scripture Union
GREEN, Charles F.	General Synod Member
GRIEVE, Dr. Sheila	General Synod Member (Chester)
GRIEVE, Val	Senior Partner, Croftons Solicitors, Manchester
GRINHAM, Rev. Garth	Vicar, Christ Church, Southport
GUTSELL, Rev. D. L. N.	Vicar, All Saints, Patcham
HACKING, Rev. Philip H.	Vicar, Christ Church, Fulwood, Sheffield
HALL, Rev. Dr. John B.	Rector of Tooting Parish Church
HALLING, Rev. Bill	Rector of Kirkheaton
HAMMERTON, Dr. John	FRCGP, General Synod Member
HAMMOND, Prof. P.	University Teacher
HARLEY, Rev. C. David	Principal, All Nations Christian College
HARMAN, Preb. Gordon	Honorary Retired Assistant Minister
HARPER, Canon Michael C.	International Executive Director, SOMA
HAY, Donald A.	Fellow, Jesus College, Oxford University
HAYDEN, Rev. David	Vicar of Cromer, Norfolk
HAYDEN, Canon John D.	Canon and Commissary, Diocese of Mount Kilimanjaro
HENDERSON, Canon Roy	Council Chairman, Trinity College, Bristol
HEINZE, Rev. Dr. R. W.	College Lecturer in Church History
HIGGINSON, Dr. Richard	Ethics Tutor, Cranmer Hall, Durham
HIGTON, Rev. Tony	Rector of Hawkwell, General Synod Member
HINE, Rev. Dr. Richard A.	Liturgy Lecturer, Oakhill Theological College
HINGLEY, Rev. C. J. H.	Tutor, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford

HITCH, Rev. Kim W.	Vicar, St. James', Hatcham
HOARE, Sir Timothy	General Synod Member
HOBSON, Peter	General Synod Member
HODGE, Canon Michael	General Synod, Rector of Bidborough
HOLDEN, Dr. J. T.	General Synod Member (Southwell)
HOLLOWAY, Rev. David	General Synod, Standing Committee Member
HOLMES, Lionel G.	Licensed Reader, Diocese of Guildford
HOLMES, Dr. Oliver Wright	Legislative Committee, General Synod
HOLMES, Nigel	General Synod Member
HOLT, Mrs. Ann	Member of CEEC
HOPE, Rev. Robert	Team Rector, Radipole, Weymouth
HOPKINS, Rowland	General Synod Member
HOWARTH, Rev. Robert	Vicar of Harlow
HUMPHREYS Rev. Dr. James G.	Vicar of Bramcote, Rural Dean of Beeston
HUMPHRIES, Rev. Donald	Vicar, Holy Trinity, Cambridge
HUTCHINSON, Canon Peter	Rector of Keighley, General Synod Member
HYATT, Rev. Robert K.	Vicar of Claygate
IDLE, Rev. Christopher M.	Rector of Limehouse; Author
INWOOD, Rev. Richard	General Synod Member (Bath)
IRVING, Canon Don	General Secretary, Intercontinental Church Society
ISBISTER, Dr. J. N.	Author and Management Training Consultant
JACKSON, Very Rev. Brandon D.	Provost of Bradford
JACKSON, Rev. Roger B.	Rector of Deane, Bolton
JOHNSON, Prof. Gordon J.	Professor of Preventive Ophthalmology
JOHNSTON, Preb. R. P.	Formerly General Synod Member
JOHNSTON, Philip	Headmaster; General Synod Member
KEILLER, Rev. Jane	NSM Deacon, St. Barnabas, Cambridge
KERFOOT, Jim	General Synod Member (Chester)
KING, Canon Philip	Vicar, Christ Church, Harrow
KIRK, Rev. Andrew	Theologian Missioner of CMS
KNAGGS, Franks	General Synod Member (Newcastle)
KNIGHT, Canon Donald M.	Founder-Rector, Harlow New Town
KNIGHT, Rev. John B.	Vicar of Summerfield, Birmingham
KUHRT, Canon Gordon W.	London University Theology Lecturer; General Synod
LANDRETH, Gordon	Former General Secretary, Evangelical Alliance
LAWSON, Rev. Michael C.	Vicar, Christ Church, Bromley
LEIGH, Rev. Martin	Ecumenical Officer for Derbyshire
LEWIS, Rev. David V.	Vicar, Holy Trinity, Wallington
LINGS, Rev. George W.	Vicar, ex-General Secretary, Eclectic Society
LLOYD, Rev. Trevor	Vicar, Trinity St. Michael, Harrow
LOCKE, Geoffrey L. E.	General Synod Member
LUCAS, Preb. R. C.	Rector, St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, London
MACINNES, Rev. David R.	Rector, St. Aldates, Oxford
MANWARING, Randle	Author; Member of Diocesan Synod
MARCHANT, Ven. G. J. C.	Emeritus Archdeacon and Canon Residentiary
MARTIN, John K.	Editor, <i>Church of England Newspaper</i>
MASON, Rev. T. H. Ambrose	Church of England Evangelical Council
MATTHEWS, Rev. Colin	Head, Bible Ministries Department, Scripture Union
MAUDE, J. Kenneth	General Synod Member; Reader
MAY, Rev. Charles	Vicar, Christ Church, Fulham
MAY, Dr. Peter	General Synod Member
McCLOUGHRAY, Roy K.	Director, Shaftesbury Project
McKECHNIE, Rev. John G.	Vicar of Lindfield, Sussex
MENON, Vijay	General Synod Member; Author; Chartered Engineer
MILLAR, Rev. Sandy	Vicar, Holy Trinity, Brompton
MILMINE, Rt. Rev. Douglas	Former Bishop of Paraguay
MOORE, Rev. John R.	General Synod Member; Team Rector
MOTYER, Rev. Stephen	Lecturer, London Bible College
NEECH, Canon Alan	Rural Dean of Loddon, Norwich
NEILL, Rev. Jim	Chairman, Southwell Diocesan Evangelical Fellowship
NOEL, Marcel P.	General Synod Member
O'BRIEN, G. M.	General Synod Member
PAGET-WILKES, Rev. Michael	Vicar; Author
PALMER, Rev. Ian S.	Vicar of Annfield Plain, Durham
PARKIN, Rev. Trevor K.	Vicar, St. Mary's, Maidenhead
PAYNTER, Mrs. Jennifer R.	General Synod Member
PEARCE, Preb. John	General Synod Member
PERRIS, Rev. J. Martin	Vicar of Redland, Bristol
PHENNA, Rev. Peter	Assistant General Secretary, CPAS
PICKERING, Prof. John F.	University Professor
PILLAR, Rt. Rev. Kenneth	Bishop of Hertford
POLLARD, Rev. Noel S.	Lecturer, St. John's College, Nottingham
PONT, Arthur	General Secretary, BMMF Interserve
POUNCY, Rev. A. G.	Retired Vicar of Woking
PREECE, Rev. R. A.	SW Regional Secretary of OMF
PRICE, F. W.	Chartered Electrical Engineer
PRINGLE, James	General Synod Member (St. Albans)
PRIOR, Canon Kenneth F. W.	Author; Minister St. John's, Downshire Hill
PYTCHES, Rev. Dr. Peter N. L.	Area Dean of Central Barnet
PYTCHES, Rt. Rev. David	Formerly Bishop of Chile, Bolivia and Peru
REES, Rev. Anthony	Vicar of Cockfosters
REES, Rev. Michael	Chief Secretary, Church Army

REID, Rev. Ian D.	General Synod Member
REID, Rev. Gavin H.	Evangelism Secretary, Church Pastoral Aid Society
RIGLER, Rev. Anthony E. H.	Vicar, St. Luke's, Portsmouth
ROBOTOM, Peter G.	General Synod Member (Chichester)
ROE, Jack R.	General Synod Member (York)
RONAYNE, Rev. Peter	Rural Dean of Streatham
ROOT, Rev. John	Vicar, St. James', Alperton
ROSE, Rev. K. Judith	Rural Dean of Gillingham, Kent
ROSS, Rev. Alex	Vicar, Bishop Hannington Church, Hove
ROWLANDSON, Maurice	Consultant
ROYLE, Timothy	General Synod Member
RUSHTON, Rev. James D.	Vicar, St. James', Carlisle; Proctor in Convocation
RUSSELL, Prof. Colin A.	Professor, the Open University
RUSSELL, Rev. Ian	Vicar, St. Jude's, Mapperley
RUSTON, Canon Mark	Retired
SALISBURY, Rev. Roger	Rector, Holy Trinity Platt, Manchester
SALTER, Rev. John F.	Vicar, Emmanuel, Stoughton, Guildford
SAMPSON, Rev. Clive	Chairman, Canterbury Diocesan Evangelical Fellowship
SAMUEL, Rev. Dr. David	Director of Church Society
SAVAGE, Rev. Michael A.	Rural Dean of Otley
SAVILLE, Canon Ian K. W.	Rural Dean of Wimborne
SAWARD, Preb. Michael	General Synod Member
SCEATS, Rev. David D.	Diocesan Training Officer
SCOBLE, Gordon P. W.	Churchwarden, All Saints, Lindfield, Surrey
SEARLE-BARNES, Canon C. W. J.	Vicar and Rural Dean of Tonbridge
SHAW, Canon Geoffrey N.	Principal, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford
SHIRESS, Rev. David H. F.	Vicar, St. Michael's, Blackheath
SHIRRAS, Ven. Eddie	Archdeacon of Northolt
SHORT, Bryan R.	General Synod Member
SHORT, Canon John	Vicar, General Synod Member
SIMMS, Mrs. Joan	General Synod Member
SIMS, Mrs. Helen E.	General Synod Member
SINCLAIR, Canon Maurice W.	Principal, Crowther Hall, Birmingham
SKINNER, Rev. John	Rector, St. Leonard's, Exeter
SMALLEY, Mrs. June S.	General Synod Member
SMITH, Rev. Alan	Rector of Rushden
SMITH, Ian R.	CMS Area Secretary, Ripon, York
SPANNER, Rev. Prof. Douglas	Professor Emeritus, Plant Biophysics, London University
STANLEY, Canon John A.	Vicar of Huyton
STEVENS, Rev. David	Member of Diocesan Synod
STEVENSON, T. J. P.	General Synod Member
STONE, Rev. Godfrey O.	Tutor, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford
STORKEY, Alan	Lecturer, Oak Hill College
STORKEY, Dr. Elaine	General Synod Member (London)
STOTT, Rev. Dr. John R. W.	President, EFAC; Author
STRAPPS, Rev. R. D.	Vicar of Sandal Magna, Wakefield
STRIDE, Rev. Eddy	Rector; Chairman of Church Society
STRONG, Preb. S. C.	Prebendary Emeritus, Hereford
SUGDEN, Rev. Christopher	Registrar, Oxford Centre for Mission Studies
SUTTON, Canon Harry	Honorary Canon Missioner, SAMS
TAYLOR, Rev. Godfrey	Vicar, St. John's, Boscombe
TAYLOR, Rev. Roy W.	OMF China Coordinator (UK)
TAYLOR THOMPSON, Derek	Retired Commissioner of Inland Revenue
THOMSON, Rev. O. M.	Rector of Sevenoaks
THOMSON, Rev. R. I.	Vicar, St. Mary's, Reigate
TILLER, Canon John	Chancellor of Hereford Cathedral
TINKER, Rev. Melvin	University Chaplain
TONG, Rev. Peter L.	Rector of Bedworth
TONKIN, Canon R. John	Vicar, Holy Apostles, Leicester
TOON, Rev. Dr. Peter	Theological Teacher and Author
TRAPNELL, Dr. David H.	Formerly President, British Institute of Radiology
TURNBULL, Ven. Michael	Archdeacon of Rochester
TURNER, Rev. Geoffrey M.	General Synod Member
TYRRELL, Mike	Member of Provincial Synod
VASEY, Rev. Michael	Tutor, St. John's College, Durham
VAUGHAN, Ven. Peter St. G.	Archdeacon of Westmoreland and Furness
VEVERS, Rev. Eric	Vicar, All Saints, Sidmouth
WADDELL, Miss Jean	Former CMS Missionary, Iran
WALDRON, Prof. Malcolm B.	Pro. Vice-Chancellor of Surrey University
WALKER, Canon Michael J.	Vicar of Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk
WALKER, Rev. Nigel	Vicar, St. Mary's, Upton, Wirral
WALLACE, Neville G.	General Synod Member; Reader
WALLER, Canon John W.	Vicar of Pudsey
WALLIS, Rev. John A.	UK Director, Overseas Missionary Fellowship
WALSH, Arthur E.	General Synod Member
WALTERS, Rev. Michael	Vicar of Knutsford and Toft
WARD, Mrs. G. M.	General Synod Member (Lichfield)
WARREN, Very Rev. Alan	Provost of Leicester
WARREN, Rev. Norman	Rural Dean of Merton
WATHERSTON, Lady	Chairman, National Council for Christian Standards in Society
WATSON, Rev. Robert B.	Vicar, Holy Trinity, Knaphill
WATSON, Rev. Timothy	Rector, All Saints, Weston, Bath

WEBLEY, Simon	Economist
WENHAM, Rev. Dr. David	Tutor, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford
WENHAM, Rev. John W.	Author; sometime Bristol University Lecturer
WENT, Rev. John S.	Vice-Principal, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford
WESSON, Rev. John G.	Rector, St. Martin's-in-the-Bullring, Birmingham
WESSON, Mrs Jeanne	Member, Social Policy Committee, BSR
WESTGATE, James N.	Civil Engineer; General Synod Member
WESTON, Canon Keith	Director of Ordinands, Norwich Diocese
WESTON, Rev. Neil	Chairman, St. Albans Diocesan Evangelical Fellowship
WHEATON, Canon David	Former Principal, Oak Hill College
WHITAKER, Trevor	General Synod Member
WHITE, Rev. Keith	Rector, Holy Trinity, Norwich
WIDDECOMBE, Canon Malcolm	Vicar, SS Philip & Jacob, Bristol
WIGLEY, Canon Max	Vicar, Gt. Horton, Bradford
WILCOCK, Rev. Michael	Vicar, St. Nicholas', Durham; Author
WILKINS, Richard	Chairman, Church Pastoral Aid Society
WILLETT, Canon Allen	Canon Emeritus, Chelmsford Cathedral
WILLIAMS, Rev. Ian G.	Vicar of Littleover, Derby
WILLIAMS, Canon John H.	General Synod Member
WILLIAMS, Rev. Dr. John F. A.	Vicar of Highfield, Southampton
WILLIAMS, Rev. John R.	Vicar of Chilwell, Nottingham
WILSON, Rev. David G.	Vicar, St. Mary's, Spring Grove, Kensington
WOOD, Rt. Rev. Maurice A. P.	Formerly Bishop of Norwich
WOOD, Rev. Peter	General Synod Member
WOOLDRIDGE, Rev. Derek	Rector, St. Paul's, York
WRIGHT, Frank	General Synod Member

Ireland (Ulster/Eire)

BAXTER, H. C.	Lay Reader, Church of Ireland
BRIDCUT, Rev. W. J.	Superintendent, Irish Church Missions
CLARKE, Rev. Ken H.	Rector of Coleraine
ELSDON, Dr. Ronald	Church of Ireland General Synod
ENGLAND, Rev. Robert G.	Religious Studies Head, Regent House School, Newtownards
McCANN, Dr. J. Sydney	Member, Connor (C of I) Diocesan Synod
MILLER, Rev. Harold C.	Chaplain, Queen's University, Belfast
O'CALLAGHAN, Dermot	Member of General Synod (C of I)
ROSS, William	MP; Member of General Synod (C of I)
SMART, Canon Sydney	Member, Church of Ireland Liturgical AC 1963-84
STEVENSON, Thomas G.	Chairman, Church of Ireland Evangelical Fellowship
TWADDELL, Rev. William R.	Rector of Portadown
WEST, Rev. Clive	Rector of All Saints, Belfast

Scotland

CLANCY, Rev. Michael	Hon. Curate, St. Silas, Glasgow
GORDON, Rev. Bruce H. C.	Rector, Christ Church, Duns, Berwickshire
GORDON, Canon Kenneth D.	General Synod Member
MAYBURY, Rev. David K.	Warden, Whitcheater Christian Centre
READER-HARRIS, Dr. Michael J.	Secretary, Scottish Episcopal Evangelical Fellowship
SCOBIE, Rev. Dr. Geoffrey E. W.	Rector, St. Silas, Glasgow; Psychology Lecturer

Wales

ALDIS, Arnold S.	Retired Surgeon
BELL, Rev. Stuart R.	Vicar and Governing Body Member
BROWN, Rev. Roger L.	Vicar of Tongwynlais
DAY, Miss G. E. M.	Layreader in Aberystwyth
GRAY, Professor Peter	Professor of Child Health, UWCM
LEWIS, Ven. Bertie	Archdeacon of Cardigan
LEWIS, Rev. W. G. R.	Rector, Hubberston Parish, Dyfed
PATERSON, Rev. Robert M. E.	Vicar of Galfa, Cardiff
RHODES, Dr. Elizabeth	University Lecturer, Chemical Engineering, Swansea

APPENDIX III

(Those listed below, being archbishops and diocesan bishops, together with some suffragan and assistant bishops and a consultant invited to the Lambeth Conference, have expressed their general sympathy with the viewpoint of the Open Letter and their hope that its concerns will be carefully considered both at the Lambeth Conference and in the ongoing work of ARCIC II).

ALLISON, Rt. Rev. C. FitzSimons	Bishop of South Carolina, USA
BAUGHEN, Rt. Rev. Michael A.	Bishop of Chester, England
BAZLEY, Rt. Rev. Colin F.	Bishop of Chile, Southern Cone of America
BUCHANAN, Rt. Rev. Colin G.	Bishop of Aston, England
CHHOA, Rt. Rev. Datuk Luke H. S.	Bishop of Sabah
DAWES, Rt. Rev. Peter S.	Bishop designate of Derby, England
DEHQANI-TAFTI, Rt. Rev. Hassan B.	Bishop in Iran (in exile)
DUDLEY-SMITH, Rt. Rev. Timothy	Bishop of Thetford, England
ELLISON, Rt. Rev. John A.	Bishop of Paraguay, Southern Cone of America
EVANS, Rt. Rev. David R. J.	Bishop of Peru and Bolivia, Southern Cone
GBONIGI, Rt. Rev. Emmanuel B.	Bishop of Akure, Nigeria
HATENDI, Rt. Rev. R. Peter	Bishop of Harare, Zimbabwe
HLA AUNG, Rt. Rev. Andrew	Bishop of Myitkyina, Burma
KAUMA, Rt. Rev. Misaeri	Bishop of Namirembe, Uganda
KURIA, Most Rev. Manasses	Archbishop of Kenya, Bishop of Nairobi
LEAKE, Most Rev. David	Primate of Southern Cone of America
LE FEUVRE, Rt. Rev. Philip	Bishop of St. Mark the Evangelist, South Africa
OLAJIDE, Rt. Rev. Gideon I. O.	Bishop of Ilesa, Nigeria
OMOLO, Rt. Rev. Jonathan D.	Bishop of Maseno West, Kenya
PENMAN, Most Rev. David	Archbishop of Melbourne, Australia
REID, Rt. Rev. John R.	Regional Bishop, South Sydney, Australia
ROBINSON, Most Rev. Donald W. B.	Archbishop of Sydney, Australia
TAY, Rt. Rev. Dr. Moses	Bishop of Singapore
TAYLOR, Rt. Rev. John B.	Bishop of St. Albans, England
WILLIAMSON, Rt. Rev. Roy	Bishop of Bradford, England

Lambeth Conference Consultant

ETCHELLS, Miss Ruth	Former Principal, St. John's College, Durham
---------------------	----------------------------------------------

ISBN 1 85174 076 7

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602-430786)