



# THE WINDOW

No. 9 - August 1986

PRESIDENT: RT REV JOHN GIBBS

Anglican-Lutheran Society

## The contexts of Anglican-Lutheran communion and key questions by the Revd Dr Eugene Brand

The formulation of the theme for the addresses at this conference is itself a sign of hope. "In communion" is not a description of the present state of Anglican-Lutheran relationships, at least not if communion is understood in the full sense of the word as the descriptor of full church fellowship. On the other hand, it is not just a pious wish either. There is a sense, of course, in which all baptised persons are in communion. That is an eschatological reality, for the communion of all the baptised - their *koinonia* - is first and foremost a gift of God in Christ; it is something we realise, not something we achieve.

But Anglicans and Lutherans are "in communion" - in the sense of ecclesial realisation of the baptismal fact - in more than just acknowledging this fundamental oneness in Christ. There is the recent declaration in the United States of "interim eucharistic sharing" between the Episcopalians and most Lutherans. There is the "official eucharistic hospitality" between the Lutheran churches of Sweden, Finland, Latvia and Estonia and the Church of England, which extends back to the early part of this century. Even earlier were the seeming ad hoc relationships between Swedish Lutherans and Anglicans in colonial days on the eastern seaboard of North America.

Still it is unlikely that an Anglican-Lutheran Society would have been founded as recently as twenty years ago and, even if it had a been, it is unlikely that a meeting would have had as its theme "in communion." For as the opening sections of the Cold Ash Report (Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group, 1983) point out, the Anglican and Lutheran communions "had in many ways become strangers to each other" during the centuries between the post-Reformation period and the recent past. That in these days we are not only renewing our acquaintance but are, at least in several

parts of the world, committed to realising full communion, is a cause for joy and thanksgiving.

Without questioning the validity of speaking of Anglican and Lutheran communions, it is necessary to note how their development has created internal diversities. If one thinks that in describing the Church of England one has described the Anglican Communion, one is just as mistaken as if one assumes that German Lutheranism is simply replicated wherever there are Lutheran churches. Bishop John Howe in his recent *Highways and Hedges* (Toronto, 1985) helps non-Anglicans grasp how Anglicanism, wherever it is found, displays its English

continued on page 3

### FEATURED IN THIS ISSUE...

'In Communion: Problems and Opportunities' was the theme of the 1986 conference of the Anglican-Lutheran Society, held on 23-24 May. The main articles in this issue of THE WINDOW are shortened versions of the keynote addresses presented at the conference, each offering a different perspective on the theme.

Mr Dana Netherton, an Anglican historian, considers 'Interim Eucharistic Sharing in the U.S.A.'

The Revd Dr Eugene Brand, LWF Secretary for Ecumenical

Relationships and Ecclesiological Research, writes about 'The Contexts of Anglican-Lutheran Communion and Key Questions.' 'What is meant by Communion?' is a summary of the talk given by the Revd Canon Christopher Hill, the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assistant for Ecumenical Affairs.

(The full texts of Mr Netherton's and Dr Brand's papers may be obtained by sending an addressed A4 envelope with a 22p stamp or an international voucher to the Editor of THE WINDOW).



## What is meant by communion?

A summary of an address given by the Revd Canon Christopher Hill

When Christians talk about being in communion, what is meant? What kind of unity are we seeking? We should mean a communion of life, worship and mission.

Let us first of all consider the understanding of communion in the early Christian community. The First Epistle of John suggests that communion includes a vertical element and a horizontal element. Christians are in communion with the Father and with one another. Participation in the life of God leads to participation with one's fellow Christians. This thinking developed into an ecclesiology of communion. The community of Christ exists in a particular locality; Christ is truly present in Word and Sacrament in a particular local church. Although Christ is truly present in the local community, to be truly Christian it is also necessary to be in relation with one's fellow Christians universally.

Anglicans have tended to regard communion as simply a sacramental interchange or the interchangeability of ministries. This has diminished the meaning of communion, has meant a concentration on worship at the expense of life and mission. For example, Anglican discussion with the Old Catholics and with the Scandinavian churches in the 1920's and 30's was about eucharistic hospitality and the exchange of ministries. There was little discussion about the fuller, richer meaning of communion, including the life and mission of the Christian community. The whole point, however, of sacramental communion together is to enable people receiving the sacrament to go out into the world as the one body of Christ. There is a growing understanding in Anglican circles that communion is a much broader concept than this former emphasis implies. The elements of life and mission are also central to the meaning of communion.

In ecumenical discussions, especially the Anglican-Lutheran conversations, Anglicans should not offer anything less than this full sense of being in communion. The reports of Anglican-Lutheran conversations have been gradually moving in this direction. This is reflected, for example, by the agreement that subsequent discussions between Anglicans and Lutherans should be especially encouraged in areas where Anglicans and Lutherans work side by side. This implies an emphasis on life and mission in considerations of unity, because these elements are of particular importance to churches living close together. The Joint Working Group, reporting in 1983, began to spell out the implications of this new, broader sense of communion.

What kind of church, then, does this three-fold communion imply? Some sort of structural relationship is certainly called for. The question of structures of unity has been barely touched in ecumenical dialogues, except in the Lutheran-Roman Catholic discussions, which have produced some very helpful suggestions ('Facing Unity' published by the LWF). We must consider which models of unity to apply. Organic unity has usually been preferred by Anglicans. Lutherans, on the other hand, have preferred other expressions of unity. A complication in Anglican-Lutheran discussions is that circumstances are different in different parts of the world. What would be a good model for Europe, where there is geographical separation between Anglicans and Lutherans, might not be good in the U.S.A. Lutherans have often spoken of a sort of federal model, which Anglicans would probably want to avoid. Perhaps we need to move away from both terms. Patristic patterns may give some help here, according to which the office of bishop is seen as a focus of internal unity and as a link of communion between the local community and the wider church.

A local church could exist with a good deal of autonomy. Great diversity is possible in unity; there need be no suggestion of uniformity. Any model that is adopted must offer communion in the fullest sense, but should otherwise allow great diversity, pluriformity, and richness.

Being in communion also implies that there will be organs of common decision-making, which will promote consultation and coordination. This points to some form of conciliar and even primatial unity. This might be difficult for Anglicans and Lutherans, however, because of the 16th century inheritance of the 'sovereign state'.

Moving the discussion in the direction of these wider understandings of the meanings of a communion of life, worship and mission, together with the structures necessary to sustain and promote such communion, moves us from the old, stale discussion about apostolic succession. We move from an over-concentration on the ministry of the Church to a proper emphasis on the mission of the Church.

THE WINDOW is sent quarterly to Members and Associate Groups of the Anglican-Lutheran Society. Information about the Society and membership applications are available from The Secretary, Anglican-Lutheran Society, 30 Thanet Street, London WC1H 9QH. Annual membership subscription rates are: Individual £6/US\$15 (OAPs or students £3/US\$10.50); Family £7.50/US\$17.25; Associate Group (five copies sent) minimum £15/US\$28.50.

Anglican-Lutheran Society

President

The Rt Revd John Gibbs  
(Anglican)

Chairman

The Revd Dr Ian Phelps  
(Anglican)

Secretary

The Revd Geoffrey Brown  
(Anglican)

Treasurer

Mr Richard Kubica  
(Lutheran)

Committee Members

Sister Naomi  
(Anglican)

The Revd Jarmo Kökkö  
(Lutheran)

Mr John Eibner  
(Lutheran)

THE WINDOW

Editorial Office,  
Anglican-Lutheran  
Society, 30 Thanet  
Street, London WC1H 9QH

Editor

The Revd Thomas Bruch



continued from page 1

origins. "Wherever Anglicans come from," he writes, "they are likely to think like Anglo-Saxons" (p.146). World Lutheranism may bear to some extent the "made in Germany" label, but due to the rapid spread of the Wittenberg Reformation into Scandinavia and eastern Europe, world Lutheranism bears a more "continental" stamp. For both Anglicans and Lutherans, established and/or folk churches have constituted the matrix.

When one discusses relationships between the Church of England (or Anglican churches in the United Kingdom) and European Lutherans, the question of communion is put within a particular context. These partners have experienced in common a Reformation era rupture with Rome which was, at the same time, theological and political in origin. In both situations it is virtually impossible to separate the theological from the political elements because of the homogenisation of church and state in the culture of Christendom and because of the championing and protection of the Reformation by princes. Even today, in spite of the erosions attributed to "secularism", these European partners exhibit an inextricable mix of Christianity and culture.

Having lost contact during the course of the sixteenth century, Anglican and Lutheran theological and ecclesial traditions developed separately in differing philosophical climates. The Anglo-Saxon mentality to which Bishop Howe refers tends to assign a high place to reason and is marked by a certain pragmatic bent. Lutheran theology, with its continental heritage, has been marked by great pessimism about human potential and has exhibited - in contrast to British theology -- a speculative bent. Moreover, though continental Lutherans have had their high church movements, these have not made anything like the impact on the Lutheran Church generally which similar movements made on the Anglican Church.

Because of the parallel historical-cultural situations the question of communion encounters new non-theological factors in such a European context. More significantly, fewer non-theological problems arise because on the level of the parishes British Anglicans and continental Lutherans seldom encounter one another in daily life and still would not even after full communion between their churches had been realised. That is not to suggest that these churches should not take the steps to full communion or regard them as important; it

is merely to observe that afterwards the difference will be experienced by the few people who travel a lot and by church leaders. The agenda leading to communion in Europe, then, tends to be largely theological. And with the exception of the problem of ministry, the items on that agenda have been dealt with. Progress has been facilitated both by a common Reformation heritage and by the virtual lack of doctrinal disputes historically such as those which mar the relationship between Lutherans and Roman Catholics or Lutherans and the Reformed.

A second context for Anglican-Lutheran communion is that between churches transplanted by emigrants. Such a context prevails in North America and Australia and is at least part of the picture in what we now call the Third World. Since I know it best, I shall let the North American situation stand as example of the second context.

Upon arriving in the United States Lutherans found themselves in a culture, both ecclesial and civil, shaped by Anglo-Saxons. The ecclesial culture was not simply Anglican. Often it was primarily Congregationalist or Methodist, but it was English nonetheless. Anglicans, I assume, also had adjustments to make, but they cannot have been as difficult. They spoke the language, their culture was generally dominant and accepted; theirs was sometimes even the actual or quasi-established church. None of this was true for the German and Scandinavian Lutherans.

An important ingredient in the development of American Lutheranism has been its gradual emergence from its foreign language ghetto existence to becoming an accepted part of American ecclesial culture. Roman Catholics, it might be noted, have had a similar history in North America. This emergence has at least the potential for a creative thrust among second and third generation English-speaking Lutherans. Their theological heritage bears its Continental stamp. Their cultural heritage, however, bears an Anglo-Saxon stamp.

One further thing should be said about American Lutheranism which, so far as I know, has no parallel in transplanted Anglicanism. Many Scandinavian Lutherans emigrated to North America not only because of economic circumstances and the lack of a future at home, but being mostly pietists, they also wished to escape the strictures of an established church and be able to live, as they saw it, in freedom from imposed liturgies and other burdens of an establishment. They were people



with strong reservations about ecclesial structures and power.

Many German Lutherans emigrated to North America to escape the uniting of Lutheran and Reformed churches in the so-called Prussian Union. They wished to remain Lutheran confessors and to preserve Lutheran theology and praxis as they had received it. Still today one of the nastiest words in the American Lutheran vocabulary is unionism!

In this second Anglican-Lutheran context, the question of communion brings with it about the same theological agenda it would bring in Europe, though with American accents. For example, the pietistic heritage of American Lutheranism might complicate the question of ministry and orders. Descendants of the anti-unionists, on the other hand, might see in the Anglican understanding of ministry a solid Reformation-tradition point compatible with pure Lutheran theology and practice.

But there are also powerful non-theological factors at work in the second context. Chief among them is the English language and the Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-American culture which Anglicans and Lutherans in North America share. Equally important is the matter of compatibility of partners within the denominational mix that typifies American church life. Those parts of Lutheranism which have tended to distance themselves from a Reformed Protestantism find in greater commonality with Episcopalians a support for that particularity. Those parts of Lutheranism with a more pietistic heritage tend to fear an authoritarian clericalism in ministerial orders and may, for that reason, think they have more in common with Presbyterians.

A final observation regarding the second context of Anglican-Lutheran relationships is that realising full communion in North America would directly affect the daily life of people in the parishes. It would often mean that Anglican and Lutheran congregations located on diagonal street corners would have to rethink their separate existence.

The third context for Anglican-Lutheran relationships subsists among churches which have their origin in 19th/20th century missionary endeavours, i.e. chiefly in the Third World. The importance of this context for the future of the Church is immense.

The historical, theological and cultural developments which led to the emergence in the 16th century of both Anglicanism and Lutheranism have only tangential relevance to churches in the

Third World context. Their loyalty to different Christian world communions, therefore, is - to affirm Bishop Howe's judgement - born out of affection for those who first preached the gospel to them and to those who supported them in their initial development as churches. Unfortunately, this loyalty has sometimes also been a matter of dependence furthered by the availability of financial support.

If that is a true picture, then a theological agenda between Anglicans and Lutherans in the Third World is likely to be at best a dutiful exercise having little real contextual relevance. Furthermore, it would seem that the common and overwhelming task of being the Church in an alien religious culture - learning how to proclaim the gospel in it and how to come to terms with it in praxis - demands the highest possible degree of unity among the churches. Perhaps the greatest gift the churches of the "north" could give those of the "south" is to allow them to be and to become themselves - not to abandon them, but to allow the gospel to liberate them fully and in terms of their own cultures. For with the churches of the south, it would seem, lies the future of the Church. Already one speaks of the need for the re-evangelisation of the "north".

As a way of proceeding, I wish to make use of a set of questions regarding the formation of the so-called new Lutheran church which were formulated in the United States in anticipation of the merger in 1988 of the Lutheran Church of America, the American Lutheran Church, and the association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

It is not my intention to apply all nine subquestions to our present theme. Were there to be full communion between Anglicans and Lutherans, that would without doubt enhance the preaching of the gospel, help deepen the devotion and discipleship of the believers, and help advance the evangelisation of all peoples. More directly, it would enhance the practice and understanding of baptism and eucharist. That covers four of the questions. Now to the other five.

# 1

Would Anglican-Lutheran communion contribute to vitalising church leadership?

Since being in communion involves mutual recognition of ministries and the possibility of any ordained person functioning in either church, the answer must be yes. Anglicans can assist Lutherans in ending their endless debate



about whether the ordained ministry is a function or an office. As BEM indicates, the ordained ministry is clearly an office which exists not for superior status but for the functions of proclamation and sacramental presidency. Entering into communion with Anglicans would require Lutherans to exercise their confessional freedom regarding episcopacy by accepting bishops in historic succession. So long as the debate remains unresolved, Lutheran freedom tends to be freedom from an historic episcopate rather than freedom for it, and Lutheran bishops are not quite sure who they are. Nor is anyone else. A sense of identity and of historical connectedness are vitalising factors surely.

What Lutherans have to contribute to a vitalising of church leadership is their "evangelical" corrective against seeing in ecclesiastical orders a guarantee of faithfulness to the apostolic gospel or as possessing any authority other than that of the gospel. I use "evangelical" here as Lutherans have cherished it to mean gospel-oriented. I would not use it in the sense of designating one party within the Anglican Communion.

## 2

Would Anglican-Lutheran communion strengthen the theological integrity of the community?

It is on this point that Lutherans, especially those in North America, have their greatest reservations about Anglicans. Doubtless Lutherans have often been guilty of both rigid and mindless varieties of confessionalism. But we must ask Anglicans why they seem to be so reticent about being confessional. Some Lutherans fear that Anglicans are so comprehensive that they are prepared to tolerate anything. Does not theological integrity (which I understand to mean theological faithfulness to the gospel) require drawing lines? Is it not conceivable that a creative encounter of Lutheran confessionalism with Anglican comprehensiveness could lead to a strengthened theological integrity for all?

## 3

Would Anglican-Lutheran communion help animate the fullness of ministries in the church?

Some of what was said above about vitalising church leadership applies here also. In addition one should observe that the traditional threefold ministry (with a real diaconate), upon which Anglicans have insisted and which BEM affirms as

desirable, would be a great contribution to fulness in ministries among Lutherans, but that the Reformation stress on the priesthood of all baptised believers would guard against seeing Christian ministry solely or even primarily in terms of these ordained ministries. Care must be taken with a real diaconate that deacons not displace or demoralise lay ministries. Ministry remains the function of the whole people of God.

## 4

Would Anglican-Lutheran communion make more credible and effective the witness and work of Christians in society?

Where separated geographically, being in communion would make little difference for either community. But where Anglicans and Lutherans live side by side a common witness would obviously be more credible and effective. It is true, of course, that being in communion is not a requisite for the common witness of churches in society. But it is, I think, a bit different when one speaks of the witness and work of Christian persons in society. Being in communion will affect positively those witnessing and working persons and that, in turn, will affect the witness and work itself.

## 5

Would Anglican-Lutheran communion strengthen Lutheranism's gift to the whole body of Christ?

At first I was inclined to leave this final question in the series out of consideration, seeing it as applicable only to the original situation of the "new" Lutheran church in the USA. The question also does not indicate what the gift is - i.e. what unique gift Lutherans have to give. But I have included it to remind us of the simple point that whatever Anglicans or Lutherans have to give to the whole body of Christ would be strengthened by giving such gifts together.

## FREE BOOKLET ON FREE SYNOD

A booklet entitled 'The Free Synod of the Church of Sweden - A Reform Movement within an Established Church' is available at no charge to readers of THE WINDOW. It was published in March 1986 by the Free Synod and presents the background and position of this new movement within the Swedish Church. If you would like a copy, please send an addressed C5 envelope with a 12p stamp or an international voucher to the Editor of THE WINDOW.



## Interim eucharistic sharing in the U.S.A. by Mr Dana Netherton

The first step toward 'interim eucharistic sharing' in the U.S.A. was a series of bilateral dialogues. Lutheran-Episcopal dialogue in the U.S. began in 1969. A year later, the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations began. Both groups reported in 1972, and both reports recommended closer relationships between Anglicans and Lutherans.

The Anglicans in the International report added:

Anglicans do not believe that the episcopate in historic succession alone constitutes the apostolic succession of the church or its ministry. ...We, therefore, gladly recognise in the Lutheran churches a true communion of Christ's body, possessing a truly apostolic ministry.

Such recognition, if reciprocated by the Lutheran churches, implies, according to the minds of the participants, official encouragement of intercommunion in forms appropriate to local conditions.

The Anglican participants cannot foresee full integrity of ministries (full communion) apart from the historic episcopate, but this should in no sense preclude increasing intercommunion between us...

The American report specifically recommended "intercommunion between parishes or congregations" in certain situations.

The International report also specifically recommended joint worship:

In places where local conditions make this desirable, there should be mutual participation from time to time by entire congregations in the worship and eucharistic celebrations of the other church. Anniversaries and other special occasions provide opportunity for members of the two traditions to share symbolic and ecumenical worship together.

No specific action was taken on these recommendations, but the American dialogues were found interesting enough to continue in 1976. This second series of dialogues reported in 1980, and recommended:

1. That our respective Church bodies "mutually recognise" one another as true churches . . . by taking appropriate legislative action.
2. That, because of the consensus achieved in [these dialogues] on the chief doctrines of the Christian faith, our respective churches work out a policy of interim eucharistic hospitality so that Episcopalians may be welcomed at Lutheran altars and Lutherans may be welcomed at Episcopalian altars.

None of this specifically named "intercommunion". But to those who looked on, it was clear which way the wind was blowing. An Episcopal bishop on the Catholic side of the house (William Wantland) objected. In 'The Living Church', an Episcopal newspaper, he said that the effect of intercommunion at this time would be to declare the historic episcopate an adiaphoron, or merely optional, for the Episcopal Church, as it now is for the Lutherans. A rigorist, Wantland said:

Lutherans claim that the important part of Apostolic Succession is the succession of doctrine, and that the succession of persons is meaningless. ...

The Lutheran emphasis on sound doctrine is admirable. We Episcopalians can learn and benefit from it. At the same time, however, we respectfully believe that our Lutheran friends can also learn and benefit from our heritage, with its emphasis on continuity of order and sacramentality. ...

... It...would appear that the solution to the question is not either succession of ministry or succession of teaching, but both succession of ministry and succession of teaching.

Certainly, in this case, Anglican comprehensiveness makes more sense than Lutheran exclusiveness. Lutherans insist that eucharistic sharing must come before agreement on the succession. Such insistence is unacceptable, and we should be honest enough to say so to our Lutheran friends.

As may be imagined, these views generated some heat among Lutherans. One Lutheran pastor, David Gustafson, responded in a later number of the same Episcopalian publication. He said:

I think the best way to approach the dialogues, eucharistic hospitality, and possible intercommunion is to see ourselves as mutually sinful, with shortcomings.

He asked Wantland, rhetorically:

What would happen to the dialogues if Lutherans were to take a similar attitude with regard to doctrinal purity and insist without compromising that Episcopalians be more consistent in their doctrine?

Wantland answered:



I submit that the Episcopal Church would greatly benefit. For too long Anglicans have been seen as fuzzy in their thinking, allowing just about any view imaginable. It is high time for us to state precisely where the church really stands, and what is its minimum essential deposit of faith, about which there can be no compromise. It might even be high time to tell some of our bishops, priests, deacons and laity that if they persist in teaching false doctrine, they will have to leave the church.

Wantland did not speak only for himself; others felt his concerns as well. The problem was solved, in the end, by adding qualifying phrases to the agreement.

The resolutions passed by Episcopal and Lutheran Conventions explicitly stated that the agreement "does not intend to signify that final recognition of each other's Eucharists or ministries has yet been achieved."

In addition, clarifying commentaries from both the Episcopalians and the Lutherans included "conscience clauses". As the Episcopal commentary puts it:

The proposed text does not constitute what otherwise might be called "reciprocal intercommunion". Individual members of each church are left to make their own decisions about whether to accept the invitation from the other. Neither Episcopalians nor Lutherans as churches declare here that they reciprocally accept on behalf of their members this invitation.

Wantland welcomed the resolution, as phrased and clarified. He wrote:

As a matter of fact, many Lutherans might have some conscientious objection to receiving at altars presided over by priests whose theology might be highly questionable. Likewise, Anglicans would certainly object to receiving at altars where the president of the Eucharist might be a lay person (a practice permitted in many Lutheran churches), and might find it impossible to receive from a minister who is not in the Apostolic Succession.

...what the Episcopal Church has done does not provide...for intercommunion...It does not recognise Lutheran Orders. But it does allow for a closer cooperation with Lutherans, and recognises a great similarity in theological understanding of sacraments and faith. As such, this is a significant and potentially constructive step. For this reason, we applaud the careful and thoughtful negotiation that has gone into it.

Once the resolutions were passed, guidelines were needed to regulate the "joint, common celebrations" now allowed. Each church has produced its own. Some of them are strictly administrative, in the interests of "good order". The permission of the bishops (or other church officers) who have jurisdiction in the local area, should be obtained.

The conduct of the service should be planned well in advance. It should include both Word and Sacrament. The host minister should preside, or serve as the chief celebrant, using his or her liturgy; the guest minister should preach. Both should stand at the altar, and they should share in administering the elements.

Some of the guidelines show a concern for the sensitivities of the other tradition. The Lutheran guidelines say:

Since the eucharistic prayer is required in the Episcopal tradition and an option in the Lutheran tradition, Lutherans should employ a eucharistic prayer.

The Episcopal guidelines focus on potentially awkward language in eucharistic prayers, and on vestments. The guidelines recommend Eucharistic Prayer B from the Prayer Book's modern language Rite II (when the Episcopal book is used). No reasons are given, but I think that what is behind this is an awareness that Lutherans are sensitive about eucharistic sacrifice and transubstantiation. The Episcopal guidelines recommend that all "joint celebrants" wear the vestments used in the tradition of the host church whether Episcopal or Lutheran. Imagine, if you will, an Anglican priest in a Nordic church wearing the clerical ruff! Here the Episcopalians are in advance of the Lutherans, who recommend that "ministers should be vested in the manner appropriate to their tradition" -- to each their own tradition, one supposes, so that the Lutheran pastor would always wear his accustomed vestments.

The guidelines which may be of special interest are those which are clearly intended to safeguard points important to one's own tradition. The Lutherans are very sensitive about Anglican doubts regarding their ordinations, as sensitive as Anglicans are about Roman Catholic doubts. So two important guidelines state:

The parity of both Episcopal and Lutheran liturgical traditions must be manifested in these services. Representatives of both denominations should have significant leadership roles in the service.

During the Great Thanksgiving, ministers from both traditions should be present at the altar. There should be only one presiding minister. Only this



person should recite the eucharistic prayer. Concelebration by word or gesture is precluded.

The Lutherans do not want to imply that the presence of an Episcopal priest at their altar is the only thing which makes the "joint celebration" a validly celebrated sacrament.

The Episcopalians have their own concerns as well. Two of them are in regulations passed by the same General Convention which authorized the Interim Eucharistic Sharing. The regulations require: that whenever a Priest or Bishop of this Church shall be the celebrant or one of the celebrants at any ecumenical service of the Eucharist, ...[1]that the said Priest or Bishop join in the consecration of the gifts in a joint celebration, [2] that any of the blessed elements remaining at the end of the service be reverently consumed...

Anglicans will understand the concern about reverently consuming consecrated elements remaining at the end of the service. Lutherans have confessional documents which affirm their belief in the Sacramental Presence, so they do not need to give the elements any special treatment. But we do not have such documents; so we do this. It is important to us. As it happens, many Lutherans already do this too, so it poses no problems.

The other point could raise difficulties, if the people involved are sufficiently stubborn. The Convention's regulation said that the priest or bishop was to "join in the consecration of the gifts". Here is now the guidelines expand on this:

The chief celebrant should say the Eucharistic Prayer in its entirety. The joint celebrant/s should indicate their participation by standing at the altar together with the principal celebrant and by extending his right hand during the Words of Institution and/or by joining in the Words of Institution in an undertone.

Contrast this with the Lutheran commentary's remarks concerning concelebration -- including the joint recitation of the Words of Institution by ministers from various denominations:

Concelebration as it developed historically or is practised ecumenically today is not an option for Lutheran pastors of the American Lutheran Church or the Lutheran Church in America. Lutherans, with a functional view of the ministry as an Office of the Word, have not adopted concelebration which is historically rooted in a view of the collegiate character of an ordained priesthood given special power through ordination, and in a hierarchical understanding of the church. Nor are Lutherans attracted to models of concelebration which avoid the question of theological consensus.

The Commentary then quotes a 1978 Statement on Communion Practices: "Only one minister shall preside over the entire celebration."

Such language sounds strong to Anglican ears. The Episcopal guidelines are only suggestions; the final authority in each diocese rests with the diocesan bishop. The Lutheran guidelines appear to have authority over the Lutheran bishops. It is curious that Lutherans, with this "functional" view of ordained ministry, have developed so powerful a sense of the authority of the Church over its bishops. I suspect Anglican bishops would not welcome such an understanding of ecclesiastical authority, despite Wantland's comments.

As there is no room in this position for the "chief celebrant" and "joint celebrant" described in the Episcopal guidelines, I suspect that stubborn clergy could well reach an impasse on this matter, if they are willing to let it turn into one. But they need not be. Perhaps I should close this introduction by telling you how two congregations' ministers handled their services. The local Lutheran church was being renovated. The building would be unusable for many months. The pastor and the local Episcopal rector were on friendly terms, so they discussed how the Episcopal building could be made available to the Lutherans. It had a small chapel, separate from the main church, which they could use; but it was too small, and the singing of Lutheran hymns would disturb the Episcopal service (and vice versa), since both congregations were used to worshipping at the same time. The solution dawned on both clergymen: the Lutherans would join the Episcopalians for the duration. They worked out a pattern of using one another's liturgical material, and when one preached the other presided. There was no concern about "concelebration", no concern about "chief" and "joint" celebrants.

I was told this happy tale by the priest concerned, back in 1983. It was a little over a year later that I learned that he had been consecrated Bishop Coadjutor of Virginia. With his diocesan planning to retire in January of this year, the Rt Revd Peter James Lee should now have succeeded to the position of Bishop of Virginia. Oh -- and I met him in Oxford, among the Anglo-Catholics present at the 150th anniversary of the Oxford Movement.