

A MODEL FOR PARTNERSHIP

A MODEL OF PARTNERSHIP DISTILLED FROM THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PAUL AND THE PHILIPPIAN
CHURCH AS A TOOL TO EXAMINE THE PARTNERSHIP
PROGRAMMES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND TO
PROPOSE NEW DIRECTIONS

by

PHILIP NEIL GROVES

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology
School of Historical Studies
The University of Birmingham
September 2009

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This interdisciplinary study is a work of missiology and aims to formulate a model of partnership for mission in the Anglican Communion which can be used as a critical tool in order to understand the failures of the past and enable planning for the future. Throughout the thesis a consistent method of modelling is applied. This consists of the formulation of *explanatory* models from the examination of real instances, and their application as *exploratory* models in other contexts.

It is argued that the explanatory models guiding the development of mutual responsibility and interdependence between the provinces of the Anglican Communion have been insufficient. Evidence is given of their inadequacy as exploratory models. It is further argued that models developed in response to crises in the Anglican Communion do not take seriously The Anglican Way of “discerning the mind of God.”

An alternative explanatory model is distilled from the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. This is applied as an exploratory model and is shown to enable a critical assessment of past and present programmes, and to be useful in developing new initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family for their support through the years of thinking and writing. They have suffered from my obsession and lived through it all. My thanks go to my parents who assisted with fees and because they always believe in me.

Many people have assisted me, both in commenting on the text and proof reading. I would like to thank my colleagues at the Anglican Communion Office, especially Nigel Vigers, and also Angharad Parry Jones, John Kafwanka, Terrie Robinson, Stephen Lyon, Andrew Franklin, and Gregory Cameron. I would also like to thank Ruth Harrison, Liz Mckelvey and Phyll Chesworth for wading through drafts of the text.

I am indebted to Paula Gooder for teaching me so much in such a short space of time. I would like to thank Hugh Houghton for his clarity of thought and critical mind. All that is good in the biblical sections is due to them, and all the errors are my responsibility.

I want to thank Peter Fulljames for forcing me to move from MPhil to PhD and to David Cheetham for taking me under his wing.

Lastly, I would like to thank the community of St Philip's College, Kongwa, Tanzania where I learnt about partnership.

Phil Groves

ABBREVIATIONS

ABCC	The Archbishops Commission on Communion
ACC	Anglican Consultative Council
ACMS	Advisory Council for Missionary Strategy
ACO	Anglican Communion Office
ANITEPAM	The African Network of Institutions of Theological Education Preparing Anglicans for Ministry
BEM	Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (Report of the WCC)
CHP	Church House Publishing
CIO	Church Information Office
CMS	Church Missionary Society (until 1995) Church Mission Society (from 1995)
CUP	Cambridge University Press
ECUSA	Episcopal Church in the USA (to 2006)
FCA	Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans
GAFCON	Global Anglican Futures Conference
GS Misc.	General Synod Miscellaneous [Paper] (Church of England)
IASCOME	Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Mission and Evangelism
IATDC	Inter-Anglican Doctrinal and Theological Commission
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
KJV	King James Version of the Bible
MISAG I	Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group I
MISAG II	Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group II
MRI	Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
OUP	Oxford University Press
PCR	Program to Combat Racism
PiM	Partners in Mission
RCD	The Ridley Cambridge Draft of the Anglican Covenant
RSV	Revised Standard Version of the Bible
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SNTS	Society for New Testament Studies, (<i>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas</i>)
SU	The Scripture Union
TEC	The Episcopal Church (in the USA) (post 2006)
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TVR</i>	<i>The Virginia Report</i>
<i>TWR</i>	<i>The Windsor Report</i>
USPG	United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WCC	World Council of Churches

Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Contents

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Reasons for the Study	1
1.2. Methodology	4
1.2.1. Missiology	5
1.2.2. The Anglican Way	6
1.2.3. Models	9
1.2.3.1. The use of Models in Ecclesiology	10
1.2.3.2. The use of Models in Biblical Interpretation	12
1.2.3.3. The use of Models in Missiology	14
1.2.3.4. The use of Models in this Thesis	15
1.3 The Structure of the Thesis	15

CHAPTER TWO

2. THE FOUNDATION OF THE MODERN ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Introduction	19
2.1. Background	20
2.2. Max Warren	22
2.2.1. Max Warren – The Proposal of the Idea of Partnership	23
2.2.2. Evaluation of Warren’s Model of Partnership	35
2.3. Stephen Bayne	37
2.3.1. Stephen Bayne – Anglican Identity	39
2.3.2. Stephen Bayne and the Forming of the Anglican Communion	43
2.3.3. Stephen Bayne – Summary	46
2.4. The Anglican Turning Point	47
2.4.1. The Writing and Adoption of “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”	47
2.4.2. The Document – “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”	49
2.4.3. “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” as an Explanatory and Exploratory Model	55
Conclusion	56

CHAPTER THREE

3. THE PRACTICAL OUTWORKING OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Introduction	58
3.1. The Establishment of the PiM Consultation Process 1963-1973	59
3.2. The PiM Consultations 1973-1997	64
3.3. Review of the PiM Consultations from Contemporary Evaluations	67
3.4. Review of the PiM Consultations from Archive Records	75
3.4.1. Charting the PiM Process	75
3.4.2. Reviewing the Statistics	80
3.5. Review of the PiM Consultations from Three Case Studies	84
3.5.1. West Africa	85
3.5.2. England	88
3.5.3. The USA	90
3.5.4. Review of the Case Studies	91
3.6. The PiM Consultations – Conclusions	91
3.7. The “Ten Principles of Partnership” – A Proposed Model	93
3.7.1. Local Initiative	94
3.7.2. Mutuality	95
3.7.3. Responsible Stewardship	96
3.7.4. Interdependence	101
3.7.5. Cross-Fertilisation	102
3.7.6. Integrity	103
3.7.7. Transparency	103
3.7.8. Solidarity	104
3.7.9. Meeting Together	106
3.7.10. Acting Ecumenically	107
3.7.11. Critique of the “Ten Principles of Partnership”	107
Conclusion	109

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESPONSES TO CRISES IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION 1978 – 2009

Introduction	110
4.1. Historical Context	111
4.2. <i>The Virginia Report</i>	118
4.2.1. “The Context”	119
4.2.2. “The Theology of God's Gracious Gift: The Communion of the Trinity and the Church”	122
4.2.2.1. Analysis	122
4.2.2.2. Critical Assessment	127
4.2.3. “Belonging Together in the Anglican Communion”	128
4.2.4. “Levels of Communion - Subsidiarity and Interdependence”	129
4.2.5. Summary	132

4.3. <i>The Windsor Report</i>	132
4.3.1. Biblical Foundations	133
4.3.2. Practical Consequences	135
4.3.3. Summary	138
4.4. IATDC 2006	139
4.5. The Application of <i>The Virginia Report</i> Model in the Covenant Drafts	142
Conclusion	147

CHAPTER FIVE

5. THE STUDY OF *KOINONIA* AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Introduction	150
5.1. <i>Koinonia</i> in Anglican Reports	150
5.2. Methodological problems with the use of <i>Koinonia</i>	153
Conclusion	159

CHAPTER SIX

6. DEVELOPING MISSIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES FOR ENGAGING WITH NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP AND THEIR APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS

Introduction	161
6.1. Developing Missiological Principles for Engaging with New Testament Scholarship	162
6.2. Philippians - New Testament Scholarship and Partnership	172
6.2.1. The Integrity and Purpose of Philippians	174
6.2.2. Unity and or Disunity? – Seeking a Theme for Philippians	182
6.2.3. Philippians – A Letter of Partnership or Friendship?	186
6.2.4. Using the Models of Sampley and Peterman as Exploratory Models	195
Conclusion	196

CHAPTER SEVEN

7. DISTILLING A MODEL OF PARTNERSHIP

Introduction	198
7.1. Common Purpose	200
7.1.1. Analysis	200
7.1.2. Distillation	204
7.1.3. Abstraction – Partners have a common purpose	205
7.2. Equality of Status	205
7.2.1. Analysis	205
7.2.1.1. Paul the Apostle	209
7.2.1.2. Paul the “Father”	216
7.2.1.3. Paul, Power and Authority in Philippians	225
7.2.2. Distillation	225
7.2.3. Abstraction – Partners are of equal status	226

7.3. Common Basis of Belief	226
7.3.1. Analysis	226
7.3.2. Distillation	229
7.3.3. Abstraction – Partners have a common basis of belief	229
7.4. Unity Within each Community	230
7.4.1. Analysis	230
7.4.2. Distillation	236
7.4.3. Abstraction – Partners have a concern for unity in one another’s community	236
7.5. Eagerness to Communicate and to be with One Another	237
7.5.1. Analysis	237
7.5.2. Distillation	241
7.5.3. Abstraction – Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another	241
7.6. Complementary resources and skills	241
7.6.1. Analysis	241
7.6.2. Distillation	245
7.6.3. Abstraction – Partners share complementary resources and skills	245
7.7. Willingness to share in One Another’s Struggles and Victories	246
7.7.1. Analysis	246
7.7.2. Distillation	248
7.7.3. Abstraction – Partners share in one another’s struggles and victories	248
7.8. The Philippian Model	248
Conclusion	250

CHAPTER EIGHT

8. USING THE PHILIPPIAN MODEL AS AN EXPLORATORY MODEL

Introduction	252
8.1. Applying the Philippian Model to Warren, Bayne, and “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”	253
8.2. Applying the Philippian Model to the PiM Consultations	257
8.3. Applying the Philippian Model to the Search for Anglican Identity	260
8.3.1. The Ridley Cambridge Draft and the Philippian Model	262
8.3.2. Resonance and Dissonance	267
8.4. The Philippian Model and the Listening Process, Indaba, and Continuing Indaba	268
8.4.1. Historical Background	269
8.4.2. The Lambeth Conference and Indaba	271
8.4.3. The Listening Process and Continuing Indaba	273
8.5. Further Applications of the Philippian Model	277
Conclusion	278

CHAPTER NINE

9. CONCLUSION

Introduction	280
9.1. Recommendations Arising from the Thesis	282
9.1.1. Models	282
9.1.2. Missiology and the Bible	282
9.1.3. New Testament Scholarship and Missiology	283
9.1.4. The Application of the Philippian Model in the Anglican Communion	283
9.1.5. The Application of the Philippian Model for Partnership in Mission	284
Summary	284

Bibliography

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. General Reasons for the Study

In 2006 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, quoted an unidentified theologian as saying “only the whole Church knows the whole truth” as a basis for his defence of the significance of the maintenance of the Anglican Communion as a single entity.¹ In the face of disputes and divisions some are arguing that the constituent churches of the Anglican Communion would be better off as separate national churches concentrating on mission in their own theological, geographic, or cultural enclave.² The Archbishop argues against this course of action, not only because the divisions are present within national churches, but also because the breadth and wealth of the gospel is not comprehensively embodied in one place and one culture. Andrew Walls has described our time as an “Ephesian Moment”: a point in time when the Western guardians of “standard” Christianity have encountered new expressions of Christianity from Africa, Asia, America and beyond.³ The original “Ephesian Moment” was the brief point in time when Jewish Christians came together with Gentile Christians under the guidance of Paul. Paul insisted that “in union with him [Christ] you too are being built together with all the others to a place where God lives through his Spirit” (Ephesians 2:22).⁴ Walls argues that “the Church must be diverse because humanity is diverse; it must be one because Christ is one.”⁵ The original “Ephesian Moment” came to an end as the Gentile church dominated the Jewish minority, which was soon forced to conform to Gentile Christianity or to find its Jewish identity outside the

¹ Rowan Williams, “The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion” (27 June 2006), *The Archbishop of Canterbury*, <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/640>. Asked about the providence of the quote, the Archbishop was unsure.

² Titus Presler, “The Impact of the Sexuality Controversy on Mission: The Case of the Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* vol. 33, no. 1 (January 2009): 11-16.

³ Andrew Walls, “The Ephesian Moment – At a Crossroads in Christian History,” in his *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002), 78.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 77.

church. In the present age the church is more diverse than it has ever been, with not only people of every nation and ethnic group, but also women and the poor taking roles that were previously the preserve of white men with university education.⁶

The “Ephesian Moment” has not just crept up on the church: the Anglican Church has been officially aware of its growing diversity since the Toronto Congress of 1963 and the adoption of a document entitled “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ.”⁷ The Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) at its third meeting in 1973 articulated the same theology as Walls. ACC –3 referred to the argument between Paul and Peter recorded in Galatians and went on to say, “As in the first century, we can expect the Holy Spirit to press us to listen to one another, to state new insights frankly, and to accept implications of the Gospel new to us, whether painful or exhilarating.”⁸

The present “Ephesian Moment” is the challenge of a multiplicity of cultures expressing the gospel locally within a global Communion. There are those who express an apparent desire for certainty in the attempt to impose one version of Christianity on all. Others seek to be content with separate versions of Christianity living in separate networks.⁹ Miranda Hassett describes the narrative guiding those who are seeking to define Anglicanism more tightly around a confession of faith and as that of a “global-shift vision.”¹⁰ This vision is the idea that there has been a shift in the centre of world Christianity from North to South. She writes, “This vision of global Christian reconfiguration consists in a narrative of the decline of the churches of the North (Europe and North America), beset by modernism and secularism, and the concomitant rise in validity and influence of the

⁶ Ibid., 81.

⁷ “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” in *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ*, ed. Stephen Bayne (London: SPCK, 1965), 1-8.

⁸ ACC –3 *Trinidad, Report of the Third Meeting, 1976*, 55.

⁹ Ibid., 78-9.

¹⁰ Miranda K. Hassett, *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 10-4.

churches of the global South, characterized by a zealous, conservative scriptural faith.”¹¹ She argues that disaffected groups in North America have used this narrative to call for the exclusion of those who are not like them.¹² The progressive churches of the global North have been tempted to dissociate themselves from what they perceive as a rigidly conservative South.¹³

In Hassett’s opinion, the danger for the Communion is that the narrative is believed in a simplistic form and becomes self-fulfilling.¹⁴ Right at the end of her book she alludes to another possibility, one that concurs with the Ephesian option. The challenge is to discover a “new Pentecost,” a church that embraces diversity and its “transforming impact.”¹⁵ For this to become a reality she identifies a need for the development of partnerships that cross one or more of the boundaries of geography, nationality, language, culture and economic disparity. This is a difficult route and such partnerships do not merely emerge; they require planning and maintenance.

The threat of breakdown in the Anglican Communion is not new. The partnership enterprise has been struggling since churches within the Communion decided to ordain women to the priesthood in the 1970s. There may have been a consensus in the Anglican texts of the 1960s and 1970s in the valuing of cross-cultural experience, but there was a false expectation that partnership would just happen. The contention of this study is that partnership across geographic, economic and cultural barriers in the early church – such as the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi – involved conscious maintenance, drawn from understandings of partnership present in first century Greco-Roman culture. The replication of this relationship in the

¹¹ Ibid., 11.

¹² Ibid., 249-52.

¹³ Ibid., 255-7.

¹⁴ Ibid., 257.

¹⁵ Ibid., 258. See, Christopher Duraisingh, “Encountering Difference in a Plural World: A Pentecost Paradigm for Mission,” in *Waging Reconciliation God’s Mission in a Time of Globalization and Crisis*, ed. Ian T. Douglas (New York: Church Publishing, 2002), 171-212.

present requires the kind of planning and effort in maintenance that has not been previously attempted within the Anglican Communion. What is needed to make the present “Ephesian Moment” a reality is not merely the endorsement of *missio Dei* theology,¹⁶ but a careful programme of partnership to enable the Communion to overcome difficulties and to flourish.

There is no doubt that a great deal of effort was put into the administration of partnership programmes in the Anglican Communion. The argument of this thesis is that this effort was rudderless because it lacked a model to guide planning and to enable critical evaluation. The aim of this thesis is to offer an academic study of the attempts to build partnership within the Communion and to offer reasons why such efforts failed, and to see how partnership might be engaged in successfully in the present and future.

The most significant partnership relationship in the early church of which we have a record is the one between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. If the Bible has any significance for the present reality of the church then a study of that relationship is vital for understanding the present reality. The aim will be to establish a model capable of enabling planning and criticising practice.

1.2. Methodology

The aim of this thesis is to discover a model for partnership for mission in the Anglican Communion which can be used as a critical tool to understand the failures of the past and enable planning for the future. As such it is a work of Anglican missiology utilising the concepts of models. This section will set out the understanding of missiology, the Anglican way of doing theology and the conceptual basis of modelling at use in this thesis.

¹⁶ For an outline of the concept of *missio Dei* see: David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (New York: Orbis, 1991), 389-93. For an account of its place in missiology see: Craig Van Gelder, “How Missiology can Help Inform the Conversation about the Missional Church in Context,” in *The Missional Church in Context: Helping Congregations Develop Contextual Ministry*, ed. C. Van Gelder (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 20-24.

1.2.1. Missiology

Missiology is an interdisciplinary study and as such has proved difficult to define. The discipline had no place in the enlightenment divisions of theology into “Bible (text), church history (history), systematic theology (truth) and practical theology (application),”¹⁷ especially in the pre-missionary era. Pressure from missionary societies and students wishing to study the missionary phenomenon led to the establishment of missiology as a discipline. However, there was no agreement as to whether missiology was a subdivision of practical theology, a new separate discipline or if its concerns should be incorporated in all four traditional disciplines.¹⁸ None of the approaches was entirely satisfactory and all led to the isolation of the discipline. The first approach defined mission as an optional “activity” of the church. In German academic theology missiology was considered a distinct discipline, but it was commonly considered as being about foreign affairs not theology itself. The third approach, favoured in England, relied on specialists being aware of the missiological nature of all theology, but this was rarely the case.

In 1991 David Bosch published *Transforming Mission*, a book described by Lesslie Newbigin as “a kind of *Summa Missiologica*.” Bosch records a change in mood in missiological studies through the second half of the last century. He argues this is due to the redefining of mission from being an activity of the church in the world to the activity of God in the world. Karl Barth’s endorsement of *missio Dei* theology gave momentum to the redefining of missiology as an essential element of all Trinitarian theology. According to Bosch “just as the church ceases to be church if it is not missionary, theology ceases to be theology if it loses its missionary character.”¹⁹ Bosch states: “missiology’s task, in free partnership with other disciplines, is to highlight theology’s reference to the world.”²⁰

¹⁷ Bosch, *Transforming*, 490.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 490-2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 494.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

Bosch presents the discipline of missiology as a practical necessity to remind other disciplines of their missionary nature. “Missiology, then, accompanies the other theological subjects in their work; it puts questions to them and let them put questions to it; it needs dialogue with them for their and its own sake.”²¹ Tippet argues that missiology belongs to an interdisciplinary realm with a place of its own, relating to other disciplines in a dynamic fashion.²² Kim states that “Mission studies is impoverished if reduced to one of its constituent parts or squeezed into a narrow section of the theological curriculum. Conversely, a missiological perspective enhances other theological disciplines.”²³ The interaction of missiology is not only between academic disciplines, it also has the responsibility of engaging with missionary praxis. There is always a temptation either to define missiology from a source of authority – such as biblical “laws” – or from subjective reality, such as the need to maintain “missions.” The task of the missiologist is to enable the conversation between sources of authority, such as the Bible and tradition, with the practical realities of mission. Bosch describes it in this way: “It is Scripture (and, if we wish, tradition) that relates us and our context to the church and mission of all ages, and we cannot do without this. But equally, we cannot do without grounding our faith and our mission in the concrete, local context.”²⁴ Missiology in this thesis is understood as a distinct discipline occupying the space between a variety of disciplines and the practical activity of God in the world.

1.2.2. The Anglican Way

The search for criteria with which to assess context is a significant task for the missiologist. The task of this thesis is to relate academic disciplines with the task of developing mission partnership within the Anglican Communion. Bosch argues for the need

²¹ Ibid., 495.

²² Alan R. Tippet, *Introduction to Missiology* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1987), XIII.

²³ Kirsten Kim, "Mission Studies in Britain and Ireland: Introduction to a World-Wide Web," *British Journal of Theological Education* 11.1 (2000): 72-86.

²⁴ Bosch, *Transforming*, 498.

for criteria for the critique of context.²⁵ As this is a study of partnership within the Anglican Communion the sources of common criteria should be looked for in Anglican self-definition. Anglican self-definition is often described as the “Anglican Way.” This section offers a brief description of how the Anglican Way is understood in this thesis.

It would be inaccurate to say that the Anglican Way is formally defined, but there is a consensus behind the assertion of the Theological Education for the Anglican Communion working party that: “As Anglicans we discern the voice of the living God in the Holy Scriptures, mediated by tradition and reason.”²⁶ The significance of Scripture in forming Anglican theology is a common starting point, as is the stress that for Anglicans the Bible is to be interpreted by tradition and reason and so avoiding literalism.

The attention to study and respect for tradition and reason is seen in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. In his commentary on the Articles, Oliver O’Donovan argues that, for the Reformers, the sense of Scripture was more important than the precise words. Words are significant, but words are open to interpretation and may change their meaning over time and, more importantly, they are open to manipulation. O’Donovan argues that Anglicanism understands that “the task of biblical exegesis is to restore and maintain the clear outline of the scriptural sense, assisting the reader to hear the words of Scripture with the force which they had at their first uttering, so that they are effective in bringing to critical examination the ideas and speculations which prevail at any given age.”²⁷ Such an approach does not allow proof texts to define theology and action.

Richard Hooker is credited with substantially shaping the Anglican approach to theology. He rejected both the Catholic proposition that Scripture was insufficient in itself,

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ “Theological Education – Signposts. The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey” (2007), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/signposts/english.cfm>.

²⁷ Oliver O’Donovan, *On the Thirty Nine Articles – A conversation with Tudor Christianity* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1986), 54.

requiring further revelation, and the extreme Calvinist position that Scripture was not only sufficient, but complete. These two opinions he held to be “repugnant to the truth.”²⁸ For Hooker, Scripture was to be understood by both tradition and reason.²⁹

Section 1 of chapter 3 of *The Virginia Report*³⁰ describes the Anglican Way of “discerning afresh the mind of Christ for the Church in each generation.”³¹ It begins by affirming the “Holy Scriptures” as the “primary norm for Christian faith and life.”³² These Scriptures “must be translated, read, and understood, and their meaning grasped through a continuing process of interpretation.”³³ It is argued that this is done by the application of tradition and reason. The consideration of tradition is an appeal to “the living mind, the nerve centre of the Church.”³⁴ Reason is understood within the report as “the human being's capacity to symbolise, and so to order, share and communicate experience” and it refers to what can be called “the mind of a particular culture.”³⁵ *The Virginia Report* sums up this section with this statement:

3.11 The characteristic Anglican way of living with a constant dynamic interplay of Scripture, tradition and reason means that the mind of God has constantly to be discerned afresh, not only in every age, but in each and every context. Moreover, the experience of the Church as it is lived in different places has something to contribute to the discernment of the mind of Christ for the Church. No one culture, no one period of history has a monopoly of insight into the truth of the Gospel. It is essential for the fullest apprehension of truth that context is in dialogue with context. Sometimes the lived experience of a particular community enables Christian truth to be perceived afresh for the whole community. At other times a desire for change or restatement of the faith in one place provokes a crisis within the whole Church. In order to keep the Anglican Communion living as a dynamic community of faith, exploring and making relevant the understanding of

²⁸ Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, The Second Book*, 7.

²⁹ Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, The Third Book*, 12 and 13.

³⁰ *The Virginia Report* is reproduced in many places, such as the record of ACC –10 (ACC – 10 *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium, Panama 1996*, eds. N. Curie and J. Rosenthal (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1996), 223-85), and *The Official Report Of The Lambeth Conference 1998: Transformation And Renewal July 18-August 9, 1998* (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1998), 14-63. It was also made available for study and some Provinces may have reproduced it for their own use. It is also available on the internet: “The Virginia Report,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/documents/virginia/english/index.html> (land). The report has consistent paragraph numbering, while page numbers do differ from text to text.

³¹ *TVR*, 3.5.

³² *Ibid.*, 3.6 .

³³ *Ibid.*, 3.7.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.8.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.9. Also see 3.10.

the faith, structures for taking counsel and deciding are an essential part of the life of the Communion.³⁶

Anglican method provides the criteria for the missiological study of mission partnership in the Anglican Communion. It should be expected that Scripture, understood by tradition and reason, should guide Anglican thinking concerning “communion.”

However, Anglicans do not share a common mind on how Scripture is to be interpreted by tradition and reason. In his book *Anglican Approaches to Scripture*, Rowan Greer identifies many trends as he presents “a highly confused picture” of the diversity of Anglican understandings of Scripture.³⁷ However, he contends that within every strand of Anglicanism Scripture retains a central place.³⁸

It is the assumption of this thesis that a genuinely Anglican approach to partnership will look to use the Bible. The specific methodology of Scriptural interpretation will be complex reflecting Anglican rejection of the simple and literal application of Bible verses. The demands of this complexity are looked at in detail in chapters 5 and 6 of this thesis and involve a specific discussion of the relationship between missiology and New Testament scholarship. The use of the Anglican Way to consider Anglican mission partnerships presents a further problem identified by Bosch. A method is required to discover the relationship between the sources of authority and the praxis of partnership. The method proposed is to utilise a theory of models.

1.2.3. Models

The Bible is far more varied than a series of simple commands and so the hermeneutical task of applying principles from the Bible to a specific situation requires the extraction of those principles from a variety of literary forms including biographies, poetry, histories and letters. The proposed methodology is the use of a *model*. Oakes observes that

³⁶ Ibid., 3.11.

³⁷ Rowan Greer, *Anglican Approaches to Scripture* (New York: Crossroad, 2006), 161.

³⁸ Ibid., 162.

all those who interpret the Bible use models, but because they are not consciously modelling their conclusions go astray.³⁹ This thesis is built upon a conscious use of the theory of models. Models are not only used in biblical scholarship, but also in ecclesiology and missiology. The following three sections draw insights from those who have worked with models in these disciplines and is followed by a description of the way models will be used in this thesis.

1.2.3.1. The use of Models in Ecclesiology

Models of the Church by Avery Dulles is possibly the most influential theological work to consciously use models.⁴⁰ It remains a standard text in theological colleges and seminaries around the world, and to be positively referred to in numerous academic and popular articles and books.⁴¹ Dulles engages with the theoretical use of models in theology in the introduction to *Models of the Church*. He divides models into two types: explanatory and exploratory.⁴²

Explanatory models are defined by Dulles as those which describe what we already know, “or at least we are inclined to believe,” by the use of analogy.⁴³ Thus metaphors such as the cloverleaf, or ice, water and steam are used to describe the Trinity. The Trinity is something Christians believe and models are used to describe it. Explanatory models cannot tell us anything new about the subject and are not in themselves articles of faith. However, they are helpful in clarifying or explaining what is believed.

Exploratory models have a capacity to lead to new insights. His example of an exploratory model is his model of “Church as Servant.”⁴⁴ He claims that this is a new model,

³⁹ Peter Oakes, *Philippians- From people to letter* SNTS 110 (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), 56.

⁴⁰ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church (expanded edition)* (New York: Doubleday, 1st ed. 1978, this ed. 2002).

⁴¹ *Amazon.com* lists 251 books which cite *Models of the Church*. “Models of the Church – Citations,” *Amazon.com*, http://www.amazon.com/Models-Church-Avery-Dulles/dp/book-citations/0385133685/ref=sid_dp_av/102-3721400-6884909?ie=UTF8&citeType=cited#cited.

⁴² Dulles, *Models*, 16-17.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 18. See chapter 6. *Ibid.*, 81-94.

but based on a biblical image. Thus, he has taken biblical material and from that shaped an explanatory model that he uses to interact with contemporary ecclesiology as an exploratory model.

Dulles sets up two types of model, but then he confuses them. Although he defines the distinction between explanatory and exploratory models in the introduction, he does not highlight the delineation within the text of his work. The models he uses are explanatory, in that they explain what is already known, and exploratory, in that the clarity gained by moving from diffuse beliefs into models, challenges preconceptions and offers new ways of being church. Throughout this thesis the clear distinction between explanatory and exploratory models will be maintained. Models are speculative unless they are rooted in some form of reality and they are platitudes if they do not either challenge current paradigms or defend them from criticism. Thus models, at their best, are tools to bring the insights of one reality to another.

Dulles offers seven criteria for the evaluation of models,⁴⁵ but fails to make clear that these criteria can be divided into explanatory and exploratory categories. That is: for a model to be explanatory it must have a basis in reality, and to be exploratory it has to offer value, or, in his word, “fruitfulness.” Three criteria listed by Dulles are explanatory in nature: having a “basis in scripture,” a “basis in tradition,” and “having correspondence with the religious experience of men [and women] today.” Four are exploratory criteria: the “capacity to give members a sense of corporate identity and mission,” the “tendency to foster the virtues and values generally admired by Christians,” “theological fruitfulness,” and “fruitfulness in enabling Church members to relate successfully to those outside their own group.”⁴⁶ Listing the questions in this manner highlights the distinction between explanatory and exploratory models, but the specific questions asked by Dulles are not appropriate for

⁴⁵ Ibid., 183-84.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

this thesis. Corresponding questions as to the faithfulness of models as explanatory models and the fruitfulness of models as exploratory models will be asked.

An explanatory model will be subjected to questions related to the categories established as the Anglican way in *The Virginia Report*. An Anglican exploratory model should be based upon Scripture, understood by tradition and reason. An exploratory model will be subjected to specific questions to define if it is fruitful. The test of an exploratory model is if it is a useful critical tool for the examination of past actions, fruitful in guiding planning, and able to critically assess present action. A model is good if it is a faithful representation of the source object and brings clarity to the critical appraisal of the present subject.

1.2.3.2. The use of Models in Biblical Interpretation

The use of models is not limited to theological investigation. Biblical scholars also use models to gain a better understanding of texts. A consideration of how biblical scholars use models will enable further understanding of both the uses of models in general and in the specific use of models in biblical scholarship.

Bruce Malina set out the theoretical basis for the use of models in biblical studies in his book *The New Testament World – Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. He utilised models as a method of translating the cultural concerns of what he expressed as the “foreign” writers of the New Testament.⁴⁷ He defines models as “abstract, simplified representations of more complex real world objects and interactions.”⁴⁸ He is aware that such abstractions “are notorious for misfitting the real world experiences they attempt to represent.”⁴⁹ So he offers a scientific procedure for reducing the danger of misfit. “(1) postulate a model ...; (2) test the model against the real world experience it relates to; (3) modify the model in terms

⁴⁷ Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World – Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (London: SCM, 1983). References to “foreigners” are frequent within the book and set out in Chapter 1 on pages 2-4 and again 23-4.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

of the outcome of the test to reduce the misfit by detecting errors of omission and commission.”⁵⁰

Malina’s definition of a model as “abstract, simplified representations of more complex real world objects and interactions” is one that will be referred to within the text of this thesis and will be taken as a definition of explanatory models. Chapters 2 and 4 of the thesis seek to understand the processes leading to the construction of models for mission partnership in the Anglican Communion and ask questions of their sufficiency in properly relating “real instances and objects.” Chapter 7 seeks to establish an alternative model based upon the “complex real interaction” between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. This requires the investigation of models used by biblical scholars in the study of Philippians, as well as forming a model from Philippians. Care is taken to maintain clarity between processes.

New Testament scholars use models to explore the text of the Bible. Malina advocated bringing models from the cultural environment of the Mediterranean to the study of the New Testament in order to understand the text. He drew conclusions from contemporary Mediterranean culture to postulate the dominance of such concepts as “honour” and “shame,” which he regarded as foreign to Western readers. Critics suggest that he did not properly show that these concepts were true of the Mediterranean culture of the time of the writing of the New Testament.⁵¹ This has led to a search for models from contemporary contexts for the understanding of the New Testament writings.

Philippian scholarship has a wealth of such models to work with. Oakes brings an intentional model based upon his archaeological study of mid-first century Philippi to enable an exegesis of Philippians.⁵² Alexander proposes a literary structure from contemporaneous

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ David Horrell, *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 20.

⁵² Oakes, *Philippians*.

letters of friendship.⁵³ Sampley suggests that the relationship between Paul and the Philippians is a formal quasi-legal *societas* relationship.⁵⁴ Peterman proposes a model of reciprocity based upon contemporaneous writings as an exploratory model for the understanding of the text.⁵⁵ All of these studies are used in chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis.

While all the studies mentioned above use models in order to investigate the biblical text, they do not suggest present application. Peterman illustrates the complexity for the missiologist in using New Testament scholarship. He objects to modern social models being applied to Bible texts and stresses the cultural and social differences between now and then.⁵⁶ He dismisses the attempts of sociologists to generalise about human society, and as a historian he emphasises the changes that have taken place. He proposes a model of reciprocity as an exploratory model for the understanding of the text. However, there is a significant methodological problem for the missiologist in his approach. If there is no correspondence between society then and now, there is nothing of relevance to be learnt from the biblical texts. This tension is explored in chapter 6 of this thesis.

New Testament scholars are used to constructing explanatory models to explore the biblical text. Missiologists commonly form explanatory models from biblical texts for use as exploratory models to critique present reality.

1.2.3.3. The use of Models in Missiology

Missiologists have argued that there is a sufficient correspondence of social and cultural factors to make a leap across time and culture in both directions. In the introduction to the 1927 edition of *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?*, Roland Allen argued against those who claimed that “what was possible for him (Paul) in his day is impossible for us in

⁵³ Loveday Alexander, “Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians,” *JSNT* 37 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989): 87-101.

⁵⁴ J. Paul Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

⁵⁵ G.W. Peterman, *Paul's Gift From Philippi – Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving*, *SNTS Monograph Series 92* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).

⁵⁶ Peterman, *Paul's Gift*, 20-1.

ours.”⁵⁷ Missiologists such as Walls,⁵⁸ and Nyiringe,⁵⁹ have followed Allen in leaping from biblical text to present application.

Recent missiologists have realised that missiology and Biblical scholarship exist in differing worlds. Kent Yinger writes observes that “Specialists in the respective disciplines of missiology and Pauline studies traverse disciplinary boundaries only infrequently.”⁶⁰ Missiologists have been eager to use exploratory models but are less good at constructing sufficient explanatory models. The aim of this thesis is to use biblical scholarship in the distillation of an abstract explanatory model that in turn will be tested as an exploratory model in the context of mission partnership in the Anglican Communion.

1.2.3.4. The use of Models in this Thesis

Throughout this thesis the distinction between explanatory and exploratory models will be maintained. *Explanatory* models are considered to be abstractions of real objects and instances. *Exploratory* models are considered to be the application of abstracted models in real contexts. At times models have been used in the Anglican Communion, and questions will be raised as to their sufficiency as both explanatory and exploratory models. In Chapter 7 an explanatory model will be distilled, and in Chapter 8 it will be examined as an exploratory model.

1.3 The Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 of the thesis examines the formation of the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” at the Third Anglican Congress of 1963. It begins by investigating the exploratory model developed by Max Warren in his

⁵⁷ Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), vii.

⁵⁸ Walls, “The Ephesian Moment.”

⁵⁹ Zach D. Nyiringe, “To Proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom (ii)” in *Mission in the 21st Century*, ed. Andrew Walls and Cathy Ross (London: DLT, 2008), 11-24.

⁶⁰ Kent L. Yinger, “Paul and Evangelism – A Missiological Challenge from New Testament Specialists” *Missiology: An International Review* vol. XXXVII, no. 3 (July 2009): 393.

proposition of partnership as an alternative to the model of dominating power.⁶¹ It then investigates the writings of Stephen Bayne, who sought to enable the Anglican Communion to discover a new way of being as the colonial past gave way to a potential future of interdependence. It is argued that while Warren, in particular, offers a good explanatory model, it was insufficient because it failed to use a biblical basis, and because it was not articulated within the document except in the words of the title. It is argued that the content of the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” promoted action contrary to the hoped-for relationships of mutuality. As such the Anglican Communion lacked an exploratory model to enable planning towards the ending of the donor/receiver culture.

Chapter 3 catalogues the practical implementation of programmes intended to implement Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence (MRI) and to end the giver/receiver culture of the Communion. The principal official programme intended to implement MRI was the *Partners in Mission* (PiM) consultation process. The PiM consultations are examined in order to determine their effectiveness. The contemporaneous reviews of process, an analysis of the consultations from primary sources and three case studies, also from primary sources, point to the failure to break the giver/receiver mentalities. The process concluded with the drawing up of “Ten Principles of Partnership.” The “Ten Principles” are examined as an exploratory model and it is argued that they are insufficient because they are drawn from the experience of a failed process. As such the principles are unsystematic, repetitious, and at points contradictory and therefore insufficient as an exploratory model.

Chapter 4 is an account of the development of models intended to enable the Anglican Communion to respond to crises over the ordination of women and inclusion of partnered lesbian and gay people. It was recognised that the Communion lacked coherence

⁶¹ Max Warren, *Partnership - The Study of an Idea* (London: SCM, 1956).

and so successive commissions were asked to consider the nature of Anglican identity. The chapter is not an analysis of the issues, but an investigation of the reports of commissions as explanatory models and potential exploratory models. The focus is on *The Virginia Report*, *The Windsor Report*, follow up work of the Inter-Anglican Doctrinal and Theological Commission, and the three drafts of an Anglican Covenant. It is shown that the work of the commissions is insufficient in establishing an exploratory model in the Anglican way. It is argued that the Bible is treated as a source of proof texts and the alternative concept of subsidiarity is accepted uncritically.

Chapter 5 considers the methodological issues surrounding the proposal by those involved in ecumenical dialogue to use the biblical concept of *koinonia* as a model to be applied to the Communion. It is argued that the proposal fails to take proper account of the scholarly consensus on semantic study in the construction of a *koinonia*-based explanatory model. As such any ecclesiology developed from the model is likely to be insufficient.

Chapter 6 develops a methodology for missiological engagement with New Testament scholarship. This takes seriously both Bosch's understanding that "it is impossible to read the New Testament without taking into account that most of it was consciously written in a missionary context,"⁶² and Plummer's observation that "existing studies devoted exclusively to missionary subjects rarely meet the demands of rigorous biblical theology."⁶³ The methodology is then applied to the study of Philippians as a potential source of an explanatory model of partnership that crosses geographic and economic boundaries.

Chapter 7 applies the principles in Chapter 6 to distil a seven point exploratory model of partnership, abstracted from the real instance of the relationship between Paul and

⁶² Bosch, *Transforming*, 489.

⁶³ Robert L. Plummer, *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 2-5.

his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. The final product of the chapter is an abstracted model of partnership ready to be used as an exploratory model with seven aspects:

1. Partners have a common purpose.
2. Partners are of equal status.
3. Partners have a common basis of belief.
4. Partners have a concern for unity in one another's community.
5. Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.
6. Partners share complementary resources and skills.
7. Partners share in one another's struggles and victories.

Chapter 8 applies the Philippian Model as an exploratory model. The Model is used to criticise the failings identified in Chapters 2 to 4 in order to understand why policies intended to encourage partnership failed, and why it has proved difficult to develop a structure for the delivery of subsidiarity. The chapter seeks to demonstrate how the Model has been significant in developing planning for future action, especially in the development of the Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening Project.

Chapter 9 is a conclusion considering the intentional use of models in missiology, the interaction between missiology and biblical scholarship, and the potential future application of the Philippian Model in the Anglican Communion.

CHAPTER TWO

2. THE FOUNDATION OF THE MODERN ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Introduction

The Anglican Communion is in search of an identity. It is in search of a way in which to deliver its missiological goals, expressed in the “Five Marks of Mission,” and a way to understand itself as a Communion of interdependent, autonomous churches. The aim of this thesis is to seek a model to analyse the historical realities and the present context of the Communion, and to enable planning for the future, commensurate with the Anglican Way of discerning the mind of God: that is through a study of the Bible, informed by tradition and reason. This is a missiological study that presupposes that the driving reason for the existence of the Communion is mission. The thesis seeks to use the theory of modelling set out in the introduction. *Explanatory* models are formed from the study of real objects and instances, expressed in abstract form. The model can then be used as an *exploratory* model to better understand a different object or reality and to develop plans for future action.

This chapter investigates the theological roots of the modern Anglican Communion with the aim of discovering why these roots were not sufficient to sustain the development of the Communion. It is argued that the beginning of the modern Anglican Communion was at the third Anglican Congress in 1963. The Congress endorsed the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” the product of the thinking of Max Warren and Stephen Bayne.¹

The writings of Warren and Bayne are analysed within their historical context to search for the models that shaped Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence (MRI). The

¹ “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” in *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ*, ed. Stephen F. Bayne (London: SPCK, 1963, reprint 1965), 1-8. The document, endorsed by the Congress, was published within a book of the same title that also contains supporting documents. Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence (MRI) came to be a guiding principle for the work of the Communion. To differentiate the three within the text of this thesis the book will be in italics, the document within quotation marks, and the concept capitalised as MRI.

document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” is analysed to understand how the theological models of Warren and Bayne were applied as exploratory models. The models were lost within the document leading to an absence of direction for future implementation of MRI.

2.1. Background

The modern Anglican Communion can be traced to the Toronto Congress of 1963. Officially it was the third Anglican Congress, but each one was a stand-alone individual event. The first Pan-Anglican Congress took place in 1908, immediately prior to the fourth Lambeth Conference and was an unofficial assembly of bishops, clergy and laity from around the world. Organised by Bishop Montgomery – secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel – it enabled theological discussion of a wide range of topics. The second congress met in 1954 and was described by Stephen Neill as “more of a demonstration than a meeting for the transaction of business.”² It is primarily remembered for the first use of the Compass Rose symbol designed for the event and subsequently adopted as the symbol of the Anglican Communion.

The status of the third Congress was also unclear, but the need was obvious. The preceding years had seen the end of the British Empire, and it was clear that the nature of the Anglican Communion could not remain the same. In 1999 Bishop Simon Chiwanga, the Chairman of the Anglican Consultative Council, described it in this way:

The turning point of the Communion from that of givers and receivers to a family of equals was the 1963 Anglican Congress in Toronto and its far-reaching imperative known as ‘Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ’ or MRI for short. MRI proposed a radical reorientation of mission priorities stressing equality among all Anglican churches. MRI and the 1963 Congress was hailed as a breakthrough that would transcend the paternalism and dominance of Western patterns of mission. For the first time the younger churches in the Anglican Communion saw themselves as equal to the older, ‘richer’ churches of the West. MRI challenged the historic sending churches of the

² Stephen Neill, *Anglicanism* (London: Pelican, 1958), 412.

Anglican Communion to change their attitudes and theologies of mission to be in line with the emerging realities of a new Anglican Communion.³

Those participating were well aware of the radical nature of the event. A contemporary commentator said that it “may well become a landmark in the history of the Anglican Communion, one of those events after which things are ‘never quite the same.’”⁴ Stephen Bayne, the architect of the Congress, called his collected works from the period “*An Anglican Turning Point*,” and consciously talked of the Communion “coming of age.”⁵ The document that is so intimately associated with the Congress, “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” talked of the death of what was familiar and “the rebirth of the Anglican Communion.”⁶ For many it seemed to be “Bishop Bayne’s Paper” prepared for the Congress in advance, but Bayne insisted during his address to the Congress that it “did not exist in anybody’s mind until three weeks ago.”⁷

However, ideas do not spring out of nothing. Events and contexts had a part in their making, and the work of two significant people shaped the foundational language and understanding of partnership in the Anglican Communion with which we live today. Stephen Bayne was undoubtedly one of them, but the other, Max Warren, was equally significant. Their contributions came together at the Toronto Congress and were formed into a synthesis, which, while others influenced it, carried the marks of their commitment.

This thesis argues for the value of models to critique failure and establish the direction for new action. The task of this chapter is to investigate the models at work in the construction of MRI: that is to investigate the formation and application of models of partnership. The distinction between explanatory and exploratory models is applied. The

³ Simon Chiwanga, “Chairman’s Address ACC- 11,” *Anglican Communion News Service* (ACNS 1881 17 September 1999), <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/acnsarchive/acns1800/acns1885.html>. For the significance of Toronto 1963, see also Church of England, *A Growing Partnership: The Church of England and World Mission* GS Misc 439, (London: Church of England, 1994), 6.

⁴ Peter Whitely, back cover of *Frontier Mission – an account of the Toronto Congress 1963* (London: SPCK, 1963).

⁵ Stephen F. Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point – Documents and Interpretations* (Austin Texas: Church Historical Society, 1964). For examples of his use of “coming of age,” see 111 and 113.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 131-2.

subject of the study is the relationship between the explanatory model and the abstract “imperative” of MRI. The following chapter will investigate the sufficiency of the model as an exploratory model following the 1963 Congress.

2.2. Max Warren

The Toronto Congress was not even a vague possibility when Max Warren presented a series of lectures to Ohio Wesleyan University in March 1955.⁸ Warren was well established as one of the most significant Christian leaders of the twentieth century, a creative thinker who backed up his theological exploration in remarkable leadership of the evangelical movement in the Anglican Communion.⁹ As Vicar of Holy Trinity Cambridge and General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, he held two of the most significant posts in evangelical Anglicanism. “Warren played the combined roles of Charles Simeon (as leader of the evangelical movement) and Henry Venn (as a leader of the missionary movement).”¹⁰

Warren’s interests were far ranging. As an evangelical leader he asserted the uniqueness of Christ,¹¹ while demanding dialogue with other religions, and valuing the contribution of all faiths to our understanding of God.¹² While he accepted the title evangelical, he disliked further labelling himself as conservative or liberal.¹³ However, he was “keen to use the constructive results of biblical criticism,”¹⁴ and as such he is seen from today’s perspective as being a liberal figure in the leadership of evangelicalism.¹⁵

⁸ Max Warren, *Partnership - The Study of an Idea*. (London: SCM, 1956).

⁹ For example, prior to World War II he had developed an ecumenical relationship with German Lutherans and marked the first Sunday of the war by a joint service in English and German. See Graham Kings, *Christianity Connected* (Zoetermeer, The Netherlands: Boekencentrum, 2002), 30-31.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹¹ For example, Max Warren “The Uniqueness of Christ,” *The Modern Churchman*, 18 (1974): 55-66.

¹² See John Stott’s acceptance of Max Warren’s influence in John Stott *Christian Mission in the Modern World* (London: Falcon, 1975), 73.

¹³ Max Warren, *The Sevenfold Secret* (London, SPCK 1962), 1.

¹⁴ Kings, *Christianity Connected*, 45.

¹⁵ *Some Issues in Human Sexuality* (London: Church House Publishing, 2003), 28.

2.2.1. Max Warren – The Proposal of the Idea of Partnership

The title of Max Warren's book was *Partnership – the Study of an Idea* and the first chapter (entitled "The Concept of Partnership") set the scene for the speculative nature of the lectures.¹⁶ The first sentence is: "Partnership is an idea whose time has not yet fully come."¹⁷ From there he continued in the first paragraph to argue that the birth pains had begun and that partnership would be required as a key to unlock the doors which divide and disrupt society.¹⁸ Warren's book was based upon a series of four lectures to the Wesleyan University with a further chapter added, on the advice of the Advisory Committee of the Religious Book Club, on the theme of "Partnership and the Multi-racial Society." This chapter reflects on the opportunities for partnership in the political life of East, Central, and Southern Africa at the end of the colonial era.¹⁹

Warren took the concept of partnership from Stephen Neill's lectures entitled *Christian Partnership* where Neill focused on the history of the fast moving development of the ecumenical movement over the previous two years.²⁰ Neill charted the development of the World Council of Churches and the formation of the United Church of South India, both of which he was intimately involved in. However, he did not explore the underlying theological and philosophical principles that would ask the question: what is partnership? This was what Warren attempted and his concerns were far reaching, particularly in the way they set out the issues that were to dominate world history in the second half of the twentieth century. His focus on the contrast between partnership and "dominating power,"²¹ and the critique of the developing theories of apartheid show his awareness and concern for political

¹⁶ Warren, *Partnership*, 11-33.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 99-127.

²⁰ Stephen Neill, *Christian Partnership* (London: SCM, 1952). These lectures were sponsored by CMS of which Warren was then General Secretary.

²¹ Warren, *Partnership*, 15-7.

reality. Warren asserted that in this context the idea of partnership was vital.²² The structure of the arguments within the book as a whole, and within the individual chapters, led from observed reality and socio-political arguments into theology.

We can identify the task Warren sets for himself as explanatory and exploratory modelling. His intention for the first chapter is to investigate complex, real world objects and interactions in order to establish an abstract simplified representation for further use as an exploratory model in the following chapters.²³ In considering the construction of the explanatory model three critical questions may be asked:

- Are the real world objects and interactions chosen appropriate?
- Are they accurately understood and explained?
- Are there other real life objects and interactions that are significant?

Warren begins with the analysis of what might be termed as an object; that is the semantic origin of the English word *partnership* from the Anglo-French term *parcener*, which he defines as meaning co-heirship. From this he constructs his model of partnership as three commitments. These are *involvement*, the *acceptance of responsibility* and the *readiness to accept liability*.²⁴ Warren argues that a partnership is freely entered into and open to dissolution, and is a relationship where the partners are involved together by committing to one another in trust. Each partner is ready to serve the purpose of the common enterprise and is prepared to take responsibility for it. They are ready to pay the price of partnership; that is, to accept the liabilities.

Warren begins the wider discussion with a consideration of power in the context of a world still trying to overcome the effect of two world wars, in the midst of the developing cold war and contemplating a world beyond colonialism. These contexts led people to accept

²² Ibid., 108-110.

²³ Referring to Malina's definition of models in Bruce Malina *The New Testament World – Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (London: SCM, 1983), 17.

²⁴ Warren, *Partnership*, 13.

Bertrand Russell's 1938 conclusion that the education systems in place, and the whole experience of life of all people gave them the feeling that "The only possible relation between two human beings who co-operate is that in which one issues orders and the other obeys them," with no hope of any other way.²⁵ In contrast Warren proposed the idea of partnership. "Believing that the choice is between death and life, that the lust for dominating power spells death to our world, the Christian will choose life and find it in the living experiment of partnership."²⁶

Warren then seeks three real life areas of interaction to establish the legitimacy of the model. These are family, industry and politics. He bases his concept of the idealistic family from biblical references in 1 Peter, Ephesians and 1 Corinthians. He saw the ideal marriage as the acceptance of the three commitments of involvement, responsibility and the acceptance of liability. He states that marriage that builds itself on the principles of partnership "does not end in the divorce court."²⁷ This was not to idealise marriage but to extract from the ideals of marriage the framework of the concept. Warren utilised the Bible to confirm and illustrate the definition of partnership he had previously established, rather than building a theology of partnership from the Bible. The biblical verses quoted do not immediately define partnership in the way he set out, but are interpreted from that perspective.

From the world of industry Warren looked to the work of George Goyder. In his book *The Future of Private Enterprise* Goyder had proposed partnership as an alternative to the destructive polarisation of capitalism and communism.²⁸ The ideas within it, which would have been very radical at the time, reflect the "Third Way" policies of Clinton and Blair of the 1990's. For Goyder dominating power is seen in the hands of shareholders and

²⁵ Ibid., 17, quoting from Bertrand Russell, *Power – A New Social Analysis* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938, 6th Impression 1948), 17.

²⁶ Ibid., 21.

²⁷ Ibid., 23.

²⁸ George Goyder, *The Future of Private Enterprise* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1951).

does not offer any power to the workers, the community and the consumer. As alternatives he points to two employers who had made their businesses into partnerships, Carl Zeiss of Jena in Germany, and the Lincoln Electric Company in Cleveland, Ohio. These companies are still both very successful, the leading companies in their fields, and continue to this day in the partnership model.

The Lincoln Electric Company declares its philosophy and catalogues its progress on its website: “Lincoln Electric recognizes that an important part of being an industry leader means creating a sense of community among the people we serve, as well as honoring our responsibility to the communities in which we work.”²⁹ The test of the company’s commitment to the workforce, and the workforce’s commitment to the company, came in the difficult years of economic down turn at the beginning of the 1980s. The company was faced with a difficult situation where an obvious solution was to make employees redundant. Instead they reduced the hours and reallocated the roles of the whole workforce. Even though it meant a significant drop in income for all, the workers accepted the liabilities and did not force a confrontation.³⁰ The company survived where others failed.

When Warren turned his attention to politics, he saw a viable opposition, loyal to the state while critical of the ruling party, as the fundamental basis of democracy. The loyalty to the state was seen in different ways and Warren gives an illustration of this from the United Kingdom, by referring to bi-partisan foreign policies. In holding together on foreign policy the parties demonstrate their acceptance of responsibility and liability.

Warren then moved on to consider American politics, and quoted from lectures given by Adlai Stevenson, who argued that for Americans there was no longer a possibility of isolationism. Warren quotes: “We shall have to listen as well as talk; learn as well as teach.

²⁹ “Lincoln Electric Community,” *The Lincoln Electric Company*, <http://www.lincolnelectric.com/community/>.

³⁰ Andrew W. Singer, “How a Downturn put One Rust Belt Company’s Principles to the Test,” *ETHIKOS and Corporate Conduct Quarterly* (August 1988), <http://www.singerpubs.com/ethikos/html/lincolnelectric.html>.

And I sometimes think that what America needs more than anything else is a hearing aid.

We can encourage the acceptance of our ideas only as we are willing to accept the ideas and suggestions of others. All this means a large relinquishment of our freedom of action.”³¹

Within this Warren saw the essential elements that underpin partnership especially in the use of the word “responsibility” which was for Warren a significant marker of the partnership relationship and a word that became very significant for the Anglican Communion.

The three real life interactions do seem to be appropriate for the construction of a model of partnership. The semantic argument he begins with appears to be the less appropriate for two reasons. First, the use of diachronic semantics to establish the meaning of a word over the synchronic meaning is a fallacy in understanding modern English, as it is in the realm of biblical scholarship.³² The study of the diachronic meaning of a word is the study of its derivation, its roots and how it came to be formed. This is outwardly rational starting point, but, as Silva argues, synchronic meanings (the meaning of a word in its present state) should always take precedence over the diachronic meaning.³³ Words have historical roots and contemporary meanings; they may be derived from other words, but their meanings are best understood by their contemporary meanings.³⁴ Thus the argument about the root of the word has no real bearing on its use in the present. Second, the investigation of an object, such as a word, to establish a model for a relational interaction is limited. Deriving a model from the definition of a word is to move from the abstract to the real. The complexity of partnership relations requires more than a simple definition approach, as is indicated by Warren’s subsequent use of other real life interactions.

³¹ Warren, *Partnership*, 33, quotation from Adlai Stevenson, *Call to Greatness* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1955), 98.

³² The rejection of diachronic semantics was a feature of the work of James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: OUP, 1961).

³³ Moises Silva, *Biblical Words and their Meaning – An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 34-51.

³⁴ See Anthony Thiselton “Semantics and New Testament Interpretation” in *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Exeter: Paternoster, 1979), 79-82.

The three real life interactions examined are appropriate, as all three are areas of life where the language of partnership is employed. As such they are valid and potentially helpful areas of study. However, Warren's study is subject to the weaknesses inherent in missiological study generally. As a generalist he is offering a snapshot of each area without the detailed knowledge to inspire full confidence. He is not a marriage counsellor, an economist, or a political scientist, thus the accuracy of his analysis should be open for further study. However, it must be remembered that Warren was at this point posing an idea and he makes a good case for further study. The continued strength of the Lincoln Electric Company, even in the present economic down turn, speaks highly of the model, and it is being emulated in the difficult economic situation today by corporate giants such as Honda,³⁵ and the John Lewis Partnership.³⁶

As to other real life instances of significance, Warren does not use any biblical material in the formation of the model. The three-fold model of involvement, the acceptance of responsibility and the readiness to accept liability is used in an exploratory fashion to examine Christian theology in the second chapter of his book. The three-fold model is assumed to have the essential elements of partnership, and Christian theology is investigated to see if each element is present. Warren is able to assert: "*First*, that partnership is an idea congenial to the very nature of God. *Second*, that partnership speaks of God's relationship with man. *Third*, that partnership indicates the true relationship between man and his fellow-men."³⁷ In the incarnation, and particularly in the atonement, Warren saw the involvement of God in human life, the responsibility taken for salvation and the liability accepted by God seen in the *kenosis* "supremely embodied on the cross."³⁸ He then considered the Trinity

³⁵ *Western Daily Press* "Honda says Swindon jobs are safe" (Tuesday, September 30, 2008), <http://www.thisisbristol.co.uk/wdp/news/Honda-says-Swindon-jobs-safe/article-361499-detail/article.html>.

³⁶ Martin Hickman, "Streets ahead: Does John Lewis offer a revolutionary way forward for big business?" *The Independent* (Thursday, 20 August 2009), <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/analysis-and-features/streets-ahead-does-john-lewis-offer-a-revolutionary-way-forward-for-big-business-1774510.html>.

³⁷ Warren, *Partnership*, 35.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

and, while he was hesitant to use the actual word “partnership” to denote the relationship of the Trinity, he argued that the notion of partnership is grounded in that reality and congenial to the nature of God.³⁹

Warren further set out his argument for God being in a partnership relationship with humanity. He first establishes that “man is in fact free to respond to God or to refuse to respond.”⁴⁰ He points to the way Jesus sought relationship and denied the way of coercion. The human response to the sacrifice of God is in involvement (the first of Warren’s defining marks of partnership). “God’s involvement with us is, in our faith-obedience, met by our involvement with him.”⁴¹ This involvement leads on to the second mark, accepting responsibility. Warren turned to specific Bible passages to show that God shares the responsibility for mission with humanity.⁴² Human beings accept the responsibility with God for the communication of his love to the world, which is not an easy task, and is represented by the call to “take up one’s cross” (Mark 8:34), and the ambition to share in the suffering of Christ as articulated in Philippians (3:10). While Christ took unlimited liability for the sin of the world, Paul took on a share in that liability to share in salvation. Thus, the third part of the partnership relationship becomes evident and Warren has shown that the relationship between God and man is one of partnership.

He continues by emphasising the continuing human identity within the relationship: “Nowhere in the Bible is there any suggestion that man’s relationship with God will ever involve the loss by man of his identity.”⁴³ No matter how close the relationship between God and man, the two do not become one. Warren saw the relationship between man and God as an “I-Thou” relationship, referring to the work of Martin Buber, who contrasted the

³⁹ Ibid., 39.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 40.

⁴¹ Ibid., 42.

⁴² 1 John 4:19; Amos 3.7; Acts 5:32, 15:28; 2 Cor. 5:19-20, 6:1.

⁴³ Ibid., 45.

relational “I-Thou” with the observational “I-it.”⁴⁴ Buber argued that in the forming of the relationship the “I” in the “I-Thou” is different to the “I” in the “I-It” but remains “I” nevertheless and maintains the identity of the one in relationship.⁴⁵ It is in this context of fully accepting the identity of each that partnership is possible.

The final part of the theological foundation was to see that the nature of partnership is a right relationship between human beings. Warren turns to the New Testament and to the word *koinonia*. Drawing upon Raymond George’s *Communion with God in the New Testament*, he saw *koinonia*, partnership or fellowship, as more properly translated as “having a share” or participation.⁴⁶ He argued that all Christians are “apprehended” by Christ, and the partnership that Christians share is “in Christ,” that is, set out by God as an inevitable response to the call.⁴⁷ This free will entering into the relationship with Christ inevitably brings partnership.⁴⁸ He followed this with a discussion of the Eucharistic texts of participation in the blood and body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16), which are not just about being united with Christ, but also about being one body – a horizontal partnering as much as a vertical one.⁴⁹ He then analysed the words of “the Grace” (2 Cor. 13:14). He argued that “fellowship” is engendered by the Holy Spirit bringing a “new solidarity,” so the Christian community not only partners with the Holy Spirit, but also with one another “in the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁰

Warren effectively utilises his model of partnership – involvement, accepting responsibility and accepting liability – in order to examine core elements of Christian theology. The observation that Warren’s own model of partnership is used as an explanatory

⁴⁴ Martin Buber, *I and Thou* 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958, 1984 reprint).

⁴⁵ See *Ibid.*, 3-6. Also John V. Taylor, *Go Between God* (London: SCM, 1972), 3-24.

⁴⁶ Warren *Partnership*, 46-7, referring to A. Raymond George, *Communion with God* (London: Epworth, 1953).

⁴⁷ Warren, *Partnership*, 49.

⁴⁸ An unresolved problem not discussed by Warren is that saying people are apprehended by Christ appears to contradict his earlier emphasis on the requirement of freedom to enter into the partnership.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 50.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 51-2.

model is, at this point, an observation not a criticism. However, the distinction is important as we seek to further examine the fruitfulness of the concept.

Warren continues to use his model as an exploratory model in the following two chapters as he considers how the idea of partnership could be applied in specific circumstances. He specifically applies it to the ecumenical sphere and to Christian mission. In considering partnership in the ecumenical movement, he traces the events of the second gathering of the World Council of Churches, and then applies the three categories of partnership to ecumenism from a distinctly Anglican perspective. Under the heading of *involvement*, he said, “No one ought to be permitted to hold any responsible office within the Anglican Communion without some effort being made to ensure that he is assisted to spend some time travelling right outside the Anglican pale.”⁵¹ Those who did so would discover how small a reflection of Christianity Anglicanism is, understand the distinctive points Anglicanism has to offer, be less proud, and discover the values of other churches. He also suggests this principle is important for those of other denominations. He argues that responsibility and liability are best lived out in the local establishment of councils of churches.⁵² The explanatory model enables the proposal of specific action in the ecumenical sphere.

Warren turns then to consider partnership in Christian mission, which is central to this thesis. Karl Barth heavily influenced Warren’s theology of mission, and Warren had been present at the 1952 International Missionary Conference in Willingen⁵³ where Barth used the phrase *missio Dei*. The term was used to describe mission as the activity of God with humanity as his partner, rather than a human activity in obedience to God.⁵⁴ From this basis Warren talks of three “spheres of mission.”⁵⁵ The first is identified as the development

⁵¹ Ibid., 65.

⁵² Ibid., 74-76.

⁵³ See David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (New York: Orbis, 1991), 390.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 389.

⁵⁵ Warren, *Partnership*, 82-3.

of a philosophy that could provide “tacit assumptions against the secure background on which life can be lived.”⁵⁶ This philosophy was to be worked out in the context of the collapse of agreed values in the post-war situation. The second sphere of mission was to “collective man” in the context of industrial urbanisation.⁵⁷ Both of these were centred on the Western world, rather than on the urbanisation of the pre-industrial world that has become a feature of recent missionary thinking, and Warren did not see a place for partnership in these first two mission contexts.⁵⁸ It is only in his third sphere that he saw partnership having a place. This sphere was focused on mission in Africa and Asia. It is remarkable that Warren had the clarity of vision to see mission priorities within the Christian, as opposed to pre-Christian, world, but significant that he did not see partnership as relevant to these aspects of mission.⁵⁹

Warren saw the result of the 150 years of missionary endeavour in Asia and Africa as a “vanguard” of the mission to come, and he predicted it would need to be a partnership venture if it was to succeed. He challenged feelings of Western superiority, arguing that the reason there were no Christians in large parts of Africa and Asia, while there were many in Europe and America, was due in large part to the opportunities. He emphasised that with opportunity comes responsibility. He argued that geography is less important than people and the popular emphasis on reaching places was false; the task was to reach *people*. The practical way forwards was to work in partnership, and he argued that the priority was that those involved in mission should be Christians, rather than that they came from any one ethnic group. “We shall hardly begin to understand the nature of the Christian Mission to a pre-Christian society in our world today unless we are prepared to abandon once-for-all the

⁵⁶ Ibid., 82.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 82-3.

⁵⁸ E.g. Aylward Shorter, *The Church in the African City* (New York: Orbis, 1991).

⁵⁹ His failure to see the potential African, Latin American and Asian contribution to the mission in Europe and America contrasts with thought today.

last vestiges of the idea that this Mission is one *from the West to Asia and Africa*.⁶⁰ It is clear from Warren's text that this was a difficult concept for many to accept in a Britain that was still a colonial power. Missionaries were still considered to be white, and little credence was given to indigenous missionaries.

In proving his point Warren set the scene of Africans and Asians beginning to assert their demands for independence, despite their seeming desire to be like westerners in their language, consumable wealth and culture. The desire for independence, he claimed, was found in a growing self confidence, nurtured by the Christian insistence on the worth of the individual. The care shown for the outcasts and the despised, and the respect shown to women through the education provided by the missions for girls as well as boys, had facilitated this self worth and enabled them to comprehend the failings of Europeans in their greed and fighting, especially in two world wars.

Warren argued that the first task for mission in a pre-Christian society is for the Christian Church to realise both its connectedness with European culture and to reject an arrogant assumption of the superiority of the whole of European culture. The second is to recognise the complexity of the different approaches and cultures resulting from the nationality of the missionaries. Here Warren brought up the issue of money, describing the American missionary style as pouring in a great deal of money, producing envy in those who were served by a British or German mission. Indeed Warren saw significant problems in the divergent philosophies of the missionary societies and the exportation of denominational division that divide young national churches.

In contrast to the pouring out of money Warren looked to partnership between the Christians of Asia and Africa and those of the West.

“Partnership means involvement between real people in real situations. It means committal of oneself in trust to the genuine integrity of the other person. It calls for a responsible attitude to the other by each. It means the acceptance of a host of

⁶⁰ Warren, *Partnership*, 84.

liabilities. And all this is completely **mutual** or it is not partnership. It calls for a **responsible** attitude to the other by each.”⁶¹

In the repetition of the three fold model, Warren offered to the Anglican Communion some of the language by which it has understood partnership ever since. The combining of the words “mutual” and “responsible” in the same paragraph was the first step to their conjunction in the phrase – “mutual responsibility.” It is important that Warren placed this mutuality within the context of involvement between people in real situations. It is by giving priority to the development of relationships that mutuality can be developed. The model here is being used to propose further action, and it is probable that this is what Warren understood as the content of the document “Mutual Responsibility in the Body of Christ.”

Warren then pointed out that partnership was hidden from African and Asian Christians. Money was given to develop institutions and missionaries did work that “nationals” could do for themselves. The prayer and sacrifice that underlies giving was not communicated, and so they failed to pray for the Christians in the West. Christians in the West who had little or no understanding of what it meant to be a religious minority in a hostile environment, no understanding of how the Christians were seen by their countrymen as imperialists by association, and had no understanding of the poverty of many of the peoples of these lands.⁶² He argued that prayer informed by imagination and information is the first place to start in partnership and from this:

A sense of responsibility for exploring every possible means of service which will reduce the embarrassment of the Christians of Asia and Africa to the minimum. This in turn will lead to a readiness to recognize that Asians and Africans must be free to decide between the saving essentials of the Christian Gospel and the paraphernalia, whether in worship or in organization with which the West has introduced it: and that, having made their decision, they must be allowed a like freedom to invest the unchangeable gospel with a dress which will make it so local as to be unmistakably universal.⁶³

⁶¹ Ibid., 92-3. Emphasis mine.

⁶² Ibid., 93-4.

⁶³ Ibid., 94-5.

In this paragraph Warren begins to explore a theme that was central to the subsequent MRI project, that is, partnership is understood as offering greater diversity, not greater uniformity. He saw partnership as an escape route from Western domination of African and Asian churches; they could be free through being partners. *Interdependence* was not a word coined by Warren, nor did he use *dependency*, but the move from dependent to interdependency was Warren's concern. Thus the language of mutual responsibility and the concepts of interdependence found a first home in these brief speculative lectures. Their source was the exploratory model of partnership as *involvement, the acceptance of responsibility and the readiness to accept liability*.

Warren believed that the task of evangelism in the pre-Christian lands was impossible both for the African and Asian Christians alone, and for Western Christians, without local support. He supported the call of the Willingen Conference for international teams for mission, and hoped to see African and Asian partnerships emerging.⁶⁴ However, he had not thought through the full consequences of partnership. New mission fields were for him only found in Africa and Asia, not Europe and North America. The impression is given that Warren believed that Westerners could do mission on their own in their context, but Africans and Asians needed help in theirs. Partnership questions such assumptions.

2.2.2. Evaluation of Warren's Model of Partnership

Warren was a prophetic voice and saw clearly the need for partnership within a grand vision, encompassing the major issues of his day, in politics and industry as well as the evangelistic endeavour of the church. Warren's work was based on the model of partnership as involvement, accepting responsibility and accepting liability. The model was developed from observation of marriage, industry and politics, and was applied to Christian theology, rather than derived from the claimed Anglican source of Scripture, tradition and reason.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 97-8.

The use of the exploratory model is significant when placed with his articulation of the *missio Dei*. The application of Trinitarian theology in missiology was to be followed by the leading missiologists. The tools now available to the theologian, in terms of work published since 1956, allow a fuller understanding, but Warren was a truly imaginative theologian, learning from those about him, and building on his experience of the reality of mission in the world in which he lived. From the dialogue between the three-fold model and the *missio Dei* he coined the words *mutual* and *responsibility*, giving a vocabulary for partnership. He proposed that partnership leads to liberation for the African and Asian Church, which came to be called “interdependence.”

He went beyond most people of his time by identifying the need for a new philosophy and the new context of urban industrialisation as priorities for mission in the West. However, he did not consider these to be contexts for partnered mission. The Christians of Asia and Africa were not seen to have a place in mission in the West. In recent years the Church of England has discovered that it is a mission field church. Reports such as *Mission-Shaped Church*,⁶⁵ and *Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church*⁶⁶ confirm this change in attitude.

In the sphere of mission to the pre-Christian world Warren seems ignorant of the leading role of African and Asian Christians in the task of evangelism in their own contexts. This was well developed by 1956 and has now altered the centre of gravity of Christianity to the South from the North. This is surprising because he would have known the story of Crowther, been a contemporary of Azariah, and knew of the missionary story of Apolo Kivebulaya, but he does not allude to them or any others. Evangelism in Africa and Asia was mainly the work of Africans and Asians, many of them without rank or title, and many of them women of faith, with little or no learning. He remarks that “Certain it is that the

⁶⁵ *Mission-Shaped Church* (London: CHP, 2004).

⁶⁶ *Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church* (London: CHP, 2003).

resources of no Church in Asia and Africa are adequate to the task unaided,⁶⁷ but evangelistic missions in Asia and Africa challenge this assertion. His case is unproven and can only be made if it is argued that the churches in Europe and North America are unequal to their task alone as well.

In consequence the emphasis remained on Western Christians ceding partnership to African and Asian nationals in their emerging countries. It still had a feel of *from the West to Africa and Asia*. While Warren argued that mission without the blessing and assistance of the local church is impossible, the partnership he envisioned was always located in Africa and Asia. While he hoped African and Asian Christians would be able to pray for the Western church, he had no concept of them being involved in mission in the West. This means that the Western church was still the giver and the new churches the receivers.

Warren provided a significant explanatory model drawing upon relevant and positive real instances. However, these did not come from the Bible, and this is surprising for a model which was to be used as a basis for relationships within the Anglican Communion. The adequacy of the model as an exploratory tool in enabling planning for the development of the Anglican Communion is considered in section 2.4. However, it is necessary first to consider the contribution of Stephen Bayne.

2.3. Stephen Bayne

When he addressed the Overseas Mission Society, Philadelphia, in 1961, Bayne said “Canon Warren quoted somebody who said to him, when he was preparing some lectures, that he hoped Canon Warren would give a lecture about the theological significance of Bishop Bayne. Canon Warren has been around the world since and I have not heard whether he has done this – I hope he will.”⁶⁸ He was not here referring to himself as a person, but to his role as the first Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion. Where Max Warren

⁶⁷ Warren, *Partnership*, 96.

⁶⁸ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 203.

represented the English evangelical movement and the voluntary societies, Bishop Stephen Bayne was from an American liberal catholic tradition and thoroughly immersed in the official structures of the church. He would be significant merely for being appointed the first Executive Officer for the Anglican Communion by Archbishop Fisher in 1959, a role in which he continued under Archbishop Michael Ramsey until 1964. However, his influence was far greater than that which might be expected. The result of his five-year tenure continues to shape the Anglican Communion to this day. The most significant motif which he, with Max Warren, endowed to the Communion is summed up in the words “mutual responsibility and interdependence.”⁶⁹

Bayne was committed to an American form of Anglo-Catholicism, and said that for him “The mass is everything.” He also had a strong commitment to the Bible and preaching.⁷⁰ He was only 38 when he was elected Bishop of Olympia in 1946 and already established as a theologian when in 1958 he was approached by Archbishop Fisher to consider accepting the newly formed post of Executive Officer for the Anglican Communion.⁷¹ He initially refused and together they asked Ambrose Reeves of South Africa. He declined, but the discussions had allowed time for Bayne to think through what such a job might entail.⁷² When Bayne was again offered the post, he accept it as a mission-focused role not as an administrative position. He explained it to his diocese in this way: “We need to plan a common missionary strategy; we need to keep thinking together (as we do now only at Lambeth and the Anglican Congress): we need to learn to act together more and more as a world Church rather than merely as a group of national Churches of the same

⁶⁹ John Booty, *An American Apostle: the Life of Stephen Fielding Bayne Jr.* (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International 1997).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

⁷¹ His books included reflections on the understanding of God in the modern world – *Optional God* (1953) – and ethics - *Christian Living* (1957) - as well as collections of sermons and addresses – *Enter with Joy* (1961). See *Ibid.*, 71-91.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 92-93.

tradition.”⁷³ He saw his role as someone who “would be able to dream and imagine and speak for possibilities which have never yet existed, who would have the patience and persistence to bring together the needs and hopes and insights of all our sacred brotherhood, who would be set free to think of nothing save our family as a whole, and the work our Lord has given us to do in this dark world.”⁷⁴ That he was not a bureaucrat, but a serious theologian and a visionary thinker, and that he was not English and was somewhat free of the colonialist world views of the Church of England, were vital for the foundation he put in place for the future of Anglicanism. His concerns have shaped both the practical outworking of partnership across the Communion, and also the search for Anglican identity that has become a preoccupation in recent years.

2.3.1. Stephen Bayne – Anglican Identity

In taking on the role of Executive Officer, Bayne gave considerable thought to the nature of the Anglican Communion in a changing world, and the question of Anglican identity. The definition he had to work with had been articulated in Resolution 49 of the 1930 Lambeth Conference:

The Conference approves the following statement of nature and status of the Anglican Communion, as that term is used in its Resolutions:

The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted dioceses, provinces or regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:

- a) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches;
- b) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and
- c) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference.

The Conference makes this statement praying for and eagerly awaiting the time when the Churches of the present Anglican Communion will enter into communion with other parts

⁷³ Ibid., 94.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 94-5.

of the Catholic Church not definable as Anglican in the above sense, as a step towards the ultimate reunion of all Christendom in one visibly united fellowship.⁷⁵

From the beginning he realised this definition was out of date.⁷⁶ His concerns, first raised in an Article in *Anglican World* in 1960, were set out in an address in Londonderry in June 1963. He repeated them at the Toronto Anglican Congress, and further articulated them in his final annual report as Executive Officer.⁷⁷ In particular, he reflected that the progress made in the ecumenical movement in coming into full communion with the Old Catholics had challenged the definition. The Bonn Agreement of 1931 meant that those in communion with the See of Canterbury were no longer all “Anglican.”⁷⁸ For Bayne the only way of simply updating the formulary would be to say, “the Anglican Communion is an association of ‘Anglican’ churches which are in full communion with Canterbury. And of course this simply passes the buck to those who wish to decide what ‘Anglican’ means!”⁷⁹ In Bayne’s opinion the standard recourse to the Book of Common Prayer as common ground was no longer viable because the proliferation in versions of the Prayer Book made such a definition impossible.⁸⁰ He argued that the Anglican Communion had to move on from its “cultural confessionalism,”⁸¹ by which Bayne meant an essential Englishness. The elevation of English styles of dress and architecture, to the point where they were seen as essential to Anglicanism, had to end. Bayne was aware that the world was rapidly changing, especially

⁷⁵ “Resolutions from 1930 – Resolution 49” *Lambeth Conference Official Website*, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-49.cfm>. Also quoted by Bayne, *Turning Point*, 110.

⁷⁶ Booty, *Apostle*, 96.

⁷⁷ All four are in his collected works from the period: Bayne *Turning Point*, his thoughts expressed in *Anglican World* in 1960, 145-52. “Londonderry Address,” 109-23. “Toronto Address,” 124-45. “Final Report,” 95-97. Other references to these concerns are scattered throughout the works but essentially restate the points made in these works.

⁷⁸ The terms of the Bonn agreement (1931) which led to full communion between Old Catholics and Anglicans, and which continues to be a pattern for further intercommunion relations between the churches, reads as follows:

Each Communion recognises the Catholicity and independence of the other, and maintains its own. Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the Sacraments. Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 125 also 110-111. See Booty, *Apostle*, 96.

⁸¹ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 129-130.

in the places where the Anglican Communion was rooted. This change was marked by the famous speech of the British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in February 1960 in South Africa. Following his visits to British colonies across the continent he declared, “The wind of change is blowing through this continent. Whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact.”⁸² The “Wind of Change” speech, was followed by the granting of independence to Nigeria and Somalia in 1960, Sierra Leone and Tanzania in 1961, Uganda in 1962 and Kenya in 1963.⁸³ Bayne believed that autonomous churches should be free from the paralysing erosion of liberty which cultural confessionalism inevitably brought.⁸⁴

By 1963 there were 18 provinces of the Anglican Communion. These consisted of the 5 provinces of the British Islands, and 4 with distinct ex-colonial histories – USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Three (Japan, China,⁸⁵ and India⁸⁶) had missionary histories. The Province of Uganda, including Burundi and Rwanda, had been formed in 1961 with Archbishop Sabiti as the first black African Primate. There were 4 other African Provinces (South Africa, West Africa, East Africa and Central Africa) led by a white Archbishop. The West Indies was a Province and consisted of the territories that had been or still were British colonies, with the other Caribbean and Central American churches within an internal province of the USA. Finally, Jerusalem was a Province. Some dioceses, such as Adelaide, Tasmania and Willochra in Australia were not part of a province but administered directly from Lambeth Palace. It was clear that this structure could not last and local autonomy was required.

⁸² Harold Macmillan, “Wind of Change - Speech made to the South Africa Parliament on 3 February 1960,” *African History*, http://africanhistory.about.com/od/eraindependence/p/wind_of_change2.htm.

⁸³ “A Chronological List of Independence Dates For Africa,” *African History*, <http://africanhistory.about.com/library/timelines/blIndependenceTime.htm>.

Ghana had received independence in 1957 and South Africa declared its independence and founded itself as a white led republic in 1961. Zambia had to wait until the end of 1964 for independence and Rhodesia/Zimbabwe went through a political struggle until Zimbabwe finally achieved independence in 1980.

⁸⁴ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 129.

⁸⁵ There is no Anglican Province of China now, but the Province then was based on the present Province of Hong Kong.

⁸⁶ Including India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Ceylon and Burma.

Given that communion with the See of Canterbury, the Prayer Book and culture could not define the Anglican Communion; Bayne looked elsewhere as he struggled to form a structure to administer the complexity of the Communion as it was “Coming of Age.”⁸⁷ From the first he rejected “confessionalism,” a church formed around a specific statement of identity such as the Westminster Confession that binds and unites Reformed Churches, or the Augsburg Confession which is required to be adhered to by any member of the Lutheran World Federation.⁸⁸ His own experience and theology accepted baptism as the only definition of membership, and he struggled to find a suitable definition. He joked that “the only description which seems to me satisfactory is a very modest existential one indeed – the Anglican Communion consists of those churches which pay my salary and whose bishops get invited to the Lambeth Conference.”⁸⁹

Bayne valued the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral as a foundational document for the Anglican Communion.⁹⁰ It meant that the Communion had no specific definition beyond the Scriptures, historic creeds, the twin sacraments of eucharist and baptism, and an episcopal structure; all of which could be sources of unity rather than division with wider Christendom.⁹¹ These thoughts led him to the conclusion that:

*Whatever organization we have must be true to that cardinal principle of the free association of regional and national churches. The action we are called on to take, in the first instance, is that of mutual brotherhood and support in the common tasks of the Church. God has given us this association; it is not the final association of Christians, but it is all we have now; it is put into our hands as an instrument for action. And it lays down its own requirements. If we are to help one another – if we are to share fully in our common task – it must be within the framework of this brotherhood of churches.*⁹²

⁸⁷ Ibid., 109.

⁸⁸ “The Lutheran World Federation confesses the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the only source and norm of its doctrine, life and service. It sees in the three Ecumenical Creeds and in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, especially in the unaltered **Augsburg Confession** and the Small Catechism of Martin Luther, a pure exposition of the Word of God.” (Bold mine). “Constitution of the Lutheran World Federation,” *The Lutheran World Federation*, http://www.lutheranworld.org/Who_We_Are/LWF-Constitution.pdf.

⁸⁹ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 125.

⁹⁰ “The Lambeth-Chicago Quadrilateral” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/appendix/p3.1.cfm>.

⁹¹ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 127.

⁹² Ibid., 126. Emphasis his.

He believed that the desire to define the Communion too tightly would destroy the dynamic of personhood for action.⁹³ The Anglican Communion was not an institution to be defined, but a community with a purpose. He was aware that such vagueness was complex and confusing, but he saw hope in the complexity. The confessional route was the way to limitation and prescription; the non-confessional offers the possibility of unity both within the Communion and ecumenically.

However, this lack of precision also worried him. The end section of his final report is entitled “Personal,” but it is not about him and his family, or how much he had enjoyed the role, but about his continuing perplexity over the identity of Anglicanism.⁹⁴ Once the strings of history, law, culture and confession are undone, what does it mean to be an Anglican? He had no answer and this bothered him because without a clear denominational definition he felt it would be impossible to know what was being built and because without something specific to bring to the table, it would be difficult to develop compromise agreements with ecumenical partners.

2.3.2. Stephen Bayne and the Forming of the Anglican Communion

In his first three years Bayne travelled 399,000 miles, visiting almost every part of the Communion.⁹⁵ He had a unique knowledge of the Communion from his direct experience. Prior to the Toronto Congress he laid down a “fundamental axiom” for the common life of the Communion.

The fundamental axiom of our common life is that there is no church so rich that it does not need what other churches can give, and no church so small that it has nothing to give. There is no church so wise that it may not learn from others, and no church so young and untrained that it has nothing to teach. And because we take this axiom seriously, and because we are now daily more and more aware of the reality of this fellowship of churches, such meeting places as the Advisory Council become more and more important in our common life, and

⁹³ The kind of analysis which was the foundation of Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church (expanded edition)* (New York: Doubleday, 1st ed. 1978, this ed. 2002). Dulles argues that definitions of Church cement structure, but models offer flexibility.

⁹⁴ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 95-7.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 31, 40, 59. See also Booty, *Apostle*, 100-3.

need to be far more articulated into the life of each of our separate churches than the Advisory Council yet is.⁹⁶

This was an aspect of partnership which Warren had failed to develop. Bayne believed that the new, poor, small churches had vital contributions to make and the old, rich, big churches something to receive. He saw that this could not be worked out within a definition of church, but could be enabled by mechanisms of church. By April 1963 Bayne had developed an understanding of the issues surrounding the development of younger churches.⁹⁷ The differing missionary principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA,⁹⁸ and the British voluntary societies,⁹⁹ both led to cultures of dependency and paternalism. Quoting Newbigin, he saw that the missions had become “assimilated to the process of Western cultural invasion.”¹⁰⁰ Bayne continued:

He [Newbigin] goes on to comment: ‘What does not seem to have been noticed is that the question does not seem to arise at all in the biblical situation. There is no period in which the Church is independent. From its very beginning every one of these young churches, with all its manifold weaknesses and even scandalous sins, is treated as simply the body of Christ in that place, the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, and, therefore, as not being independent and not dependent but always and from the beginning in a position of reciprocal inter-dependence with other members of the Body of Christ.’

If this vision of Unity and interdependence be true, and I believe it is with all my heart, then our question must be, how shall we better organize ourselves so that just such interdependence, just such unity, is clear before our eyes at every stage? This is the question for Anglicans, and I think an urgent one.¹⁰¹

This is the only occasion I have found in which Bayne refers to the concept of interdependence prior to the Toronto Congress. This concept, along with mutual responsibility, is still the key concept for partnership in the Communion. It is significant because Newbigin is consciously modelling. He argues that the diverse New Testament churches were interdependent and therefore the church in the present should seek to find

⁹⁶ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 114.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 255-9. “The Stretch In Between” *The Living Church*, April 14, 1963.

⁹⁸ Forming missionary dioceses in Brazil or the Philippines and electing each new bishop in the USA.

⁹⁹ Resulting in some provinces being considered either “CMS,” (Uganda) “SPG,” (West Indies), or “UCMA” (Central Africa) and others having dioceses affiliated to one or the other (East Africa).

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 259. Bayne quotes Newbigin, but without attribution. I have searched in vain for the quote, but it might be from private correspondence or an unpublished lecture.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 259. Again no attribution.

ways to replicate that. However, Bayne did not find in Newbigin a model for implementing interdependence. The desire for interdependence was clear, but not the way to make it a reality.

Bayne sought to find the answers for the shape of the Communion through engagement with people. He was patient and persistent in bringing together significant people to shape and form the vision. The defining context of his work was what he called the “Canadian Summer.” By this he meant not just the Third Congress of the Anglican Communion held in Toronto from 23 to 23 August 1963, but the meetings which led up to it and provided the background for it.¹⁰² The Congress, organised by Bayne, was the culmination of his time as Executive Officer and of the huge effort he had spent touring the world in preparation. He believed that the most significant action taken at the Congress was “the adoption of the ‘Mutual Responsibility’ document.”¹⁰³ The phrase itself – mutual responsibility and interdependence – immediately became the key phrase to summate Anglican partnership and is used to this day.¹⁰⁴ “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” emerged from the week-long meeting of the Missionary Executives Conference – one of five gatherings prior to the Congress proper,¹⁰⁵ but his thought is reflected within it and the subsequent priority he gave to it at the Congress confirmed a bond between Bayne and the concept of MRI. It was his in the sense that he would own and promote it, even if he understood it to be the product of “hundreds of minds, over days of listening and hearing.”¹⁰⁶

¹⁰² Ibid., 80.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 81.

¹⁰⁴ A simple word search of *The Windsor Report* (2004), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/windsor2004/downloads/windsor2004full.pdf>, showed 47 occurrences of the word mutual, 21 of responsibility and 31 for interdependence within the document. This shows the continued reliance upon the vocabulary.

¹⁰⁵ The other meetings were of the Advisory Council for Missionary Strategy (ACMS) the Lambeth Consultative Body, a meeting of the five African Primates and a conference for the heads of Anglican Theological Colleges. Bayne, *Turning Point*, 80-1.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 132.

2.3.3 Stephen Bayne - Summary

Where Warren concerned himself with the wider world, formed a model of partnership, and then applied it to both church and secular situations, Bayne started with a definition of church, considered its complexities and then sought a solution to unite a changing Communion. He was accurate in his assessment of the inadequacy of the Lambeth Conference 1930 description of the Anglican Communion, and fully aware of the problems of confessionalism, whether confessional or cultural. He was also aware of the difficulties presented by having such a loose definition of international Anglicanism. What is most impressive was his recognition of the value of the ostensibly weak and poor, and the need of those regarded as strong and rich. The time he gave to visiting churches included time to listen and to reflect, not just to speak. He had started to use Newbigin's language of "interdependence" as the mark of this process.

Like Warren, Bayne did not look to the Bible for a model of enacting interdependence. The Scriptures are mentioned in his work as a point of reference and as a mark of communion, but never consulted on the issue that most concerned him. In the 313 pages of *An Anglican Turning Point* there are no more than half a dozen Bible references, none concerning partnership, and none followed by serious exegesis. Anglican theology claims its foundation in Scripture, tradition and reason. Unlike Warren, Bayne did not search for answers in modern management or politics: instead he relied on observation of the Communion as it was. Experience of travelling, visiting and listening gave him an understanding of the value of every part of the Communion, which was significant, but not enough to formulate a sustainable theology of partnership. When Bayne arrived at the pre-conference meetings for the 1963 Congress, he did not have a model for the Communion. He may have hoped it would have emerged from the conference, but to his excitement, he believed that it emerged before that in the meeting of the Missionary Executives.

2.4. The Anglican Turning Point

The Toronto Congress was an ambitious event including a thousand delegates from around the world, for which Bayne had been preparing from the beginning of his time as Executive Officer.¹⁰⁷ It was preceded by five meetings at Huron College, London, Ontario. The most significant for Bayne was the meeting of the Missionary Executives; fifty representatives of missionary societies, missionary boards and mission churches.¹⁰⁸ Booty records Bayne introducing the concepts of mutuality and interdependence, but, as has been shown above, these concepts had been promoted by Max Warren, perhaps the most influential of the missionary executives. This group set the agenda for the Congress to follow.

2.4.1. The Writing and Adoption of “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”

Bayne described “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” as, “a communication – a manifesto, a summons, a challenge, a proposal (to use some of the words applied to it and the Anglican Congress) – from the Primates and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion gathered in Canada in the summer of 1963, to the Churches of that Communion, calling for the response of those Churches.”¹⁰⁹ The eight-page document has both a broad agenda, clearly envisioned by the speeches that surrounded it, and specific recommendations within it.

A draft document had been prepared by the Archbishop of East Africa, Leonard Beecher, and had been framed around an appeal for capital funds.¹¹⁰ Beecher was an Archbishop and Primate, but he was also a CMS missionary, thus within an organisation headed by Warren. It was this kind of anomaly Warren was committed to breaking, but to do so the executives had to exert an authority they were looking to diminish. The proposal was

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., xi; Bayne, *Turning Point*, 27.

¹⁰⁸ Booty, *Apostle*, 112.

¹⁰⁹ Bayne, ed., *Mutual Responsibility*, x.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 113.

redrafted and submitted to the Advisory Council for Missionary Strategy (ACMS), which met at Huron College, August 5 to 8.¹¹¹ Five members of the missionary executives were also on ACMS, and these included Warren and John V. Taylor, his successor-in-waiting as General Secretary of CMS. Bayne offered the revised proposal, now entitled “Mutual Responsibility for Mission” to the Chair of the Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Further review was asked for, and a small team, including Beecher and Taylor, was commissioned to redraft the document. They were asked for a document that would describe “nothing less than a new form of the Anglican Communion.”¹¹²

There was great excitement in the discovery of the new paradigm, and it is palpable in Michael Ramsey’s forward to the short book *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ*, written to promote the document of the same name. Ramsey saw the change in paradigm as a change in character. “We cease to think of some of our Anglican Churches as ‘mother’ Churches and of others as ‘missionary’ or ‘dependant’ or ‘younger’ and come to think of them all as equal in authority and responsibility, serving one another as they serve God and humanity in a single missionary task.”¹¹³ In his introduction Bayne quoted from the closing paragraph of the document to confirm the radical nature of the proposals and then set the document in context. He said that delegates came to Canada expecting an appeal for money, but in the third draft the words “appeal” and “capital funds” were withdrawn, and in the fifth draft the focus turned to “not what other churches needed but what *we* needed – what all churches needed.”¹¹⁴ He continued by quoting the “humbling” words of the Bishop of Tokyo, Bishop Goto. “Formerly a giver and receiver faced each other, each preoccupied with the reactions of each to the other, each ashamed, both with anxious eyes fastened on the gift. Now we are released from this, for we are to stand hand in hand facing one great missionary task Where before, some of us felt we had no gifts

¹¹¹ Ibid., 112.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Bayne, ed., *Mutual Responsibility*, vii.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., xiii

because we were confronting those whom we thought had everything, now we shall discover that all have gifts that are needed, and giving, shall receive.”¹¹⁵

Bayne was well aware of the radical nature of the document and yet he was confident of its reception and that it marked a change in reality. He was realistic about the cost of such change, not just in monetary terms, but in the loss of self-understanding and the need for Western humility. The keynotes were “equality, interdependence and mutual responsibility”¹¹⁶ from which the Congress was able to confidently declare that “the Anglican Communion had ‘Come of Age’.”¹¹⁷

2.4.2. The Document – “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”

The report was able to say, “it is now irrelevant to talk of ‘giving’ and ‘receiving’ churches,”¹¹⁸ but the actual recommendations of the report deny this rhetoric. The report proposed three central truths: the church’s mission is a response to God the missionary; unity in Christ is more important than any other bond and unity; and interdependence needs a new level of expression and “corporate obedience,”¹¹⁹ but the practical result of the action plan was to reinforce the old understandings. The first recommendation was a valid and worthwhile study of needs and resources throughout the Communion, but the resources were defined as manpower (clerical and lay), training facilities and financial resources, all of which were held in plenty in the “older” churches.¹²⁰ The needy areas were defined as “the unevangelized areas that still confront the church,” which, at the time, would have been considered to be exclusively in the South and East, largely in Africa and Asia.¹²¹ The second part of the action plan was a call for money, and while the words “appeal” and “capital fund”

¹¹⁵ Ibid., xv, The “...” signifying missing text are Bayne’s editing not mine. The church in Japan was entirely financially dependent on the Episcopal Church USA (ECUSA) as seen in the PiM consultation report 1974-75 (ACO Archive).

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 1.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 2.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 2.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 2-3.

¹²¹ Ibid., 3.

were consciously dropped, the request was for an endless flow of money from the rich world to the poor.¹²² Money was considered necessary for three things: training, construction of churches, and diocesan administration. Each reflects the values of the wealthy, older, established churches over that of the fresh new church. Goto's confidence that mutual sharing had replaced giver and receiver was immediately undermined. The third need was for priests (measured in thousands), however, at the time there were plenty of priests in the "old" churches, so what was meant here was the need for priests in the "new" churches. There was a perceived need to satisfy the desire of the laity to be used throughout the Communion. The involvement of the laity was a feature of the new churches, but it was not considered how the new churches could assist the older ones in their search to see how lay people might more fully be involved in mission.¹²³ The fourth recommendation looked to deeper consultation and communication across the Communion. Again this sounds simple and effective, but the focus was put down as "pay standards, educational qualifications, pension provisions and the like."¹²⁴ These were issues of significance for the "new" churches, but generally, at the time, under control for the "old" churches.

The final recommendations returned to the new rhetoric with no content. Each Church was encouraged to study its resources and needs. "If planning and responsible partnership are to be truly mutual, we must everywhere ask ourselves, systematically and with the best help we can gain from any source, what we have, what we need, and where we are called of God to share in major partnership with our fellow Christians."¹²⁵ Finally, there was a declaration that as one Lord holds us together in a single body for a single mission, so there should be a rejection of the juxtaposition of "older" against "younger" and "sending"

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid., 4.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 5.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 5-6.

versus “receiving” for “Mission is not the kindness of the lucky to the unlucky; it is mutual, united obedience to one God whose mission it is.”¹²⁶

However, these new theologies were contradicted in the first two clauses of the action plan. The first encouraged every church to give increased support and manpower other churches in the Communion. To think that this would not be considered as from the “older” to the “newer,” or from the “richer” to the “poorer,” was remarkably naive. The call was said to be urgent because opportunities were decreasing and “some doors have already closed.”¹²⁷ The reference to closed doors was not made explicit, but it can be assumed that it was about the difficulties in sending people to some ex-British colonies, such as Egypt, which had set restrictions on missionaries. These doors were therefore considered to be in the “new” regions of the world. In the second, every church was encouraged to consider its “own obedience to mission,” considering structures, theology and priorities.¹²⁸ Practical examples were given of times when secondary needs of “our own” might be placed above essential needs of “others.” Examples included establishing the value of a new organ in Lagos or New York against the training of clergy in Asia or South America, or the possibility of old institutions in India or England releasing trained teachers for the South Pacific or Uganda.¹²⁹ A direct attempt was made to include Lagos and India as givers, but in reality the emphasis was on ending luxury in the rich churches for requirements in the new. Mission was defined as “something we do for someone else.”¹³⁰ Therefore, training clergy in Africa was the “mission” of a church that sponsored them, but not the mission of the church for whom they were being trained. Indeed Booty reports that an American Diocese challenged Bayne about this after the Congress. The diocese had been planning to launch a mission within its urban and industrial context and was, in the light of MRI, considering if

¹²⁶ Ibid., 6.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 7.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

this was a secondary need of their own rather than a prior need of others.¹³¹ Within Bayne's own theology there was no conflict and the new mission should go ahead, but it was not clear in "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ."

The third clause of the action plan was visionary. There was a call for every church to "seek the way to receive as well as to give, asking expectantly what other churches and cultures may bring to its life, and eager to share its tasks and problems with others."¹³² Indeed this was picked up by *Time Magazine* in their report of the conference. "In his unity-centered keynote address, the Most Rev. Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of the Communion, called for a new sharing of missionary responsibilities. 'Let African and Asian missionaries come to England to help to convert the post-Christian heathenism in our country and to convert our English Church to a closer following of Christ,' he said."¹³³ However, no proposals allowed such a process to happen. The last two points of the action plan called on each member church to examine their mission orientation. They are reminded that they have a mission to others and mission was not to propagatde English culture and language.¹³⁴ Each church was to involve itself in the life of other churches in the Communion, including the reorientation of teaching and prayers in the parish, and a "host of designed ways by which our common life and mutual interdependence may be expressed."¹³⁵

The final section of the report, which was printed in bold, is worth quoting in full as it sets out the future of Anglican relationships that live with us today:

We are aware that such a programme as we propose, if it is seen in its true size and accepted, will mean the death of much that is familiar about our Churches now. It will mean radical changes in our priorities – even leading us to share with others at least as much as we spend on ourselves. It means

¹³¹ Booty, *Apostle*, 117.

¹³² Bayne, ed., *Mutual Responsibility*, 7.

¹³³ *Time Magazine*, "One Big Family," (23 August 1963), <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,875119,00.html?promoid=googlep>.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

the death of old isolations and inherited attitudes. It means willingness to forgo many desirable things, in every Church.

In substance, what we are really asking is the rebirth of the Anglican Communion, which means the death of many things but – infinitely more – the birth of entirely new relationships. We regard this as the essential task before the Churches of the Anglican Communion now.¹³⁶

“Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” was a positive rallying call and a refreshing new direction. However, there were several problems that arose from it. The initial focus was on death, and guaranteed to induce fear and incomprehension in those who had not been part of the process. A body such as the Church of England was not ready for a radical change in priorities and to forgo many “desirable things.” The counterbalancing birth of entirely new relationships seemed vague in comparison.

The churches of the Communion understood “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” as a request for funds. Beecher’s original draft had been an appeal for capital funds and, although the words “capital funds” and “appeal” had been removed, the request for \$15 million was still present.¹³⁷ The richer churches were unrealistically challenged to share with others at least as much as they were spending on themselves. The financial state of the Anglican Churches in the developed world now is much more difficult than it was then, but even so the prospect of handing over half, or more, of a diocesan budget would have been hard to comprehend in England, Canada and the USA. The distorting effect of valuing money above all other resources does not seem to have been recognised. The report was strong on removing the labelling of churches as “giving” and “receiving,” but even here the sharing, which could be so much wider than just money, was reduced to “spend” in the same sentence in the final section.¹³⁸

The focus on money meant that the poorer churches were unclear what they had to bring to the table. Money, manpower and education were all in the hands of the richer, more

¹³⁶ Ibid. Printed in bold in the text.

¹³⁷ Booty, *Apostle*, 113; Bayne, ed., *Mutual Responsibility*, 3.

¹³⁸ Bayne, ed., *Mutual Responsibility*, 8.

established, churches. The painful attempt to parallel the buying of an organ in Lagos with expenditure in New York, fails to convince. Does this mean that the church in Nigeria was seriously being asked to support theological education in Asia and South America, when it had huge areas to evangelise within its own boundaries? In reality the poorer churches are only asked to provide mission fields.

The document had a very limited view of where mission was taking place. It called for an examination of each church's obedience to mission and to look at "the senses in which we use the word "mission" as describing something we do for somebody else."¹³⁹ However, there was little understanding of the need for mission in Europe and America. There is no sense within the document that the orientation for mission needed to happen in every diocese in every province. Indeed in England such a revolution has only happened in the last ten years, signified after the publication of *Mission-Shaped Church* in 2004.¹⁴⁰

The prime needs identified within "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ" were money for training for leadership, the construction of churches, and the development of administration for new dioceses. These were all institutions in the cultural style of the old churches and an expression of cultural confessionalism. There seems to be a failure to comprehend that the phenomenal growth of the church across Africa depended upon the preaching of local evangelists. Effective evangelists such as William Wade Harris and Festo Kivingere continued to be ignored and the failure to understand how the church grows and develops marked a real hindrance for the future mission of the Church.

Despite the Anglican Church's self identity as a church grounded in the Bible there was no mention of any biblical basis for change, except in the death/rebirth allusions. These are appropriate, but lack a clear vision of the nature of the new birth in the context of the Anglican Communion, and there was little incentive to participate in the death. St Paul's

¹³⁹ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁴⁰ *Mission-Shaped Church* (London: CHP, 2004).

practice of partnership offers a vision for the new forms of relationship required for international partnership in mission that are not explored or even hinted at.

Bayne had been travelling the world and bringing together a plan for the future. Wherever he went people responded favourably to his ideas, and the momentum created by such an exciting breakthrough was evident. However, such momentum resulted in a sense of urgency and a rush to action, rather than a call for reflection. What was needed was a re-education programme for all Anglicans, not an instant demand for money to flow from the rich to the poor.

The Toronto Conference was a very significant milestone on the path to a rethinking of the Anglican Communion. It was a turning point and the radical theology reflects the discovery of an emerging paradigm. It offered the vocabulary for partnership and brought together Warren's words "mutual" and "responsibility" with Bayne's word "interdependence."

2.4.3. "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ" as an Explanatory and Exploratory Model

The Document "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ" does not function well as an explanatory model because it does not set out the sources from which it was developed. Warren's three-fold model of partnership – *involvement, the acceptance of responsibility and the readiness to accept liability* – combined with the biblical call to interdependence which Bayne learned from Newbigin were significant in developing the thinking behind MRI, but this was not made explicit in the document.

"Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ" was not likely to work as an exploratory model. It is not an abstraction of principles but a call to action. Problematically the actions called for, such as the call for a fund of \$15 million, contradict the aims of ending the giver/receiver mentality. Mutual responsibility and interdependence sounds like a clear abstract exploratory model. However, it is not clear if this is one concept with two aspects, one concept with two descriptors, or two compatible concepts. Chiwanga

described MRI as an “imperative,” but on investigation it is not clear what the “imperative” is.¹⁴¹

Conclusion

In the years from 1956 to 1963 the imperial era was coming to a close. Due to Warren and Bayne the Anglican Communion emerged with a huge desire to look to partnership rather than dependency as the key feature of future relationships which would encourage a new spirit of development. Warren offered a model for partnership as a response to the alternative of dominating power. His model was drawn for legitimate sources in industry, politics and marriage, but not from the Bible. The model shaped the rapidly changing Anglican Communion by offering the language of mutual responsibility, but the model itself was not properly articulated in the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ.” Bayne’s observations of the significance of the newer and receiving churches are echoed in the rhetoric surrounding the text of the document, but they are not set out within it. As such, the elements for sustaining mutual responsibility and interdependence are not set out with clarity. The language is attractive and was welcomed, but the document is neither an exploratory nor an explanatory model, and so would be unlikely to be sufficient to enable the realisation of the aims.

There is no doubt that the Toronto Congress was a turning point and the phrase “mutual responsibility and interdependence” became the mantra of the new Communion. The test of the success of the project is if the giver/receiver relationship was changed to genuinely mutual relationships. The next chapter will investigate the response to MRI. The initial response of a Directory of Projects was replaced by the Partners in Mission (PiM) consultations. The study of the PiM consultations in chapter 3, including their foundation, application, the numerous attempts to reform them, and their effects on the Anglican Communion, shows that without a sufficient model planning implementation and critical

¹⁴¹ Chiwanga, “Chairman’s Address.”

appraisal was impossible. The model of partnership developed by Max Warren and the observations on Anglican structures of Stephen Bayne were not of sufficient strength, and were not communicated with sufficient vigour, to enable the change they envisaged.

CHAPTER THREE

3. THE PRACTICAL OUTWORKING OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Introduction

Chapter 2 considered how a model of partnership devised by Max Warren and the observations of Stephen Bayne led to the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the body of Christ.” This document was presented as an abstraction of their explanatory model, but it failed to communicate significant elements of their model. This led to the conclusion that the document was not likely to be a sufficient exploratory model and so inadequate for the purpose of planning, guiding and reviewing critically the practical outworking of partnership in the Anglican Communion. The aim of this chapter is to test this conclusion.

In order to test the effectiveness of MRI as a guiding principle, the programme for its application is critically examined. It is shown that in the absence of any model for the new relationships envisioned by the authors of “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” conventional practice guided the process. This led to the consolidation of relationships of power, based on wealth and length of establishment. The language of MRI was not matched by the practice of partnership and this led to frustration and fraction. The contention is that without an exploratory model, which has been developed as an explanatory model, programmes will confirm the *status quo*. It will be shown that those guiding the process were aware of its failure.

The chapter begins with a historical account of the official process of implementing MRI. The initial response to the Toronto Congress was the formation of a directory of projects. This was replaced by the Partners in Mission (PiM) consultation process. The focus of the chapter is on the PiM consultation process, which ran from 1973 to 1997. The ACC set out four baseline aims for the process, and the intention of the research is to discover if it delivered these aims. This is done by a consideration of the ongoing reviews of process, an

analysis of statistics relating to the process, and a consideration of 3 case studies. This chapter shows that the PiM consultations failed to fulfil the aims set for them by the ACC.

Experiences learnt from the PiM consultation process led to the development of a model entitled the “Ten Principles of Partnership.” The “Ten Principles” act as an explanatory model derived from the real instance of the PiM consultation process. They are used as an exploratory model in the Windsor Report (where they are included in the appendix) and in the Ridley Cambridge Draft of the Anglican Covenant. It is argued that because the “Ten Principles” were developed from the experience of a flawed process the explanatory model is also flawed and has little value as an exploratory model.

The research draws upon reports both in public domain and within the archives of the Anglican Communion Office (ACO). Public domain reports are contained in the reports of meetings of the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) and in reports of groups formed to study the failings of the process. The archives hold a record of most PiM consultations and unpublished reports written in preparation for meetings. This is original research and I am not aware of any previous full review of the PiM consultation process.

3.1. The Establishment of the PiM Consultation Process 1963-1973

The immediate practical response to MRI was to create a directory of projects. Churches were asked to submit requests for support for projects, which reflected their local mission priorities, with other churches being offered the chance to respond. The aim was to remove the dependency of the new churches on the missionary societies and boards by offering new forms of funding. However, 10 years later only 4 per cent of the financial support given to receiving dioceses had come through the MRI project list and these had merely confirmed a shopping list mentality.¹ An alternative approach was required and this was to come from the ACC.

¹ ACC –2 *Partners in Mission*, Dublin, 1973, 56. A report is referred to entitled “Membership, Manpower and Money” that highlighted the failure of support for the projects of the directory. I have been unable to find a copy in the archives.

The Lambeth Conference of 1968 passed a resolution resulting in the formation of the ACC as an “instrument of common action.”² The location of the first meeting in Limuru, Kenya, was considered symbolic of a vital break from European domination. From the beginning the ACC stressed action, not just words. The Council met in the context of the twin traumas of apartheid in South Africa and the rising “troubles” in Northern Ireland. ACC support for the WCC “Programme to Combat Racism”³ led to the white Bishops of Mashonaland and Cape Town dissenting from the resolutions and walking out. The sense was that the time had come to break from the old colonial certainties with action, not just words.

Action on MRI was the priority on the agenda of the first meeting of the ACC and the record of the Council points to a careful working out of the differing theologies, characterised as social gospel and evangelistic gospel. The report gives a rationale for evangelistic activity alongside wider human liberation beyond the boundaries of the church.⁴ The holistic nature of this call integrated the social and evangelistic gospel and stressed that mission is not owned by any part of the church, neither geographic nor philosophical; it is owned by God. However, a debatable distinction between “missions” and “mission” was established, where missions were seen to be the domain of those who are “willing to risk losing themselves in another and alien community.” They regarded missionaries as a “minority, who, as they are fully part of the church, require the help and support of the church and go beyond the maintenance of the life and natural growth of the church.”⁵ In the context where the traditional homes of the Christian faith were not seen as mission fields this

² ACC –1, introduction to *The Time is Now, Limuru 1971*, vii. See *The Lambeth Conference 1968 - Resolutions and Reports* (London: SPCK, 1968), 148.

³ IDC Publishers, “Programme to Combat Racism, 1939-1996,” <http://www.idc.nl/faid/448faidb.html>.

⁴ ACC –1, 43. “The obligation to make known to all men in the name of their Saviour, to invite them into a personal commitment to him, and to build them up as active members of his liberating fellowship remains an enduring obligation. But this must necessarily be in the context of full involvement in God’s contemporary work of liberation going beyond the boundaries of the Church, otherwise the work of evangelism becomes a distortion of the gospel. For mission is God’s mission; it concerns the whole of humanity and indeed the whole creation.”

⁵ Ibid., 43-4.

slants the task of “missions” to “unreached” places of non-European cultures. While mission happens everywhere, “missions” were only considered to be happening in Africa, Asia and South America, and it was these “missions” which needed supporting. The focus was on resources, both financial and human, and they called for the projects suggested by the Toronto Congress to be placed within a firm framework. This required a survey of existing resources and needs, and a format for their administration. The aim was to change the colonial attitude of missionaries setting the agenda, to indigenous leadership taking control of their own mission. They proposed companion diocese relationships, and visits including those between “younger churches in developing nations” because they argued that “companionships are not limited to the linkage of unequals.”⁶ This speaking of “unequals” was a denial of the Toronto rhetoric, which saw “all as equal in authority and responsibility.”⁷ There was no suggestion that there would be any advantage in links between dioceses of the older churches, and so companion links were predominantly considered as a way of the strong assisting the weak or the weak helping one another.

The second meeting of the ACC, entitled “Partners in Mission,” was held in Dublin in 1973 and sought to build on the work in Limuru by developing the theme of MRI. The core people who had gathered in Limuru were present again in Dublin, but there was a more realistic air replacing the earlier excitement.⁸ In his introduction to the report the Secretary General, John Howe, wrote: “The word ‘partners’ in the title refers more to Christian aspiration than to Christian accomplishment.”⁹ The delegates thus had a mandate not to describe Christian partnership but to develop a way forward towards that partnership. “The imperfect partnership needs to be advanced towards perfection – in every case for the

⁶ Ibid., 51.

⁷ Stephen F. Bayne, ed., introduction to *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ* (London: SPCK, 1965), vii.

⁸ ACC –2, introduction to *Partners in Mission, Dublin, 1973*, viii.

⁹ Ibid., ix.

mission of Christ.”¹⁰ A new start and a new structure were needed to enable this to come about.¹¹ The response was two-fold: firstly, to encourage the mission societies to change the way they related both to one another and to the churches where they served, and secondly, to move from project lists to joint consultations. ACC –2 sought to build a system where every church had the responsibility to determine its own priorities by replacing independence and dependence with interdependence. The consultation process was supposed to engender mutuality and would “enable churches better to appreciate one another’s needs and opportunities, as well as one another’s responsibilities in relation to the resources entrusted to them.”¹²

The overall aim of the process as described by ACC –2 was to enable the move from “givers who had nothing to receive and receivers who had nothing to give,” to all being “givers and receivers.”¹³ This aim was set out in the introduction,¹⁴ the statement of purpose,¹⁵ and in clause (b) of the supporting resolution.¹⁶ The consultations were intended to replace the “shopping list” mentality engendered by the directory of projects, to engender mutuality, and to “enable churches better to appreciate one another’s needs and opportunities, as well as one another’s responsibilities in relation to the resources entrusted to them.”¹⁷ To this end each Church was to “work towards financial independence in its own structures, but at the same time should be interdependent in the sharing of its spiritual and

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 53 – 9.

¹² Ibid., 55.

¹³ Ibid., 53. “If we once acted as though there were only givers who had nothing to receive and receivers who had nothing to give, the oneness of the missionary task must make us all now givers and receivers.”

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 55. “The proposed process of joint consultation is based upon the conviction that both giving and receiving must extend throughout the whole family of Anglican churches, and that every church will receive others as its partners in mission with variety of resources which they have to offer.”

¹⁶ Ibid., 59. Resolution 27 – New implementation of MRI: section (b) “affirms that this implementation will help to break the old pattern of some churches as giving and others as receiving churches, and that it will provide a means by which all churches will draw on others for spiritual help and insight, and not merely respond to those who have financial and personal needs;”

¹⁷ Ibid., 55.

material resources in the fulfilment of God’s mission.”¹⁸ They saw that the aim was “a relation of partnership through mutual consultation, a people-to-people approach as between members of a family of Churches, with a flexibility which corresponds to the varied nature of the member Churches of the Anglican Communion,” which represented a move from a clearinghouse of projects to a development of relationships.¹⁹

The clarity of these aims gives us a baseline for evaluation of the process. We can ask how successful the process was in achieving the aims set out for it. Four questions can be asked in order to assess the success or failure of the PiM consultation process:

- Did the PiM consultation process encourage the churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to become financially independent?
- Did it encourage the churches that were regarded as *giving* churches to receive?
- Did it encourage churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to give?
- Did it bring about a flexibility of approach that enabled a development of relationships?

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the PiM consultation process facilitated much that was good. People speak informally of projects that were supported and relationships that were developed and which continue to bear fruit. However, these are not the subjects of this study. The aim of the following sections is to examine the evidence to discover if the aims of the process were met. In order to do this the following section will set out a historical framework. The next three sections study the process in three ways. Section 3.3 is a study of the contemporary evaluation of the PiM consultation process. Section 3.4 takes a fresh look at the primary sources – the records of the consultations themselves and analyses the statistics of involvement. Section 3.5 considers three case studies. Section 3.6, reviews the

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

PiM consultation process, and answers the four questions posed above. Section 3.7 is a consideration of “Ten Principles of Partnership” gathered from the experience of the process.

3.2. The PiM Consultations 1973-1997

The aim of this section is to set out the historical framework of the PiM consultation process. In all there were 64 consultations between 1973 and 1995 with a final consultation in 1997.²⁰ There was a set format for the consultations and most of the reports follow a common structure. The original guidelines, as outlined in the report of ACC –2, set the centre of focus on provinces or national churches.²¹ Information was gathered from dioceses and brought to a national or provincial plan that was shared with external partners. However, later in the guidelines the external partners were asked to assist as consultants in the planning process.²² The responsibility for the running of the consultations fell on the staff of the Communion Office who redefined the structure of the consultations. The province was asked consult all its dioceses in order to write a presentation of its mission for the external partners. A seven-point plan was given to the province that included questions on the present income of the diocese, its present expenditure, how they expected to extend their present work, what new work they were proposing, and what money they needed to in order to enable that work.²³ No reference at any point in the plan was made to spiritual or human resources. By 1982 the guidelines had significantly changed. The focus was less on finance and more on the health of the diocese in mission and ministry. However, dioceses were still given the opportunity to make requests for financial and human resources.²⁴ The reports of the consultations reduced each diocesan presentation into a paragraph, summarised them and

²⁰ The number is taken from the number of reports in the Archive Boxes in the ACO. There is discrepancy in some of the records. The 1974 consultation in Japan was followed immediately by another in 1975, but they were in reality all part of the one process linked to the ending of funding from ECUSA. I have decided to treat as one consultation. It is recorded as two separate consultations in one of the reviews, this is a matter of opinion with no correct answer.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 56. “The basic unit for planning is referred to as a ‘church’, which will usually be a national church, province, or regional council; but where the situation demands, the basic unit might be smaller or larger.”

²² *Ibid.*, 57.

²³ “Presentations for Partners in Mission Consultations,” (1975), ACO archive, document 1498.

²⁴ “Guidelines for a Consultation” (1982), ACO archive, document 2399.

identified the strengths and weaknesses of the province. Issues were identified with the assistance of the external partners and programmes were presented. These often included requests for money, especially for vehicles and buildings.

The initial call was for a rolling programme of a consultation in every province every three years, and for all provinces to have had a first consultation by 1976. Many provinces were eager to get started, but the only consultation in the Church of England took place in 1981, and in the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1982, giving the impression that this was a process for *receiving* rather than *giving* churches. The schedule was not maintained.

The process was under continual review and it encountered problems in delivering its objectives. Reviews went on within the meetings of ACC –3,²⁵ and ACC –4,²⁶ which asked the Secretary General to establish a procedure for a review of the failings of the PiM consultations. He responded by appointing an *ad hoc* group that reported to ACC –5 and recommended the formation of the Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group (MISAG).²⁷ MISAG producing a report entitled *Giving Mission Its Proper Place*,²⁸ which was presented to ACC –6 in 1984.²⁹ ACC –6 picked up the recommendations of the group and re-commissioned them as MISAG II, as well as supporting a meeting of all the mission agencies and mission boards, which took place in 1986.³⁰ ACC –7 left the supervision of the PiM consultation process to MISAG II.³¹ The Secretary General of the ACC asked Geoffrey Cates to prepare a review of the PiM consultations for ACC –8, but this was not presented and has remained in the archives of the ACO.³² MISAG II published its conclusions in

²⁵ ACC –3 *Trinidad, Report of the Third Meeting 1976*, 55-8. The consideration of the PiM Consultations comes within the section on Mission and Evangelism that begins with a commitment to “Cross Cultural Evangelism.”

²⁶ ACC –4 *Report of the Fourth Meeting, Huron College, London, Ontario, 1979*, 25-7.

²⁷ ACC –5 *Report of the Fifth Meeting, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1981*, 30-4.

²⁸ *Giving Mission Its Proper Place* MISAG I (London: ACO, 1984).

²⁹ ACC –6 *Bonds of Affection, Proceedings of ACC –6, Badagry, Nigeria, 1984*.

³⁰ *Progress in Partnership, Report of the Mission Agencies Conference 8-13 December 1986, Brisbane, Australia* (London: ACC, 1986).

³¹ ACC –7 *Many Gifts One Spirit, Report of ACC –7: Singapore 1987* (London: CHP, 1987).

³² Geoffrey Cates, “Not by a Committee” – *A Report on Partners in Mission Consultations 1974 – 1989*, ACO Archive, document 1989.

1993.³³ The report contained the “Ten Principles of Partnership,”³⁴ which remains significant as is among the supporting documentation for *The Windsor Report*.³⁵ It is also referred to in the Ridley Cambridge Draft of the Covenant.³⁶

Throughout its lifetime the PiM consultation process was considered vital for the implementation of MRI,³⁷ but repeated failures were picked up in each review. MISAG II proposed that the PiM process needed to be reaffirmed, but that practical lessons needed to be learned. Following a survey,³⁸ they said that the process had “begun” to break down division between givers and receivers by a “gradually increasing sense” within the givers that they needed to receive. This was matched by “a rapidly developing” self-confidence on the part of those who once saw themselves as receivers that they knew they had gifts to offer “if they are asked.”³⁹ The implication of this was that the “Northern” Churches rarely asked for help as they had only just begun to see their need. The conclusion of MISAG II was that progress had been made towards the aims set out by ACC –2, but this was very small and very slow.

MISAG was replaced by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Mission and Evangelism (IASCOME). Their 2006 report recorded that there was a need to move on from

³³ *Towards Dynamic Mission – Renewing the Church for Mission*, MISAG II (London: ACO, 1993).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 28-31.

³⁵ *The Windsor Report*, The Lambeth Commission on Communion (London: ACO, 2004), 92-5. The “Ten Principles” are quoted in full.

³⁶ “An Anglican Covenant – The Third (Ridley Cambridge) Draft” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm>. 3.2.2.

³⁷ Michael Nazir-Ali commended the process in his address to ACC –9. Speaking of PiM consultations he said: “These processes have emphasised this last aspect of partnership in mission, that is to say the partnership between churches, and this has been a very great blessing to the Anglican Communion and if this is the only thing the Anglican Consultative Council will ever achieve, it is enough!” From “Communion and Commission” in ACC – 9 *A Transforming Vision – Suffering and Glory in God’s World, Cape Town 1993*, eds. L. McGeary and J. Rosenthal (London: CHP, 1993), 83.

³⁸ The survey was of those who had participated in consultations and resulted in seven points being made. The report says: “Significantly these lessons are largely related to the actual consultation” implying that the consultations had become the partnership. The results themselves are hard to assess, as we do not have access to the results of the survey. Each of the seven comments are given equal weight in the text and it is impossible to know if one point is a summary of something in common from many respondents or if it was a single comment articulately put or if, perhaps, it was a point the writers of the report found indicative of to their own opinion. It is unknown if comments were offered, but were not included. Five of the eight points were positive but the final summation is negative. The majority of the comments being positive would point to a success, especially as one of the negative points was merely about procedures, but there was obviously a feeling that the PiM consultations had reached an end of their useful life. MISAG II, 25-6.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

the “partnership paradigm” of the previous fifty years, and proposed three images to replace partnership: *Companion*, *Brother-Sister* and *Friend*.⁴⁰ Their report did not offer any analysis of why the PiM consultation process had failed and they did not offer a new model to replace it. IASCOME only offered a cosmetic change.

3.3. Review of the PiM Consultations from Contemporary Evaluations

The aim of this section is to follow the success and failure of the PiM consultation process through a critical study of the contemporary evaluations of the process. The prime aim of the PiM consultations was to end the dependency culture and engage provinces as equals. This meant that financial imbalance was always the most pressing issue to contend with, as well as the most complex. The Toronto Congress had recognised that all had resources to share, and ACC –2, in forming the PiM consultation process, began the task of valuing those diverse resources. The report said: “Each church should work towards financial independence in its own structures, but at the same time should be interdependent in the sharing of its spiritual and material resources in the fulfilment of God’s mission.”⁴¹ This emphasised the variety of those resources and the need for both traditional donors and receivers to discover how they were to receive from each other. The placing of the spiritual prior to material was an attempt to give a true order of value, but the spiritual resources were impossible to define.

The MRI process had already strengthened the self-governing requirement by asserting that the local church had the responsibility to set the agenda for its mission, but ACC –2 went still further, asserting that a self-governing church needed to be self-supporting in its “structures.” This was a return to the first of the “Three-selves” policy of

⁴⁰ *Communion in Mission - Report of the Inter Anglican Standing Commission on Mission and Evangelism* (ACO: London, 2006), 44.

⁴¹ ACC –2, 55.

Henry Venn,⁴² which had been quietly dropped off the agenda in the colonialist era.⁴³ The transfer of money was encouraged for the specific task of mission and only in the context of the sharing of other resources, which made a theological distinction between “structures” and “God’s mission.” While this was intended to relieve the sense of dependency from the poorer churches, the distinction was not simple; it was very hard for a young church to define what was mission and what was structure in the context of newly forming dioceses. The three-selfs model presumes a move from mission to ministry as the focus of a church, but this is a false dichotomy and the Anglican Communion was beginning to move to a model that embraced both.⁴⁴

The initial guidelines for presentations focussed predominantly on money. Dioceses were asked to present their income and expenditure in detail and provide a budget for

⁴² “Venn worked inductively at finding the principles of mission. He observed weaknesses in a missionary-founded, missionary-led church. What, he asked, gave a church integrity? A church had to feel self-worth. Over a period of fifteen years he identified three aspects of that self-worth. A church must be led by persons drawn from its own membership. So long as a group of people must look to an outsider to furnish leadership, they will feel less than fully responsible. Similarly, if they do not bear the burden of supporting the life of the church financially, their membership will lack integrity. The final test of the integrity of the life of a church is the readiness to evangelize and extend itself. When a church has been founded through the work of an outsider, it is easy for it to become dependent on the missionary to continue this function. This is perhaps the most difficult aspect of self-responsibility to acquire. These three ingredients of a church's integrity were finally stated as self-support, self-government, and self-propagation.” Walter Shenk, “Venn, Henry, 1796 to 1873,” *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 1, issue 2, (1977): 16-19.

⁴³ David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (New York: Orbis, 1991), 307.

⁴⁴ ACC –3 understood that the Communion was working with two differing models, one mission orientated, the other maintenance orientated, and saw the tensions which would come about from a move towards an emphasis on evangelism: “We can expect the Holy Spirit to press us to listen to each other, to state new insights frankly, and to accept implications of the Gospel new to us, whether painful or exhilarating.” (ACC –3, 55). These were developed by MISAG I which argued that: “These factors also make it plain that all churches are in a ‘missionary’ situation. In our age, there is no church that exists in a ‘Christian society’ needing only ‘renewal’ and ‘nurture’.” (MISAG I, 9) The group reached the conclusion that the idea of giving and receiving churches has to be renewed as well. “In our time God is calling the Church to stop thinking of ‘mission’ as something that people from wealthy, more advanced, ‘Christian’ societies do for those who are less fortunate and less enlightened.” All churches are sent to make the good news known in their context and among their people. The church in all places is said to have a responsibility for nurture and for the proclamation and demonstration of the truth. (Ibid., 9-10) The report of ACC-6, which met in Badagry, Nigeria in 1984, marked a significant move in the theology of mission within the Anglican Communion. The report of MISAG I was accepted and the recommendations approved, but the focus was on mission theology as the Council took up the call to take mission seriously and to move churches of the Communion from a pastoral model to a mission model. The Council developed a sophisticated biblical basis for mission based on the foundational belief that “God is a calling and sending God,” developed from an analysis of the mission of the Son and synthesised into a four point program for the mission of the church. The Council declared that the mission of the church was: To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom; To teach, baptise and nurture the new believers; To respond to human needs by a loving service; To seek to transform unjust structures of society. (ACC –6, 31) To these four marks of mission was added a fifth mark: “To Strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.” (ACC –8 *Mission in a Broken World – Report of ACC-8 Wales 1990*, ed. R. Coleman, (London: CHP, 1990), 101.

proposed future ministry, with the hope that an external partner might support that work.

ACC –3 met just after the first round of consultations had been completed and they already noted that money was a problem with no simple solution. On the one hand the delegates of ACC –3 complained of a swing away “from the importance of finance” towards such things as “motivation;” on the other hand they complained that “too often partnership has been seen as a sharing of financial resources rather than of spiritual insights.”⁴⁵

By the 1979 meeting of the ACC the flaws in the PiM consultations were becoming clearer and the Council asked the Secretary General to develop a procedure to study and review “the tasks before us as a Communion.”⁴⁶ Financial disparity was identified among the problems and they asked for a widening of the perception of *resources* from money and people to include ideas, experience, cultural perspectives and spiritual maturity.⁴⁷ The report noted that the members were “constantly reminded of the disparity of material resources available amongst members of our Communion.”⁴⁸ In response to the resolution of ACC –4 the Secretary General of the ACC convened a Mission Preparatory Committee with representatives from around the world and from the mission agencies.⁴⁹ This group floated a suggestion that funding issues be separated from strategy, with the consultations concentrating solely on the latter. However, they recognised “that the two could never be entirely separated.”⁵⁰ The committee regarded funds as a resource common to the Communion, and argued that concerns about funding should not influence missionary strategy.⁵¹ This attempt to remove the ownership of money from any party was an attempt to

⁴⁵ ACC –3, 56.

⁴⁶ ACC –4, 27.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 26.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ There had previously been preparatory committees, but they had not been officially named and appointed and their work had not been identified in the text of the ACC reports. The committee reported back to ACC –5. They saw their role as preparatory not only for ACC –5 but also in the sense that they were setting out the areas for a new group to study in greater depth.

⁵⁰ ACC –5, 33.

⁵¹ Ibid., 34.

sideline the problem rather than face it. The main concern was that partnership had become the goal and that mission had been ignored, and so they proposed the formation of MISAG I.

On the surface the membership of MISAG I was a broad base of consultants with a wide range of experience. However, when analysed more closely it can be seen that its make up would inevitably reinforce the very donor/receiver model that the Communion had been hoping to break. The two ACC Standing Committee members assigned to the group were from East Asia and Uganda. The three members who were on the group to reflect the experience of PiM consultations were from Nigeria, West Indies and Tanzania. All five were from churches traditionally associated with receiving. The representatives from Australia, Canada, England and the United States of America were all either representatives of mission agencies or mission boards. They were all representatives of the *giving* expressions of their respective churches. The *giving* churches only sent their givers, not those who might receive, and the *receiving* churches sent only receivers, not potential givers. From the beginning of the group the dualism of giver/receiver was institutionalised.⁵² When they came to consider the realities of the PiM consultations they immediately placed the emphasis on the sharing of resources. These were listed as “spiritual, intellectual, gifts of wisdom and skill, experience, vitality, institutional and educational amenities, human energy or material wealth.”⁵³ The deliberate placing of wealth at the end ordered the intended priorities, with wealth as the least to be valued, but the group recognised that this brought its own problems. Simon Barrington-Ward is quoted as saying that partnership often descended into powerful donors looking for proposals to back. In this context he argued that the only way of understanding equal sharing was by the romanticisation of the voices of the poorer partners as “oracles” from the South in order to offer parity.⁵⁴

⁵² MISAG I, 5.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* Quotation not referenced. For an analysis of this approach see Miranda K. Hassett, *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 175-6.

They found the solution in the “discipline of mutual accountability between partners,”⁵⁵ or transparency and accountability: openness between the churches “about what each has, gives and receives.”⁵⁶ The group identified the difficulty which arose by seeing the consultations themselves as the point of partnership, rather than allowing them to be points within a continuous partnership process. The distinction between event and process should allow, they argued, the formulation of a mission strategy that enables the allocation of resources for carrying that out; “thus funding concerns can find their proper place.”⁵⁷ While a variety and diversity of resources were valued initially, their conclusions only considered funding: “The continuing partnership process should then provide a structure to negotiate the funding needed to achieve the goals agreed upon.”⁵⁸ MISAG I rejected as unrealistic a suggestion of the Advisory committee to ACC –5 that funding should be separated from mission strategy. They argued that all resources are part of a church’s life and an essential element of mission, but offered no way out of the shopping list mentality.⁵⁹

The recommended objectives for the PiM process reflected this theology. They recommended: “The establishing of a new pattern of relationships between provinces in their strengths and weaknesses, so that resources can be shared and used more creatively in the mission of the Church,” and “encouraging an openness on the part of all so that full disclosure of information and the possession of resources can be made to one another in Christian fellowship.”⁶⁰ Grammatically this final point makes little sense and ultimately re-emphasises the donor/receiver relationship. If the objective is understood as “Encouraging an openness on the part of all, by the method of full disclosure in order that resources might be openly evaluated and need accessed so that, in Christian fellowship, resources can be transferred to be deployed where they are most needed” – which I would take as the best

⁵⁵ MISAG I, 17.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 31.

reading – then issues remain; the most serious being the focus returning to money and one way “sharing.” On the next page it is stressed once again that resources are not only financial, but also “the sharing of people and ideas,”⁶¹ but these are more subjective and abstract and impossible to account for them in open disclosure. Human resources are extremely valuable, but they are not possessions in the same way that money in a bank account is measurable. The disclosure of information within the PiM process could only show how little material wealth some churches had and how rich others were. We know by experience what they meant was for the poorer churches to commit to accounting with honesty their needs for mission, and richer churches facing up to the imbalance of resources, but this itself was a contradiction of the effort to escape from the donor/receiver mentality.

MISAG I placed the blame for ongoing dependency cultures on bilateral relationships, and criticisms were specifically aimed at the mission agencies. Warnings were issued that mission agencies and should not break provincial unity. The agencies were then called to account for themselves at a future meeting, which they would have to pay for.⁶² ACC –2 had placed the blame for the failure of the directory of projects on the continuing influence of the mission agencies, both the voluntary societies based primarily in England and CMS Australia and the mission boards of ECUSA and the Church of Canada.⁶³ ACC –4 had also identified the bilateral programmes of the mission agencies as a block on the development of genuine inter-provincial relationships.⁶⁴ The mission agencies took these criticisms seriously and convened a meeting in Brisbane, Australia in 1986. There were 50 delegates from a broad cross-section of the Communion, with full representation from Anglican mission agencies, international ecumenical agencies, and representatives from the “partner churches.” As with every report since 1963, the conference called for the full

⁶¹ Ibid., 32.

⁶² Ibid., 21.

⁶³ ACC –2, 54.

⁶⁴ ACC –4, 25.

disclose of all resources held by all the churches of the Communion.⁶⁵ It should have been clear after 23 years that there was no interest in such a task being undertaken, no team of accountants to do it, and that, more fundamentally, this would inevitably fall on monetary and property assets as other resources would be too hard to quantify. Humphrey Taylor of USPG and Simon Chiwanga from the Church of the Province of Tanzania presented two significant papers on partnership.⁶⁶ Chiwanga was identified as a “partner” and this choice of language indicates a change from “donors and receivers” to “donors and partners,” but not to “partners and partners.”

The failure of the PiM consultations was becoming apparent, but the momentum was to keep them going. In order to inform the meeting of ACC –8 Canon Samuel Van Culin, the Secretary General of the ACC, asked Geoffrey Cates to prepare a paper reviewing the 61 consultations that had taken place between 1974 and 1989, which he did under the title of “Not by a Committee.”⁶⁷ The report was not presented as intended at ACC –8. The official reason given was that was that the group considering mission, culture and human development “found themselves increasingly drawn into a consideration of the threats presented by the current global ecological crisis.”⁶⁸

“Not by a Committee” was a personal reflection on the process that Cates considered to be ongoing, but in reality it was fast running out of steam. Only six more consultations took place after 1989. He opened his report with what he described as a “pre-pendix” where he set out some statistics on the consultations. Cates felt it was important to group the “churches” by the number of consultations they had had, and the consultations held in any

⁶⁵ *Progress in Partnership*, 13.

⁶⁶ “The PiM Process: An Agency View,” in *Progress in Partnership*, 76-87, “The PiM Process: A Partner’s View,” in *ibid.*, 88-96.

⁶⁷ Geoffrey. C. Cates, “‘Not by a Committee’ – A Report on Partners in Mission Consultations 1974-1989,” (ACO Archive, 1989).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 13. While this is no doubt true it was not the whole story. The ordination of women and the consecration of women bishops had placed strains on the “bonds of affection” within the Communion that had lead to a reopening of Bayne’s original questions on the nature of the Communion itself: the question of Anglican identity.

year. In the second “pre-pendix” he set out a chart of 33 of the consultations by province and year of consultation in the left hand column, against the partners invited. In “Pre-pendix III” he narrowed down his focus to 28 consultations and counted the distribution of representatives of external partners and host province or churches between archbishops and bishops, clergy, lay men, and lay women. The statistical approach to the review of the PiM consultations could have been very important, but there are significant flaws in Cates’ methodology.⁶⁹ Significantly, he pointed out that the cost of a consultation meant that the richest three churches – England, USA and Canada – were frequently invited to provide external partners in order to pay for the process itself.⁷⁰ This set up a new layer of donor/receiver mentality within the system. The Mission Agencies still dominated. Their finance was required and they were seen as skewing the conversations. Cates argued that the old mentalities had not been broken.⁷¹ Those who were chosen as external partners were often close to the inviting Church in some way and unable to look from the outside. It is clear to him that such patterns are not able to build *koinonia*, merely to look at the relationship between projects and mission strategy. This is not a bad thing, indeed it is a very good thing, but it was not the aim of the process.

In answer to the initial aims of ACC –2 for the PiM consultation process, and set out in section 3.1 of this chapter, the evaluation of reviews indicate that the PiM consultation process did not encourage the churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to become financially independent. It did not encourage the churches that were regarded as *giving* churches to receive, or the churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to give. There

⁶⁹ He does not explain why he chooses to only pick out 33 of the consultations to chart and then to reduce that to 28 for the representatives. He recognises the statistical inaccuracy of the final figures and on the basis that the records did not talk of numbers involved and that the external partners included both those from partner churches and mission agencies. He fails to point out that, whereas in the Churches of the British Isles, Australia and New Zealand the mission agencies were voluntary societies - independent of their churches - in North America the representatives of the agencies are the representatives of their churches, part of the provincial teams.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

is little evidence that it brought about a flexibility of approach that enabled a development of relationships. The internal reviews of the PiM consultation process show that it did not encourage the churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to become financially independent and maintained the dependency culture that it was intended to break down. To understand more fully the failure of the PiM consultation process a more thorough review is required, first of the statistics and then some case studies.

3.4. Review of the PiM Consultations from Archive Records

The internal reviews of process indicate that the process failed to deliver the four aims set out for it by ACC –2. So far only secondary material (the reviews of the process) has been studied. This section is a review of primary material, the records of the PiM consultations themselves. The aim is to find evidence either of the desired change from the donor/receiver mentality, or of the consolidation of such relationships.

3.4.1. Charting the PiM Process

In order to understand the dynamics of the PiM consultation process both the review by Cates and the anonymous review of 1994 used statistical data. Cates set out an “Analysis of external Partners at Consultations” in chart form.⁷² The form is useful and so is replicated in the following pages. He limited his analysis to 33 PiM consultations. In contrast the records of all consultations were used in the drawing up of the following chart. Comparable statistics to those used in the 1994 review will be drawn from an analysis of the chart.

Some simplification is inevitable due to the effect of significant growth in the Communion over the period 1973 to 1997, from 23 provinces to 32. For example, the Province of Uganda hosted 2 consultations and the Province of Burundi, Rwanda, and Boga-Zaire hosted 3. However, the total of consultations held was 4, not 5. In 1974, the year of the first consultation, Burundi, Rwanda and Boga-Zaire were part of the Province of Uganda.

⁷² Cates, “Not by a Committee,” Pre-pendix II.

3.4.2. Reviewing the Statistics

The statistics used in this section are sourced from the above chart. This chart and the statistics sourced from it are improved versions of those in the official reviews. However, the biggest difference between this review and the official reviews is the questions asked of the statistics. The official reviews asked about participation; this review uses the information to show the failure of the PiM consultation process to achieve its declared aims. The official reviews speak of *formerly* giving and *formerly* receiving churches. It is the argument of this thesis that some churches began as and remained *giving*, while others began as and remained *receiving*. The aim of the PiM consultation process was to change that. This means it is legitimate to identify 8 giving churches and the rest as receiving churches, at least as a starting point, and to find evidence of any change in status.

The most significant giving churches were those in the USA, England and Canada. In addition New Zealand, Australia, Scotland, Ireland and Wales were seen as giving churches. All the rest were receiving churches in some form, whether by direct grant from mission boards,¹ or through Missionary Agencies such as CMS, USPG, CMS Australia, and others. The giving churches were always 8 in number, but the number of receiving churches changed through the years as old provinces were divided.

The chart shows that the major giving churches participated in all of the consultations. In all but 3 consultations, other than its own, the USA was an external partner. The consultations where the USA was absent were Canada in 1974, New Zealand in 1976, and Ireland in 1977; all giving churches. The Church of England was only missing from 5 consultations, all of which were hosted by giving churches. The Canadian church was absent only from 4 consultations, 2 of which were with giving churches. Thus only 2 consultations took place in receiving churches without all three of the highest giving churches present. Of these 2 consultations, Australia was an external partner in the Indian Ocean consultation of

¹ For example, the Church of Japan which received grants from the Episcopal Church of the USA.

1982, and New Zealand in the 1983 consultation in the Philippines. Therefore, there were never less than 3 of the 8 giving churches at every consultation in a receiving church.

The receiving churches received fewer invitations to participate as external partners. While it is simple to count the number of giving churches (their numbers remained constant at 8), the number of receiving churches varied through the process, beginning with 17 and ending with 23. For our purposes, it is convenient to take an average of 20. Over the 61 consultations held,² 360 external partners were invited. This is an average of 5.9 external partners per consultation. Of these 213 were from the giving churches; an average of 3.5 per consultation, and 146 from receiving churches; 2.4 per consultation.

The 8 giving churches hosted 12 consultations; an average of 1.5 per province. However, Canada's 3 consultations distort this statistic. While the USA and Ireland had 2 each, England, Scotland, New Zealand, Wales and Australia only had 1 each. It may be concluded that the 5 churches that only had one PiM consultation did not regard the process with enthusiasm. This conclusion is supported by the late starting dates for some of these provinces, with England and Scotland not participating until 1981 and 1982 respectively.

The receiving churches carried out 49 consultations; an average of 2.5 per province.³ They were generally quicker to organise their first process, and continued after seven of the eight giving churches finished. Only one giving church (USA) had a consultation after 1986: a period in which 11 consultations were carried out. The evidence is that receiving provinces were enthusiastic about the consultations.

Of the 12 consultations in giving churches, 94 external partners were invited – an average of 7.8 per consultation. Of these 32 came from giving churches – 2.7 per consultation; and 62 from receiving churches – 5.2 per consultation. However, these figures

² Excluding the extra-provincial churches of Cuba and the Iberian Peninsula.

³ For 23 provinces 2.1, for 17 provinces 2.9. Margin of error +/- 0.4.

are distorted by the first consultation in the USA in 1977.⁴ At this event 21 external partners (6 giving and 15 receiving) were invited. This is three times the average and thus unreasonably distorts the figures. Omitting this one consultation, the figures are 11 consultations with 73 external partners; an average of 6.6 per consultation, with 26 external partners from giving churches; 2.4 per consultation, and 62 external partners from receiving churches; 4.3 per consultation. On the face of it this seems a healthy balance. A typical consultation would involve inviting 6 or 7 partners, 2 or 3 of who would be from giving churches and 4 or 5 from receiving partners.

The receiving churches had 49 consultations with 266 external partners, an average of 5.4 per consultation. Of these external partners 181 were from giving churches; 3.7 per consultation, and 84 were from receiving churches; 1.7 per consultation. Of the 84 from receiving churches, 48 (1 per consultation) were from neighbouring provinces and only 36 (0.7 per consultation) were from other non-neighbouring receiving provinces. Giving churches were far more likely to be invited as external partners in consultations hosted by receiving churches. 5 or 6 external partners would be invited to a typical consultation in a receiving church, of which 3 or 4 would be from giving churches and 1 or 2 from receiving churches, usually near neighbours.

However, the situation was not as balanced as it appears. These figures do not take into account that the receiving churches outnumbered the giving churches by a ratio of 5:2. If this ratio is factored in, the true situation was that an average consultation involved 3.5 of the 8 giving provinces as external partners: a representation of 46.25 per cent of their number at an average consultation. The 20 receiving churches were represented by an average of 2.4 per consultation, which means that at an average consultation they were represented by only 12 per cent of their number.

⁴ *Partners in Mission – the Louisville Consultation – 1977 – One Mission – Many Missioners* Kennedy, J.W. ed. (Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1977).

Even though the representation of receiving churches at the consultations of giving churches looked healthy, even here it was skewed in favour of the 8 giving provinces. The pool of other giving churches was only 7, from which on average 2.4 were invited to consultations held in giving churches.⁵ The average giving church representation at a giving church consultation was 34.3 percent, while on average only 21.5 per cent of the receiving churches were represented.

The statistics for consultations in receiving churches show a greater imbalance. At an average receiving church consultation 46.3 per cent of the 8 giving churches were represented, against only 8.9 per cent of the other receiving churches. Of this 8.9 per cent, 5.3 percent were neighbours. That means that at an average PiM consultation in a receiving church only 3.6 per cent of other receiving provinces, which were not neighbouring the host, were represented. In simple terms, if a consultation went on in a receiving church there was a 100 percent likelihood of 2 of the 3 big donor churches being external partners, with a 96 per cent likelihood that all three would be present. If only 2 were invited then one of the 5 other giving churches would be invited. This meant 3 giving churches were represented at all receiving church consultations. If all of the big 3 were invited, one of the other 5 would receive an invitation 44 per cent of the time. Five giving churches were invited 30 per cent of the time, and 6 invited 6.1 per cent of the time.

If a receiving church invited participation from another receiving church it was most likely they would invite a neighbour. However, only in 55 per cent of the consultations did a church invite a neighbouring receiving church to participate as an external partner. In 24.5 per cent a second neighbour participated. In 14.3 per cent a third, and only in 4 per cent was a fourth neighbouring province part of the consultation. The participation of non-neighbouring receiving provinces as external partners was negligible. In only 46 percent of the consultations in a receiving province was another receiving province invited when it was

⁵ Excluding the distorting 1977 USA consultation.

not a neighbour. England and the USA attended 49 consultations in receiving churches; Canada attended 47; and the others averaged 7.2 each. In contrast, on average, a receiving church attended 4.2 PiM consultations, and over half of those these were with a neighbouring church. The result was that England, the USA and Canada had more than 10 times the input and influence in shaping the mission priorities of the receiving churches than other external partners.

The statistics show that the leading giving churches were heard loud and clear in every consultation; the other giving churches at many, and the receiving churches hardly at all. It is not surprising that MISAG II concluded that the partners in the North had not heard challenges and lessons from partners in the South.⁶ It is equally unsurprising that there was a desire for South to South dialogue, as the PiM consultations had not provided for such conversations.

The statistics generated through a study of the PiM consultation reports confirms the conclusions reached by the study of the contemporary reviews of the process. The overall result of the process appears to have consolidated the giver/receiver relationships within the Communion. Giving churches were singled out for invitation to the receiving churches consultations indicating that there was little encouragement for financial independence. The reluctance of giving churches to hold consultations indicates that they were unsure what they had to receive from such a process. However, the statistics alone do not give an account of the relationships that further shaped the consultations. More information is needed and three case studies offer further insights.

3.5. Review of the PiM Consultations from Three Case Studies

The evidence of the review of evaluations and the statistics indicate that the process failed to deliver the hoped for change in relationships from giver/receiver to partners. This conclusion is supported by three case studies focusing on consultations held in one *receiving*

⁶ MISAG II, 26.

and two *giving* churches. The consultations in West Africa are typical of consultations in churches considered to be *receiving* churches. The West African consultations are highlighted as they are well recorded, span the range of dates, and demonstrate the development of the process. The USA and England were involved in almost every consultation and effectively define the *giving* churches. They represent the richest and oldest churches in the Anglican Communion.

3.5.1. West Africa

The first PiM consultation in West Africa took place in 1975.⁷ Except for the host Archbishop, The Most Revd. M. Scott, the significant figures in the consultation, including the Archbishop of the West Indies, The Most Revd. Alan Knight, were all white.⁸ The record of the consultation sets out the context of the Province, and notes: “Africanisation is only just beginning.”⁹ One would presume that encounter with other African provinces would have assisted in that task. The mission aims were identified as training for mission, evangelism and church growth, and forms and goals of partnership. The external partners were asked to appoint a coordinator, and the initial needs they were asked to respond to were purely financial, specifically to fund pension schemes and retirement benefits.¹⁰ The final six pages of the report contained the financial plan for the mission objectives. The report does look to the hope that the Province of West Africa be invited to share in the consultations of the external partners and to offer its gifts, but the thrust of the exercise is to identify projects for financial support.

In his opening address to the second PiM consultation in 1980, Archbishop Scott asked the external partners to “see through our eyes, feel with us so that they can scratch

⁷ “An Account of the Partners in Mission Consultation of the Province of West Africa” (1975) ACO PiM consultations Archive.

⁸ The Province of the West Indies had a mission in West Africa, and while it is included as a “receiving” church in the statistics above, it was invited as a giving church and so no external receiving church was represented.

⁹ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰ Ibid., 4.

where we are itching.”¹¹ The projects requiring support were moved into the text of the report, and whereas the financial plan in the first report was in Nigerian Naira, in the second consultation it was in US Dollars. There still was no pension scheme for church workers and it seems clear that the Province was hoping that would be paid for by the partners.¹² The external partners were the same as at the first consultation, although the first West Indian-born Archbishop had succeeded Archbishop Knight.

The Province of the West Indies was not represented at the 1983 PiM consultation in West Africa, and was replaced by Nigeria, which had been part of the Province at the time of the first consultation.¹³ The report is fuller than the previous two and contains a thorough review of mission strategy that included realistic statements of the need to be self-financing. This was centred upon the appointment of a Planning and Research Officer. Markedly, the only response from the external partners recorded is an agreement to fund 90 per cent of this post, with the proviso that it be a West African lay person. However, the Appendix of the report contains five pages of requests from the dioceses for financial support, mainly for vehicles. One such request is from Kumasi Diocese and is for 6 vehicles at a cost of \$54,000.¹⁴

The record of the fourth PiM consultation in 1987 says that there were no direct requests for money.¹⁵ The external partners were the same ones who had attended the previous consultation. They commented that “the Project lists have rightly been set aside at this time,” and the report carries much more general reviews of strategy than the previous one. However, they indicated that such lists existed and the discussion of them had taken

¹¹ “An Account of the Second Partners in Mission Consultation of the Province of West Africa” (1980), ACO Archive. Quoted with approval by Cates, *Not by a Committee*, Foreword.

¹² *Ibid.*, 7.

¹³ “An Account of the Third Partners in Mission Consultation of the Province of West Africa” (1983), ACO Archive.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹⁵ “An Account of the Fourth Partners in Mission Consultation of the Province of West Africa” (1987), ACO Archive, 13.

much of the time, the difference was that they were not officially recorded.¹⁶ The motivation for setting aside the lists came from the external partners, not West Africa. The involvement of the external partners is hard to see, but they came up with a four-point plan to strengthen the Province by caring for its human resources, deepening the spiritual life of the members, maintaining its material resources (servicing vehicles and repairing buildings), and developing a policy for sharing across the dioceses. It was hoped that lay and clergy training, and “encouraging wholistic development activities that led to church growth and self-sufficiency,” could develop human and material resources.¹⁷ The need to become self-supporting is made in the text, but is followed by this statement: “In order to achieve this there is need for long-term partnership in the sharing of resources and technical assistance; short term partnership is sometimes insufficient.”¹⁸ This seems to be saying that in order for the Province to become self sufficient it needs long term funding and technical support. This is a reasonable approach, but shows that the partnership project had failed up to that point in its attempt to move the agenda on from giving and receiving churches. This is supported by the suggestion that external partners assist in the maintenance of clergy and lay workers.¹⁹ The external partners did produce observations on the state of the church from an external perspective. These addressed the marginalisation of lay people, especially women, in decision making in a church that considered far too clericalised.²⁰

The ACO archives do not contain a report of the final PiM consultation in West Africa, apart from the report made by the English external partners and presented to the General Synod of the Church of England in 1997.²¹ The only external partners present were from England, the USA and Canada. The Church of England report notes, “while women

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., 11.

¹⁸ Ibid., 10.

¹⁹ Ibid., 7-8.

²⁰ Ibid., 14.

²¹ *Partners in Mission (PIM) – Report of the Church of England delegates to the Fifth Partners in Mission consultation of the Church of the Province of West Africa (1997) GS Misc. 510.*

and young people make up the vast majority of members, the consultation was dominated by men – especially bishops, priests and lawyers.”²² This is evidence that the vision of the external partners of 1987 had not been accepted. The English partners reflected: “The main aim of many of the presentations was to elicit financial support from external partners. Proposals outlined amounted to a total of well over \$2 million!”²³

The PiM process in West Africa points to a complete failure to break away from the giver/receiver mentality. The process did not encourage the receiving churches to become financially independent, and it did not allow for cross-cultural reflections to influence the church. The fact that the report of the English partners was produced for the General Synod of the Church of England only highlights that this had never happened before. The giving churches had not been encouraged to receive, and there is no evidence that the churches that were regarded as receiving churches were encouraged to give. Neither did not bring about a flexibility of approach that enabled a development of relationships. The PiM consultation process in West Africa failed to produce the change set out for the consultations at ACC –2.

3.5.2. England

The results of the only PiM consultation in England were published in a photocopied booklet entitled *To a Rebellious House*.²⁴ The report is far-reaching and pertinent in its criticisms. In many ways it was prophetic. It calls for radical changes to clergy training in the Church of England that are echoed in *The Hind Report* of 2003; a report intended to shape all training for mission and ministry in the Church of England.²⁵ Among the proposals in the PiM consultation document replicated in *The Hind Report* are the focus on mission as the purpose of training,²⁶ promoting lifelong learning,²⁷ and an emphasis on lay training and

²² Ibid., 6.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ *To a Rebellious House – Report of the Church of England’s Partners in Mission Consultation 1981 General Synod Of the Church Of England* (London: Church Information Office, 1981).

²⁵ *Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church*. (London: CHP, 2003).

²⁶ See Ibid., 29-30. “God’s Mission, the Church and the Ministry,” sections 3.12-3.15

²⁷ *To a Rebellious House*, 36-46.

organising the training in regions.²⁸ *To a Rebellious House* called for a clear vision for ministry,²⁹ a strong emphasis on the continuing education of the clergy,³⁰ and a call for regional planning in theological education.³¹ It also contained mission-orientated proposals similar to those recently adopted by the Church of England.

The reality is that in 1981 the conclusions of the consultation were not properly considered by the decision-makers of the Church of England. The title of the report, *To a Rebellious House*, encompasses the dilemma. Even as the report was published it was clear it would not be heard. The title refers to Ezekiel 2:

“Son of man, I send you to the people of Israel, a nation of rebels, who have rebelled against me; they and their fathers have transgressed against me to this very day. The people are also impudent and stubborn; I send you to them; and you say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord God.’ And whether they hear or refuse to hear (for they are a rebellious house) they will know there has been a prophet among them.”³²

The selection of this verse indicates that it was clear to the participants that their voice would not be heard and no action would be taken. Henry Taylor pointed out that the PiM consultation had no validity within the synodical organisation of the Church of England. It had no authority and was consequently ignored. Standing Orders in General Synod were suspended for some reporting-back from the consultation, but this was out of politeness and did not affect the future of the Church. Thus a process, which was set by the ACC to be the foundational document for the planning of mission in the provinces, was respectfully heard and politely ignored.³³ One comment received was: “we are all in favour of change so long as it doesn’t make any difference.”³⁴ There was no official manner of reporting back to the instruments of power in the Church of England, and while the General

²⁸ Ibid., 77.

²⁹ Ibid., 23.

³⁰ Ibid., 24.

³¹ Ibid., 41.

³² Ibid., Inside cover, text as written there, translation used not known.

³³ *Progress in Partnership*, 79.

³⁴ Ibid., 22.

Synod offered time to hear reflections on the report in a voluntary recess,³⁵ there was no organised follow up and thus no willingness to change. The changes proposed were radical, but most of them have eventually been adopted, and they would have been vital insights if they had been used. Taylor argued that the attitude was that the PiM consultation process was for those asking for money, and not those seeking partnership for mission.

3.5.3. The USA

The evidence of the second PiM consultation in the USA supports the previous conclusions. Neither consultation was recorded in the normal manner, with the only records in the ACO archives popular reports published as small booklets.³⁶ The first consultation happened in each of the 11 internal provinces of ECUSA with common themes recurring. There was often a failure to engage, for example, in Province II the Bishop of Central Tanganyika failed to see why ECUSA could not open a new church every week as he was doing, rather than closing churches due to falling numbers.³⁷ However, the overall impression is of a very helpful event enabling the church to reflect on its mission, but without any long-term development into partnership for that mission.

For the second consultation the external partners were shown around the dioceses of the Episcopal Church, but did not feel their experiences were drawn upon. They were asked to sit apart when implementation was discussed.³⁸ Sir Philip Mawer of the Church of England presented the report of the external partners. Sir Philip commented that the insights of the external partners were never called for within the process and they felt like children on a school trip.³⁹ They offered long term assistance to enable continued participation,⁴⁰ but this was never even responded to, let alone taken up. The external partners realised that they

³⁵ Cates identifies that the report was sent to the overseas mission organisations, *Not by a Committee*, 13.

³⁶ J.W. Kennedy, ed., *Partners in Mission – the Louisville Consultation – 1977 – One Mission – Many Missioners* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1977). Robert Horine, ed., *Partners in Mission USA II – A Popular Report* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1993).

³⁷ *USA I*, 39-41.

³⁸ *USA II*, 54.

³⁹ Sir Philip Mawer, conversation, June 2006.

⁴⁰ *USA II*, 54.

had no future part to play in the mission of ECUSA, and at the closing Eucharist offered these words: “we feel you should now own the whole process for transformation, chart a course for your own destiny and accept the challenge for change brought about by our partnership.”⁴¹

ECUSA seemed unable to know how to accept help from others and bemused that they should need assistance from outside. The realm of partnership was in mission in other places, not mission in America.

3.5.4. Review of the Case Studies

The case studies confirm the conclusions of the studies of the contemporary reviews and statistics. The initial aim of the PiM consultation process was to break the giver/receiver nature of the Anglican Communion. The case studies reveal that the PiM process had not assisted in making any of the changes required by ACC –2, as defined in the questions posed in section 3.1 of this chapter. The Church of West Africa was still expecting the PiM process to deliver financial support for projects in its final consultation in 1997. The *giving* churches were unable or unwilling to hear insights from their external partners. Reception of the process was polite, but it was clear to participating external partners that there was no intention to make any changes based upon the recommendations in reports. As a consequence *receiving* churches were not offered a way of giving. The process was formal and formulaic and did not offer flexibility.

3.6. The PiM Consultations - Conclusions

The aim of this chapter is to evaluate the effectiveness of the PiM consultation process in fulfilling the aims set for it by ACC –2. In section 3.1 four questions were drawn from these aims which were:

- Did the PiM consultation process encourage the churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to become financially independent?

⁴¹ Ibid., 74.

- Did it encourage the churches that were regarded as *giving* churches to receive?
- Did it encourage churches that were regarded as *receiving* churches to give?
- Did it bring about a flexibility of approach that enabled a development of relationships?

The evidence of the reviews, of the statistical research, and of the case studies gives a consistent no to all of these questions. There was as clear a distinction between *giving* and *receiving* churches at the end of the process as at the beginning. The giving churches were offered the chance to receive, but were unable or unwilling to do so. The churches regarded as receiving had little opportunity to offer themselves to other younger churches and the giving churches did not value their resources. The consultations followed a common format and did not allow for flexibility.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that much that was good in the form of personal relationships emerged from the consultations, but this was incidental. It is impossible to know if this would have happened in any case, and it is possible to conjecture that other approaches would have produced better relationships and longer lasting results. The Church of England consultation was profound in its analysis of problems and constructive in its recommendations. If a way could have been developed which allowed that to have been brought into the centre of the church then the process could have been very valuable. The implication is that partnership is in itself significant, but that this method of delivery failed.

All were aware of the failure of the process at every point but they did not have an exploratory model of partnership to enable planning and to form a baseline for critical review. Without a model the process reinforced the *status quo*. The contention of this thesis is that an exploratory model of partnership would have assisted the planning and development of the process of delivery of MRI. “Partnership” had become an empty word with no attention paid to its how its meaning.

During the closing years of the PiM consultation process an attempt was made by MISAG II to develop a model of partnership based upon the experience gained from the PiM consultation process. This model was entitled “The Ten Principles of Partnership.”⁴² The development of a model from a real instance is the development of an explanatory model. The use of a failed or failing real instance in the development of an explanatory model means that the model itself is unlikely to be sufficient as an exploratory model.

3.7. The “Ten Principles of Partnership” – A Proposed Model

The aim of this section is to examine the potential of the “Ten Principles of Partnership” as an exploratory model. MISAG II was charged with the continued monitoring of the PiM consultations. Its report *Towards Dynamic Mission* was produced in 1993, just at the point when the consultations were themselves coming to a close. The report is significant as it proposes a model for mission partnership entitled “Ten Principles of Partnership.”⁴³ MISAG II believed that there was a need for principles for guiding mission partnership across divides of geography, economics and culture.

MISAG II commended the “Ten Principles” as “basic guidelines” based on the same ACC reports studied in section 3.3 of this chapter, and on an “accumulated wealth of experience.”⁴⁴ Therefore it was the product of the examination of a real instance, an explanatory model, and was intended to be used to guide planning and policy, an exploratory model. It is the contention of this thesis that the “Ten Principles” are flawed. Evidence has been given that the real interaction they are derived from was a failed process, which would be unlikely to produce a fruitful model for use as an exploratory tool. Learning from mistakes is valid, but the mistakes have to be identified and alternative paths suggested.

The faults in the “Ten Principles” can be seen through a detailed study. What is argued here is that the contradictions and confusion of the “Ten Principles” are not due to the

⁴² MISAG II, 28-31.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 31. See also, 27.

lack of ability in the authors, but due to the authors' attempt to extract abstract principles from a contradictory and confused process. The following analysis of the "Ten Principles" highlights the problems. Each of the principles is set out in full and commented upon. This is followed by a conclusion looking at the "Ten Principles" as a whole.

3.7.1. Local Initiative

"The responsibility for mission in any place belongs primarily to the church in that place" (ACC-2 p.53). Thus the initiative for establishing a new missionary venture in any given place belongs to the local church. Partnership therefore implies respect for the authority of the local church.⁴⁵

The first principle was a reflection of the post-colonialist agenda. The context is one where the "older," "giving" churches are asked to respect the autonomy of the young churches. The missionary societies were perceived to set the agenda of mission for churches in the global South and East, rather than these churches setting their own agendas. This principle was set by ACC -2,⁴⁶ and reflects the inculturation model and the return to the "three-selves" priorities, which was emphasised in the introduction to this section of *Towards Dynamic Mission*.⁴⁷ The report of MISAG II, like ACC -2, saw the growth of self-reliance as vital for interdependence. The move from colonial patterns of the domination of the South by the North to partnership was seen as the Southern churches taking power over their own mission.

This principle has allowed churches to set their own agendas and mission strategies, and is indeed a useful balance to colonialism. However, in the context of the Lambeth Commission of 2004, this principle was the one under which some of the American provinces have asked for the freedom to have a local initiative in relation to same-sex unions. It was probably not envisaged, even in 1993, that the provinces of the South would seek to compromise the autonomy of dioceses in the developed world. As a principle of partnership it is notable for being a statement of independence, not interdependence.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 28.

⁴⁶ ACC -2, 53.

⁴⁷ MISAG II, 24.

3.7.2. Mutuality

Mutuality is underscored by a deep sense of open and joint accountability. ‘To be open to one another as friends on the basis of common commitment, mutual trust, confession and forgiveness, keeping one another informed of all plans and programmes and submitting ourselves to mutual accountability and correction’ (Sharing Life - El Escorial - Guidelines for sharing: 1987 World Council of Churches, p.29)

Mutuality in partnership affirms the oneness of the people of God, their unity and interrelatedness as the children of one Father. In this relationship each person and community is recognized, valued, affirmed and respected.

In decision making, mutuality means sharing power. For example, major decisions affecting partners (in the South), should not be taken without their participation in the decision whether by their presence when it is made or by prior consultation.⁴⁸

Where the first principle stressed local independence, the second focused on the unity of the one church in different geographic, cultural and economic situations. Mutuality was said to be “underscored by a deep sense of open and joint accountability.”⁴⁹ However, the contradictions between the primacy of local initiative and the joint accountability of mutuality were not explored. This tension becomes apparent in the third paragraph of the section that emphasised the importance churches in the South being involved in decision making that affected them. The paragraph assumed that decisions were capable of being made in the powerful North which would affect those in the poor weak South. The recognition that this had to change was an admission of the failure of the partnership model in overcoming the colonial legacy, but it also turns the section on mutuality into a repetition of the principle of local initiative. The sharing of power was seen as allowing the provinces and dioceses of the South to have power over their own interests.

This tension between local initiative and mutuality is significant. The question of the location of power and authority is unresolved within these two principles. This is illustrated by considering the context of the issues surrounding human sexuality. Some argue that the North American churches have the freedom to bless same-sex unions on the basis of the primacy of local initiative over mutuality. Others counter that the responsibility of mutuality

⁴⁸ Ibid., 28.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

places the authority for making such changes at a level where the whole Communion can participate. Tensions have arisen with the South being perceived to have power over the North. While mutuality is a vital element of partnership, the tension between this mutuality and local independence was not addressed in this principle.

3.7.3. Responsible Stewardship

Responsible Stewardship in partnership means that partners see their resources as jointly owned and held in trust for the common good (I Cor 12:7). The giving, receiving and use of resources must be controlled by judiciousness, selflessness, maturity and responsibility (II Cor 8:9).

God's gifts to any one part of the universal church are given in trust for the mission of the whole church. No mission agency, diocese, province or national church 'owns' its resources.⁵⁰

This was the first principle to tackle the tricky problem of money. Although stewardship is about all resources, throughout the PiM process it was the inequality of wealth that caused continual problems in forming partnerships across economic differences. The principle consisted of a high sounding ideal followed by a theological rationale. It sounds positive and straightforward, but this is not a simple matter.

The paragraphs are the wrong way round. The theological rationale follows the conclusion, and the two statements are best considered in reverse order. The underlying premise expounded in the first sentence of the second paragraph seems to be in keeping with the theory of *missio Dei*. There is only one mission, that is the mission of God, and so any gift to mission is a gift to the whole. However, this statement of truth is generalised in the search for a simplistic solution to a difficult problem. Those who espouse *missio Dei* see it also as incarnational and this means that mission is always expressed locally. Therefore, while the mission of the church is no less than the full mission of God, its local expression is always a limited part of the whole. Thus the running of a diocese in England, in all its complexity, is a valid expression of the mission of God, as is an AIDS project in Nairobi. The running of a diocese in Kenya, in all its complexity, is as valid an expression of God's

⁵⁰ Ibid., 28-9.

mission as a mission programme in London. A gift to one is a gift to the mission of God in the whole world, but it remains a gift to a specific place. It is no less a gift for the mission of the whole church, but it remains a specific gift to mission expressed in a place. Therefore, while it is true that “no mission agency, diocese, province or national church ‘owns’ its resources,” in the sense that there is a responsibility to the whole for the use of such resources, it is not true that all have a claim on those resources. The resources of one partner remain their resources, otherwise partnership becomes merger.

The reality of the Anglican Communion is that each diocese is autonomous within autonomous provinces. The Anglican Communion understands that each diocese is responsible for its own resources, financial, institutional and human. Indeed this has been the specific thrust of the move towards self-reliance for the structures of the church that began in at ACC –2. The issues of autonomy and connectivity are once again ignored in this principle. *Missio Dei* would appear to be a sound basis for the discussion of the distribution of wealth, but it is used in too generalised a manner.

An alternative approach is to use a model derived from the Bible and the first clause of this principle contains two references. However, the way the Bible is used is unhelpful in this context and leads to difficulties. It is not clear that the statements can be derived from, or supported by, the verses quoted. The sentence, “responsible Stewardship in partnership means that partners see their resources as jointly owned and held in trust for the common good (1 Cor. 12:7),” needs to be looked at in association with 1 Cor. 12:7 itself. This verse reads: “Now to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good.” Two things become immediately clear; the term the “common good” is a direct quotation from 1 Cor. 12:7, and in that context the resources talked about by Paul are spiritual gifts. The second quotation is from 2 Corinthians and does concern money. The conclusion can be made that, while it was not clearly defined within the text, responsible stewardship referred to both spiritual and financial resources.

There are problems associated with single verses quoted out of context as proof texting is always methodologically problematical. Questions have to be asked of interpretation and of context, but also of other verses that might add more light or offer an alternative angle. The context of 1 Cor. 12:7 was Paul's sustained critique of those striving for "superior" spiritual gifts within the Corinthian Church. The challenge is to value the gifts of every member of a church as part of the whole of that community. The verse is important in the context of partnership as it can be applied to the valuing of all contributions to the mission of the church, especially where some gifts (especially money and learning) are often valued above others. However, it is a big conceptual leap to get from there to the demand that all gifts are "jointly owned" by the whole church. Indeed it is a common interpretation that 1 Cor. 12 concerns an individual church in a specific place at a specific time. The Corinthian Church on its own is regarded as "the body of Christ." This is not to say that the Corinthian Church was the totality of the body, but it was the reflection of the body at that time in that place.

It is not clear that within 1 Corinthians Paul expected the spiritual gifts of the Corinthians to be shared with external partners, but each one is to be valued in the context of that locality. While this verse ensures we do not forget resources wider than money, it is not clear that it supports the claim for partners to see resources as "jointly owned." Indeed the opposite might be coherently argued.

If we turn to the second sentence with a biblical quotation within it we encounter more problems. It reads, "the giving, receiving and use of resources must be controlled by judiciousness, selflessness, maturity and responsibility (2 Cor. 8:9)." The use of this second verse is, if anything, more confusing. It reads; "For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, so that you through his poverty might become rich." Its context is the Corinthian ambivalence to the call from Paul to give to his fund to aid desperately poor Christians in Jerusalem. How this verse

specifically relates to the statement, “the giving, receiving and use of resources must be controlled by judicious, selflessness, maturity and responsibility,” is not at all clear.

The imitation of Christ in becoming poor so others might be rich is implied within the verse. However, Paul himself sees the need for clarification, and the verse stands within a longer argument for generosity, from 2 Cor. 8:1-9:15. Paul did not see the imitation of Christ as a simple answer to the Corinthian problem. In 2 Cor. 8 the Macedonian church is held as an example of generosity in poverty. Paul attempts to flatter the Corinthians and makes it clear he is not commanding them, and in that context the reference to the sacrifice of Christ is made. It is followed by advice to finish what they started and a clear statement of the aim of equality. “Our desire is not that others might be relieved while you are hard pressed, but that there might be equality. At the present time your plenty will supply what they need, so that in turn their plenty will supply what you need. Then there will be equality” (8:13-14). It has to be asked if the principle of equality is what was being proposed within this principle of partnership. If so there are substantial problems.

Economic equality is impossible in the modern world. In the world of St Paul the poverty of the Jerusalem church was considered temporary, dependent upon a change in the micro-economic situation. The problem among the poor in Jerusalem seems to have been caused by a combination of unsustainable commitments to poor Christians, a long famine, and persecution of Christians that led to economic hardship. Paul certainly expected the economic circumstances could and would change.⁵¹ He saw the possibility of the Jerusalem church having the economic ability to assist other churches when they were in trouble.

Real inequalities are too great to be solved by simple sharing. As noted above, such simplistic understandings have been used to explain the perilous state of the Jerusalem Church. In the present day if a diocese in a rich country decided to share its resources

⁵¹ See Scott McKnight, “Collection for the Saints,” in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G.Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 144.

equally with a diocese in, for example, sub-Saharan Africa, the effect would not be positive. It is likely that the African diocese would attract many new members as a give-away was announced. The money would, however, soon be divided thinly, with some beneficial effects, but no long-term change. The underlying issues that cause poverty, such things as education, trade rules and infrastructure, would remain unchanged. On the other hand, the diocese in the developed country would quickly become insolvent. The need to adhere to legal requirements under employment law for salaries, pensions and insurance, alongside commitments to institutions and buildings, would not allow such a drain on cash. The opportunity for the return of the money would not depend on a simple change in fortune for the African church, but the success of very long-term plans for development. The situation of the Pauline collection for the needy Christians of Jerusalem is in no way analogous with the context of the 21st century, and other models are needed.

The reference to Christ becoming poor so we might be rich is a theological truth that Paul needed to contextualise. Christ made himself poor to make us rich, but it does not follow that by making ourselves poor we will make our partners rich. Indeed a partnership may lead to mutual enrichment without either side falling into poverty. There is a further problem with this text. As resources are seen as entirely financial, the giving will be only one way. The rich churches will make themselves poor for the sake of the poor churches that will become rich. This returns us to the one-way mission scenario which the “Ten Principles of Partnership” was hoping to break and replace. Chapter 6 of this thesis argues that the Corinthian Church was not in partnership with any other, and lacked the required maturity to enter into partnership. Thus the use of the Bible was misleading and offered a false legitimacy to the principle.

In summary, the third principle of partnership is confusing and unhelpful. It follows Toronto and ACC –2 in setting impossible expectations that have the unwanted effect of

returning the mission task to a North to South focused event. A different understanding of the exchange of resources and the place of money is needed for partnership to flourish.

3.7.4. Interdependence

‘Interdependence means to represent to one another our needs and problems in relationships where there are no absolute donors, or absolute recipients, but all have needs to be met and gifts to give.’ (WCC, *Sharing Life*, 29)

We need each other. We are incomplete and cannot be called the Church of God if the diversity implicit in our catholicity is over taken by a parochial, cultural or racial, homogeneity. In practice, three consequences follow:

- every cultural group has something to give or something others can learn from them;
- all cultures need redeeming and therefore no culture can be said to be fundamentally Christian and thus superior to others;
- every one has needs that can only be met by others. There is an African saying addressed to arrogant and selfish rich people: ‘no one buries himself - if he does one of his hands will be outside the grave.’⁵²

Having looked at mutuality and responsibility the principles now turn to interdependence. The outline of this principle starts with a quotation from the WCC document *Sharing Life*.⁵³ The difference between mutuality and interdependence needs to be carefully thought through, as it is possible for the two words to mean the same thing. Interdependence can be seen as the synthesis of local initiative and mutuality. If local initiative is diversity and mutuality is unity, then the synthesis is interdependence. In this case those in different places recognise their need of one another in order to exist in any meaningful way. This gives sense to the sentence in the principle: “We need each other. We are incomplete and cannot be called the church of God if the diversity implicit in our catholicity is over taken by a parochial, cultural or racial, homogeneity.” If this is the case then we have the beginnings of a construct for partnership. Local initiative and mutuality in tension create the interdependence or partnership.

⁵² MISAG II, 29.

⁵³ Huibert van Beek, ed., *Sharing Life, Official Report of the WCC World Consultation on Koinonia: Sharing Life in a World Community* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1989), 29. The word “interdependence” is not used in *Sharing Life* and the quote should begin from the word “means.”

This is not a straightforward fourth principle, but a development of the first two principles. The reference to the WCC document introduces a new source for the model. Up to this point the source had been experience of the PiM consultations, but here reflections from the world of ecumenism are introduced. There is confusion as to the application of the “three consequences.” For example, the relationship between Christ and culture is not simple and not agreed upon.⁵⁴ The principle introduces layers of complexity. Different churches operate with different models of engagement with their own culture. Indeed it is really only possible to talk of a place having multiple cultures – few places now exist in a single culture mentality. It is not possible to examine the roots of this principle and so very difficult to apply it.

3.7.5. Cross-Fertilisation

Cross-fertilisation requires a willingness to learn from one another. It produces an enrichment that results from being open to one another's ideas, experiences and respecting one another's cultural and contextual peculiarities in a process of give and take. `If we once acted as though there were only givers who had nothing to receive and receivers who had nothing to give, the oneness of the missionary task must now make us both givers and receivers' (ACC-2 p53).⁵⁵

This principle could be understood as a repetition of the previous one. The principle of interdependence says: “Every cultural group has something to give or something others can learn from them;” and continues: “All cultures need redeeming and therefore no culture can be said to be fundamentally Christian and thus superior to others;” and finally, “Every one has needs that can only be met by others.”⁵⁶ In many ways this is the principle of Cross-fertilisation. Cross-fertilisation was defined as a requirement of “a willingness to learn from one another.” It is not possible to see cross fertilisation of anything other than an aspect of the interdependence principle that precedes it, rather than an entirely different principle.

⁵⁴ An introduction to the issue is in Philip Groves, ed. *The Anglican Communion and Homosexuality – A resource to enable listening and dialogue* (London: SPCK, 2008), 179-209.

⁵⁵ MISAG II, 29.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

The lack of real objects or interactions from which to draw an explanatory model presents problems for the construction of an exploratory model. There is no coherence in the principles and a confusing mixing of ideas.

3.7.6. Integrity

A healthy partnership calls for integrity at all levels. It involves a recognition that all partners are essentially equal. This implies a commitment to be real and honest. We do not always have to say 'yes' to everything the other partner says for fear of offending or out of a false sense of guilt. A healthy partnership requires that we take each other seriously, raise creative and loving challenges that could lead to positive re-evaluation of long held traditions and assumptions. The result is a healthier and more enriching relationship. This includes both listening to each other and being willing to repent and change where we have been in error.⁵⁷

The sense of being true to oneself in dealings with partners was the key to this principle. Integrity was said to involve, “a recognition that all partners are essentially equal.” This is a very significant point and one that was often lost in the PiM process. Partners from the South sometimes felt unable to criticise one from the North as they felt inferior or dependant. Those from the North sometimes felt any criticism as being colonialist and bullying. Thus the final call of this section was a key point for the ongoing relationships within the Anglican Communion. Integrity “includes both listening to each other and being willing to repent and change where we have been in error.” It was not recognised how difficult this can become, and methodologies for implementing integrity were not offered.

3.7.7. Transparency

Transparency involves openness and honesty with one another. It also involves risks. The risk of being hurt. The risk of being misunderstood and the risk of being taken advantage of.

Information needs to be fully shared with one another; not only information connected with our specific relationship with one another but information about all of our relationships. Full disclosure of financial information to one another is one of the marks of a transparent relationship.⁵⁸

While transparency was considered a different principle to integrity, the two are related. One was the confidence to speak; the other is the challenge to be open. There was an acknowledged risk of being hurt and of being taken advantage of. The principle concluded

⁵⁷ Ibid., 29-30.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 30.

with a specific inclusion of a demand to be open with financial information, as a mark of a transparent relationship. Transparency was offered as a solution to the issues of the sharing of resources, but it was not clear how this would make an effective difference. Placing it as a separate principle did not offer clarity.

3.7.8. Solidarity

We are part of each other. We are committed to one another in Christ's body. What touches one member touches the others. Thus no one member must be left to suffer alone. In many non-western cultures, group cohesion and solidarity are thought to be central to existence and crucial to the progress and survival of society. In spite of their strong belief in the rights and individuality of the individual, the Igbo of Nigeria, for example, argue that 'igwe bu ike' ('our strength has its source and sustenance in group solidarity'). In parts of East Africa, the Harambee motif has been successfully harnessed in political, social and religious spheres to achieve astounding results. Missiologically speaking the church needs to act in solidarity "so that the world may see and believe" (John 17:21).⁵⁹

Solidarity is a vital concept for true partnership, an essential element of Warren's model seen in his emphasis on the acceptance of responsibility and liability. The experience of non-western cultures, specifically a Nigerian proverb and a practical Kenyan example, was used to emphasise solidarity. This was supplemented by a reference to "Christ's body" and the use of a quotation from John 17.

The use of a Nigerian proverb was intended to be an example of cross-fertilisation. Such proverbs are common across Africa and many proverbs support the sentiment. The Harambee motif is more problematic. Harambee is said to produce astounding results, but the concept and practice was not explained. In Kenya it is a significant part of life, but has its critics across East Africa. It is a way for people to come together for the common good, such as a communal offering for a school or a medical facility. This is done in a public manner with the value and source of the gifts announced. However, the public donation of money has sometimes forced those seeking influence – for example, someone standing as a Member of Parliament – to make huge donations to impress the electorate. It is claimed that

⁵⁹ Ibid.

sometimes the donations go beyond what could legally be afforded, and those who gain influence and power by such donations are accused of taking money back through corruption, which leads the communities into further poverty. It is also seen by some to be in contradiction of the biblical injunction in Matt. 6:2-4 to be silent when giving. The use of the motif was thus problematic because outside Kenya it was not understood, and also because it left no way for critics of the use of Harambee to have their say. Within this context solidarity was only seen in the sharing of suffering, not in the sharing of triumphs and victories. This one sided approach and the use of the Harambee motif, so closely allied to giving money, again slanted the partnership towards the rich helping the poor.

The purpose of solidarity was made clear in the final sentence of the principle. “Missiologically speaking the church needs to act in solidarity ‘so the world may see and believe’ (John 17:21).”⁶⁰ The context of the quoted excerpt from John 17 places questions against the way the Bible was used. The quotation used as a proof text to validate a “practical” reflection rather than used as a foundation for reflection. A proper and fuller exegesis of the biblical text might have led to a more fruitful appreciation of the nature of solidarity and unity. The prayer of Jesus in John 17 is a subtle piece of theology. Jesus begins by focusing the prayer on himself, as this is his time of glory. The use of *glory* by Jesus in John often refers to the crucifixion; the moment of full obedience that shows Jesus glorified at the point of his suffering.

The context of suffering is set by the way John interprets Jesus’ use of *glory*. In his obedience and suffering Jesus is united with the Father, in the glory of the cross. The prayer for the disciples acknowledges their future suffering. It begins with the statement of faith that they are united with Son and Father. This link with God is the foundation of their solidarity, and the sense of joy in this union is expressed. They have joy in no longer being part of the world. Suffering and persecution will follow, and Jesus acknowledges their need

⁶⁰ Ibid., 30.

for help. He then prays for the disciples who he knows will face persecution and hatred, and calls for them to be “sanctified” or set apart as he is “sanctified” (17:18-19). Carson points out that *sanctification* is a missiological term expressing the sending out of Jesus and the disciples.⁶¹ Thus solidarity in this text is unity in purpose and mission, through being set apart for common suffering. This sense of mission becomes the focal point of the prayer as the attention turns to those who will follow. They are to be one, “so that the world will believe.” The prediction of suffering for those who are to come is neither as acute nor as explicit as it is for Jesus himself or his disciples, but they are to share in the paradox of glory, which comprises both joy and suffering. Even this very simplistic review demonstrates that the solidarity principle in John is more complex and deeper than set out in the “Ten Principles of Partnership.”⁶² The sharing of joy and the sense of purpose underlies the relationship that is not primarily between Christians, but finds its source in their unity with the Father.

3.7.9. Meeting Together

The concept of mutual responsibility and interdependence in the Body of Christ implies that the Church in every place should find a forum for periodic evaluation, self assessment and cross-cultural fertilization. Thus while a PIM Consultation is not the fulfilment of a PIM vision, it is essential to it (ACC-2 p53). We need to meet together.⁶³

This principle correctly stated that partnership only happens when there is the possibility of meeting together. The PiM consultation process was emphasised as vital for this but other opportunities for meeting and other forms of communication were not considered. The PiM consultations only offered very few people the opportunity to meet with one another. Generally, two people were sent from a partner church to meet with representatives of a host church. As the PiM process did not in itself enable many people to

⁶¹ D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, (Leicester: IVP, 1991), 566-7.

⁶² This very brief and limited reflection on John 17 is intended to highlight the inadequacy of the use of a proof verse in this context. It is not intended to be definitive in itself. If John 17 is to be used in the context of constructing a theology of solidarity, then far more work is required.

⁶³ MISAG II, 30.

meet, it is questionable whether the consultations were “vital” for meeting together. There was no critique of the shallow nature of the PiM consultations attempt to engage in genuine meeting. In addition, while there is no substitute for meeting and making friends, the use of letters, email, video and other links are also important in continuing relationships. There was no consideration of methods of continuing relationships.

3.7.10. Acting Ecumenically

Our mission relationships as Anglicans must be seen as part of the wider mission relationships of all Christians. In this Decade MISAG-II underlines the importance of the Lambeth call for Anglicans to explore ways of being involved in mission cooperatively with other Christians. We need the stimulation, the critique and the encouragement of sisters and brothers in Christ of other traditions. A constant question before us must be, to what extent are those of other traditions invited to participate in advising and working with us in our outreach?⁶⁴

This principle differs from the others in that it came from a directive of the Lambeth Conference, rather than from practical observation. The tone of the principle was that this was an area that needed further work. The lack of ecumenical involvement was noted in all reviews from ACC –3 onwards.⁶⁵ The final question was left unanswered because the experience of the PiM process did not offer an answer.

3.7.11. Critique of the “Ten Principles of Partnership”

The “Ten Principles of Partnership” were derived from observation of a failed process. This means the process was an inadequate basis for the construction of an explanatory model and the principles of little practical use as an exploratory model. As an explanatory model the principles were unsystematic, repetitious, and at points contradictory. As an exploratory model they failed to offer a programme for deconstructing the giver/receiver mentality.

The unsystematic nature of the formation of the “Ten Principles” led to words such as *mutuality*, *interdependence* and *cross-fertilization* being used to describe the same concepts and this led to repetition. For example, the section on interdependence has the

⁶⁴ Ibid., 30.

⁶⁵ The failure to engage with ecumenical partners was a constant issue in the reviews of the PiM consultations: ACC –3, 56. See also ACC –4, 33, ACC –5, 31, MISAG I, 14, and *Progress in Partnership*, 6-7.

sentence, “every cultural group has something to give or something others can learn from them,”⁶⁶ which is followed in the next section by, “cross-fertilization requires a willingness to learn from one another. It produces an enrichment that results from being open to one another's ideas, experiences and respecting one another's cultural and contextual peculiarities in a process of give and take.”⁶⁷ These are the same sentiments. Another example is that transparency was advanced by MISAG II as a solution to the issues of financial imbalance, but it was presented as a separate principle, not part of the principle of stewardship. Principle 6 on integrity repeats some of the issues from principle 1 on local initiative, and principle 3 on mutuality. This is also addressed in principle 4 on interdependence. The repetition of themes means they were not clearly defined. There is an obvious contradiction between local initiative and mutuality, but this contradiction was not considered. The failure to identify how the contradictions could be resolved, and the contexts in which one principle takes precedent over another, presents a real problem for the use of the principles.

The “Ten Principles of Partnership” were based upon a failed process and so are unable to offer a positive explanatory model for planning. For example, they offered no solution to the problem of inclusion of ecumenical partners because the process from which they were drawn had failed to include an ecumenical element. There is a tendency for the principles to be statements of intent with no practical way of implementation. For example, “responsible stewardship in partnership means that partners see their resources as jointly owned and held in trust for the common good (1 Cor 12:7).”⁶⁸

Contrary to the Anglican Way, the principles were not taken from Scripture understood by tradition and reason. When the Bible was referred to within the “Ten Principles,” it was by texts randomly dropped into arguments, implying the point was thereby proved. The use of proof texts, with little or no reference to their contexts, does not

⁶⁶ MISAG II, 29.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 28.

offer a solid hermeneutical basis for partnership. The richness of the Biblical witness to partnership is a strong theme in the New Testament, and this was not reflected in the principles. Openness to the Scriptures is a significant part of Anglican theology and is ignored by the “Ten Principles of Partnership.”

Conclusion

The second chapter of this thesis argued that the architects of MRI shaped its language, but did not offer an exploratory model for its implementation. This chapter has shown that, from the first response in the formation of a directory of projects, and through the intentional response of the PiM consultation process, the lack of an explanatory model resulted in the continuation of the giver/receiver pattern for inter-Communion relationships. It is further argued that the response by MISAG II resulted in an attempt to construct guidelines, but because these were based in a failed process the resulting exploratory model was unsystematic, repetitious, and at points contradictory. This means that the “Ten Principles of Partnership” is not a sufficient exploratory model for the building of partnership relationships across geographic, economic and cultural barriers.

The absence of an adequate exploratory model of partnership resulted in the failure to build mature partnerships. When the Communion entered into controversies over the ordination of women and their consecration to the episcopate, and the full inclusion of gay and lesbian people – including their ordination, the blessing of their partnerships and the consecration of an openly gay bishop – the relationships were not sufficient. The response of the Instruments of Unity was to appoint commissions with the aim of providing models for the maintenance of communion. The following chapter reflects on these attempts to build alternative models.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESPONSES TO CRISES IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION 1978 – 2009

Introduction

The previous chapters have identified that the Anglican Communion lacked an exploratory model in attempting to establish mutual responsibility and interdependence in its partnership relationships. This meant that processes intended to implement MRI resulted in the reinforcement of existing giver/receiver relationships. It is the argument of this thesis that to enable planning an explanatory model derived from an external source and applied as an exploratory model is required. In the absence of any such model the process was rudderless and drifted into the reinforcement of the values it had been intended to break.

The failure to build MRI and develop genuine mission partnership has left the Communion vulnerable when actions in one part have dismayed Anglicans elsewhere. Since 1963 the Anglican Communion has faced three major crisis points. The very first meeting of the ACC began in crisis with the Bishop of Mashonaland walking out in objection to resolutions supporting the Program to Combat Racism.¹ However, the real threats to unity came over the ordination of women to the priesthood, their consecration to the episcopate, and moves towards the full inclusion of gay and lesbian people, including their ordination, the blessing of their relationships, and the consecration of an openly gay partnered bishop.

It is not the aim of this study to consider the crises in the Anglican Communion. There are numerous studies on the ordination of women and on the inclusion of partnered gay and lesbian people. This chapter is an investigation of the *responses* to the crises in the Communion. Recognising the lack of a model for an international communion the response has been to commission reports. Inevitably these have focussed on building structures within which the “bonds of affection” may be able to flourish. As such this process has offered models for being “communion.” This chapter examines the sources of these models as

¹ ACC –1, introduction to *The Time is Now*, Limuru, 1971, viii.

explanatory models. It is argued that the processes for constructing explanatory models were insufficient, resulting in flawed exploratory models.

The key texts for this chapter are the products of the Inter-Anglican Doctrinal and Theological Commission (IATDC), the Lambeth Commission on Communion, and the Covenant Design Group. IATDC produced *The Virginia Report* in 1996,² which acted as an exploratory model for the Lambeth Commission on Communion in producing *The Windsor Report*.³ The subsequent meeting of IATDC reflected on *The Windsor Report* and together these three documents were used as an exploratory model for the Covenant Design Group in the development of three drafts of an Anglican Covenant.⁴ This chapter begins with a brief historical introduction to the key texts followed by an analysis of their content. It is argued that *The Virginia Report* has significant faults as an explanatory model, which brings into question its viability as an exploratory model, and that these faults are present in the subsequent documents.

4.1. Historical Context

Stephen Bayne realised that the question of Anglican identity was important. He saw the inadequacy of the 1930 Lambeth Conference definition and could not find a definition that made sense to him.⁵ He believed that the growing Communion was no longer well served by the essential Englishness that he described as a “cultural confessionalism.”⁶ He also rejected confessionality (in the Lutheran sense of adherence to a denominational confession such as the Augsburg Confession) on traditional Anglican grounds, set out in the Lambeth-Chicago Quadrilateral. The Quadrilateral was based upon the assumption that the

² *The Virginia Report (TVR)* in ACC –10 *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium, Panama 1996*, N. Curie, and J. Rosenthal, eds., 223-85 (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1996). See also “*The Virginia Report*” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/documents/virginia/english/index.html> and.

³ *The Windsor Report (TWR)*, The Lambeth Commission on Communion (London: ACO, 2004).

⁴ At the point of submission of this thesis the Ridley Cambridge Draft (RCD) is under review. See “ACC – 14. Resolution 14: 11,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc14/resolutions.cfm#s11>.

⁵ “Resolutions from 1930 – Resolution 49,” *Lambeth Conference Official Website*, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-49.cfm>. Also quoted in Stephen F. Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point* (Austin, Texas: Church Historical Society, 1964), 110.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 129-130.

Anglican Communion did not define itself in differentiation from the Church Catholic, and thus only adopted those creeds and structures agreed by whole church, namely the Scriptures, the historic creeds, the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, and the historic episcopate.⁷ He was keenly aware that such beliefs made Anglicanism impossible to define with the clarity of Lutheranism or the Roman Catholic Church. His hope was that as the strings of history and culture unravelled, a new bond forged in common purpose within the Communion would emerge.⁸

The strains on the bonds of affection appeared prior to the 1978 Lambeth Conference. In the years leading up to it, the Province of Hong Kong and the Provinces of Canada, the United States and New Zealand had ordained women to the priesthood, and a further 8 provinces had accepted women's ordination in principle.⁹ The appendix of *The Official Report of the Conference* contains three speeches that all refer to this issue.¹⁰ One of these was the speech given by Bishop Bowles in moving Resolution 21.¹¹ Bowles had chaired the group that had considered the ministry and ordination of women, with a particular emphasis on the way the Communion could continue amidst division. There was a real danger that the Communion would split over this issue and Bishop Bowles' group proposed strategies for holding it together.¹² These were firstly to accept the reality of women priests, that more would be ordained, and to accept that there would be ongoing opposition to women in the priesthood. Secondly, all should commit to ongoing unity with no excommunication (open or concealed), and no discrimination against any because of their views. The group also looked at ecumenical relationships and sought to manage the damage caused by moving to ordain women when others, such as the Roman Catholics and the

⁷ Ibid., 127. See "The Lambeth-Chicago Quadrilateral," *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/appendix/p3.1.cfm>.

⁸ Bayne, *Turning Point*, 126.

⁹ *TWR*, 12-21.

¹⁰ *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978* (London: CIO, 1978), 116-24.

¹¹ Ibid., 119-122.

¹² Ibid., 120.

Orthodox, were not prepared to discuss such a move.¹³ The proposed strategy was to express humility, to refer the process back to New Testament diversity, and to make it clear that the Anglican Communion had much to learn.

Professor John Macquarrie had been invited to speak at a “Hearing” at the Lambeth Conference, and an abbreviated version of his talk was also published in the official record.¹⁴ He commented on the relationship between theology and social context, recognising that one was never free of influence from the other.¹⁵ He then considered the limits and measure of consensus, arguing that consensus did not require all to think alike, because diversity was vital for healthy churches. However, absolute pluralism was not healthy either, and he proposed that a two-thirds majority was a good measure of consensus. He questioned the boundaries for such votes on issues as serious as women’s ordination and the authority of provinces to make decisions that affected the whole church.¹⁶ He then attempted to “get the problem into perspective.”¹⁷ He argued for a hierarchy of truths, where central doctrines required common assent, and where peripheral issues existed in a grey area. He argued against the notion that “the ordination of women priests in a Church is a sufficient ground for people to leave that Church and set up a schismatic body.”¹⁸ Finally, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Donald Coggan, in what Thomas calls a “notable intervention,”¹⁹ focussed the question on the nature of authority in the Communion.²⁰ By doing so the Archbishop set the agenda for the newly formed Doctrine Commission.²¹ He also called for consideration of the nature of Anglican authority within the context of regularised meetings of the Primates.²²

¹³ Ibid., 121-2.

¹⁴ Ibid., 116-119.

¹⁵ Ibid., 117.

¹⁶ Ibid., 117-8.

¹⁷ Ibid., 118.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Philip Thomas, “Commissioning Commissions: a context for the work of the ABCC and IATDC” (2004), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/documents/commissioning.pdf>.

²⁰ *Lambeth 1978*, 122-4.

²¹ “Resolution 25: An Anglican Doctrinal Commission,” in *ibid.*, 47.

²² *Ibid.*, 123.

The Primates' Meeting had effectively become part of the tradition of the Church by 1987.²³ In a paper written during the ACC meeting by a group chaired by the Primate of Ireland, Archbishop Robin Eames, it was listed as one of the four "Instruments" for maintaining unity in diversity in the Anglican Communion. The group looked to the Instruments to "continue to be consultative in style and persuasive in terms of authority."²⁴ They asked for their paper to be presented to the Lambeth Conference the following year. However, the Lambeth Conference was not satisfied with this hurried attempt to produce a discussion paper, nor were they able to use the subtle theology of the IATDC report *For the Sake of the Kingdom*.²⁵ Instead they passed the following resolution:

That the new Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (or a specially appointed inter-Anglican commission) be asked to undertake as a matter of urgency a further exploration of the meaning and nature of communion; with particular reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, the unity and order of the Church, and the unity and community of humanity.²⁶

This resolution was accompanied by an explanatory note setting out the context for the study.²⁷ The explanation said that the impaired state of Communion in the context of the potential consecration of women bishops required a theological enquiry into the nature of communion. This study should relate to the ecumenical context and should "provide a

²³ ACC –7 *Many Gifts One Spirit, Report of ACC –7, Singapore 1987* (London: CHP, 1987), 129.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 130.

²⁵ See, Thomas "Commissioning." Thomas writes: "*For the Sake of the Kingdom* especially offered a subtle argument (is it fanciful to see the hand of a young Rowan Williams at work there?) which sets theological pluralism, but not relativism, within the yes and no, the even now and not yet of the reign of God. The Christian calling is to discern a 'transcendent horizon' in the midst of time and history, and Anglicanism's particular vocation is to do that within 'a fellowship based in a common set of institutions ... through practical acts of sharing, through mutual consultation, through mutual admonition and criticism (and) through a common willingness to take up difficult – even divisive – issues for the sake of the truth of the Gospel.' (p59-60). It is not hard to see why a report like that, with its focus on repentance, faith, spiritual and cultural transformation, was not easily reduced to a set of conference resolutions. But this very fact identifies a second feature which determines the contribution that theological commissions can make. *For most readers the value of a report will be whether or not it supports their own opinion. If it does, then it will be accorded a status in future discussions which it is probably unable to bear, and if it does not, it will be ignored altogether.* In times of dispute, even within the church, most participants are not so much interested in understanding as winning. To often the issues are not about truth, but power." (Emphasis his).

²⁶ *The Truth Shall Make You Free - The Lambeth Conference 1988 - The Reports, Resolutions and Pastoral Letters from the Bishops* (London: CHP, 1988), 216.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

theological framework in which differences can be handled.”²⁸ Eames was named as the chair of the commission.

Eames was also the chair of another commission appointed at the same Conference to respond more directly to the crisis. Resolution 1 focussed directly on “the ordination or consecration of women to the episcopate.”²⁹ The Conference called upon the Archbishop of Canterbury “to provide for an examination of the relationships between provinces of the Anglican Communion and ensure that the process of reception includes continuing consultation with other Churches as well;” and “to monitor and encourage the process of consultation within the Communion and to offer further pastoral guidelines.”³⁰ This commission was officially called the Commission on Communion and Women in the Episcopate, and produced four brief reports which were published together and known as *The Eames Report*.³¹ The report offered practical guidelines, but also entered into “theological reflection on the nature of *koinonia*.”³² The Commission met between 1988 and 1993 and overlapped with the second report of IATDC entitled “Belonging Together in the Anglican Communion,” which was first published in 1992.³³ The overlap was not only in time; *The Eames Report* and *The Virginia Report* shared a great deal of common ground in structure and content.

The 1990 meeting of the ACC supported further study of issues of identity and authority in the Anglican Communion by IATDC and other bodies.³⁴ However, the ACC registered its disquiet over the use of the word “authority,” which the representatives regarded as inferring a top down, almost papal approach. They also commended the word

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid., 201.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ *Women in the Anglican Episcopate: theology, guidelines and practice: The Eames Commission and the Monitoring Group Reports* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1998). See Bruce Kaye, *Conflict and the Practice of Christian Faith – The Anglican Experiment* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2009), 89.

³² TVR, “Introduction.”

³³ Finally published as chapter 3 of TVR.

³⁴ ACC –8 *Mission in a Broken World – Report of ACC-8 Wales 1990*, R. Coleman, ed. (London: CHP, 1990), 162-3.

“communion” rather than unity.³⁵ IATDC reconvened in 1994 and met again in 1996 at the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria, USA. Archbishop Eames was once more in the chair. The report was presented to ACC –10 in Panama in 1996 and to the Lambeth Conference in 1998, where it was commended for study in the provinces.³⁶

The dominating issue for the Church at the 1998 Lambeth Conference was not, however, women bishops, but the divisive debate on homosexuality. This resulted in the passing of Resolution I.10,³⁷ which rejected all homosexual practice as “incompatible with Scripture,” and said that the bishops “cannot advise the legitimising or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions.”³⁸ It also committed the bishops to “listen to the experience of homosexual persons.” A crisis point came in 2003 when the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the USA confirmed the election of an openly gay partnered man as Bishop of New Hampshire.

An emergency Primates’ Meeting was called prior to the consecration of Gene Robinson, and the primates offered the following statement:

³⁵ Ibid., 141.

³⁶ “Resolutions from the 1998 Lambeth Conference, Resolution III.8,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1998/1998-3-8.cfm>.

³⁷ “Resolution I.10 Human Sexuality,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1998/1998-1-10.cfm>:

This Conference:

- a. commends to the Church the subsection report on human sexuality;
- b. in view of the teaching of Scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage;
- c. recognises that there are among us persons who experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation. Many of these are members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church, and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of relationships. We commit ourselves to listen to the experience of homosexual persons and we wish to assure them that they are loved by God and that all baptised, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ;
- d. while rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture, calls on all our people to minister pastorally and sensitively to all irrespective of sexual orientation and to condemn irrational fear of homosexuals, violence within marriage and any trivialisation and commercialisation of sex;
- e. cannot advise the legitimising or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions;
- f. requests the Primates and the ACC to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Communion and to share statements and resources among us;
- g. notes the significance of the Kuala Lumpur Statement on Human Sexuality and the concerns expressed in resolutions IV.26, V.1, V.10, V.23 and V.35 on the authority of Scripture in matters of marriage and sexuality and asks the Primates and the ACC to include them in their monitoring process.

³⁸ See sections d. and e. above.

If his consecration proceeds, we recognise that we have reached a crucial and critical point in the life of the Anglican Communion and we have had to conclude that the future of the Communion itself will be put in jeopardy. In this case, the ministry of this one bishop will not be recognised by most of the Anglican world, and many provinces are likely to consider themselves to be out of Communion with the Episcopal Church (USA). This will tear the fabric of our Communion at its deepest level, and may lead to further division on this and further issues as provinces have to decide in consequence whether they can remain in communion with provinces that choose not to break communion with the Episcopal Church (USA).³⁹

The response of the primates to the consecration of Bishop Robinson on November 2nd that year was to appoint another commission, once again chaired by Archbishop Eames. The Lambeth Commission on Communion was not asked to consider issues of human sexuality, but it was asked to help understand the meaning of being in impaired or broken communion and to see how the highest degree of communion could be maintained in the circumstances. They were asked to draw upon existing work on the issues of communion.⁴⁰ Eames was not the only member of IATDC on the Lambeth Commission, and the final report, known as *The Windsor Report*, echoed and developed *The Virginia Report*. One specific innovation within *The Windsor Report* was the call for an Anglican Covenant.⁴¹

Within this historical context three significant documents – *The Virginia Report*, *The Windsor Report*, the report of the reconvened IATDC – will be considered. Following this the historical development of the Covenant process will be summarised and the texts of the three draft texts will be considered, with emphasis on the third, the Ridley Cambridge Draft (RCD). The aim will be to discover the models used to assist the Anglican Communion in its understanding of its identity and what it means by “communion.”

³⁹ “A Statement by the Primates of the Anglican Communion meeting in Lambeth Palace,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/36/25/acns3633.html>

⁴⁰ “Anglican Communion – Commission Announced,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/36/50/acns3652.html>. See also *TWR*, 13.

⁴¹ *TWR*, 62-4.

4.2. *The Virginia Report*

The Virginia Report was published in 1997 after two meetings of IATDC. It was a report put together by committee and was open to the methodological problems of a committee report. There are two problems we can identify in the writing of the report.

Firstly, such reports involve the members compromising over strongly held theological views and this carries the danger of strong voices ensuring their positions are adopted. We cannot be sure that the resulting report was one which was owned in all its parts by all the contributors with equal passion and conviction.

Secondly, there were issues of transparency in the sources used to form the final model. *The Virginia Report*, and in particular chapter 2, is described as a model by IADTC in its 2007 report *Communion, Conflict and Hope*.⁴² The process of developing *The Virginia Report* was analogous to the process of modelling set out in the introduction to this thesis. The participants were drawn from around the world and brought their own complex contexts and theologies. The aim of the committee was to reduce this complexity into a simple format, devoid of individuality, for application across the Communion in a variety of complex realities. The move from real instances to abstract is the formation of an explanatory model for use as an exploratory model in new contexts. The methodological problem in the assessment of the report arises from the impossibility of investigating the sources of the model. The process of beginning with real objects and interactions was inevitable, but the work done on this is not available to us in the product. There are points where speculation about the sources is possible. For example, the inclusion of the principle of subsidiarity was likely to have involved taking the European Union as a model. Understanding the European debate following the signing of the Maastricht Treaty may

⁴² *Communion, Conflict and Hope – The Kuala Lumpur Report of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission 2007* (London: ACO, 2008).

assist in the evaluation of the report. Other real life contexts that shaped the document are less clear.

The Virginia Report is not a simple document; it developed over time and has different interests and styles. It raised many questions and left some unanswered. The introduction posed significant questions and is considered below with the first chapter, entitled “The Context.” Chapter 2 was a distinctive chapter as it set out to give a biblical understanding of “communion.” It continued the meta-narrative style introduced by *The Eames Report* and developed in *The Windsor Report*. The principle of subsidiarity, as proposed in chapter 4 and formulated in chapter 5, was one further element of *The Virginia Report* that has become significant by subsequent developments.

4.2.1. “The Context”

The first chapter of *The Virginia Report* is only three pages long and gives the context for the whole of the report.⁴³ The first paragraph set the agenda: “Our Lord Jesus Christ prayed that his followers might be one, as He and the Father are one, so that the world might believe (Jn 17:20-21).”⁴⁴ The statement was made to stress that the consideration of unity is not due to crisis, but an obligation to God, founded in the biblical witness. The first paragraph continued by recognising that responding to this call is difficult, and was being done within a crisis situation for the Anglican Communion. “At every level of Christian life, the call to graceful interdependence and unity in faith and doctrine challenges us.”⁴⁵ The insertion of the word “interdependence” was significant. This placed the study in the context of the tradition of Anglican understandings of partnership. However, neither the word, nor the concepts behind the word were unpacked anywhere in the text.

⁴³ TVR, 1.1-1.16.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 1.1.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

The chapter continued by noting that disagreements have marked the church from the first days and that the Bible itself was a product of controversies.⁴⁶ The reasons for the present difficulties were placed in the context of rapid changes in society that bring both great blessing and destruction.⁴⁷ It contested the unquestioning belief in progress and promoted the value of cultural roots. The next section reflected on some of the contexts in which the gospel is lived by Anglicans and stressed that “Our response to these issues is conditioned by our particular cultural context, our way of interpreting the Bible, our degree of awareness of being part of a wider human community, and our attentiveness to the response of other ecumenical partners and to the concerns of those of other faiths.”⁴⁸ The next section said:

1.6 The churches of the Anglican Communion struggle with these concerns within a life of communion and interdependence. Discernment has to be exercised about which concerns are best addressed by the local church, which provincially and which by the whole Communion. An added burden is placed on decision making when churches are separated from one another.

The task of discerning which concerns are addressed at which level of the church was a key concern for *The Virginia Report*. This was picked up later by the proposal to use the principle of subsidiarity.

Section 1.8 set out the second task of the Commission:

1.8 When Christians find themselves passionately engaged in the midst of complex and explosive situations, how do they avoid alienation from those who by Baptism are their brothers and sisters in Christ, who are embraced in the communion of God the Holy Trinity, but who disagree? How do they stay in communion with God and each other; how do they behave towards each other in the face of disagreement and conflict? What are the limits of diversity if the Gospel imperative of unity and communion are to be maintained?

This was followed by some clues about how these questions might be answered.

They suggested that some issues might be so complex that we will have to be satisfied with provisional answers. Thus the task will be about “forming a mind” by listening to and

⁴⁶ Ibid., 1.2.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 1.3.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 1.5.

learning from one another, while “holding each other in the highest degree of communion possible with tolerance for deeply held differences of conviction and practice.”⁴⁹

The next section introduced another important theme, mission. The challenges to unity as a Communion were said to require “effective structures for maintaining unity in service and mission.”⁵⁰ Giving a purpose to the struggle for establishing structures is very important; effective structures are to enable effective mission. *The Virginia Report* offered a justification for setting the theological debate in the context of the theology of the Trinity. It was argued that the basis of the church’s “communion” is founded upon “the triune God, whose inner personal and relational nature is communion.”⁵¹ This led on to a reassertion of the significance of mission:

1.12 The references in the Lambeth resolution to the Trinitarian doctrine and the unity and community of the whole human family make it clear that the concern of the Lambeth Conference was not simply for strengthening the peace and unity of the Anglican Communion, but also for the faithful and effective engagement of the Communion in God's mission of love and reconciliation in the world.

The Commission was aware of the danger that focusing on sorting out structures to enable mission would bring an unwanted focus on ordained ministry at the cost of ignoring the laity, and so they noted that any structure had to enable the whole people of God in mission.⁵²

They then continued with a rather dubious and grandiose claim:

1.14 The instruments of communion, which are a gift of God to the Church, help to hold us in the life of the triune God. These are the instruments which we seek to renew within the Anglican Communion. They are also the structures we seek to share with all those who have been baptised into the life of the Triune God. Our hope is that this theological reflection may contribute not only to the Anglican Communion but to the ecumenical goal of full visible unity.

The Instruments of Communion emerged on a trial and error basis over the preceding years, and the Primates’ Meeting had only been formalised about ten years prior to the first meeting of IATDC. This paragraph appears to be an attempt to provide a theological reason

⁴⁹ Ibid., 1.9.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 1.10.

⁵¹ Ibid., 1.11.

⁵² Ibid., 1.13.

for structures that had come into existence by chance. The claim that they “seek to share” these structures with all the baptised is an ecumenical aspiration which should have raised eyebrows in other denominations, and it is not clear how claims for God’s specific blessing on these structures would have enhanced ecumenical dialogue.

The dilemma for the Commission was that they gave themselves three starting points: first, the witness of the Bible; second, the witness of theology, founded in the understanding of the Trinity; third, the structures as they were at the time. The first two were reconcilable within the theological methodology of the priority of Scripture, but the tension came in using the current structures as a starting point. The question of whether these structures were provisional, or a revelation of God-ordained leadership for mission in the manner of the Trinity, was left unresolved. The discussion of theology was kept separate from the discussion of structures. Chapter 2 was all about Bible and theology, with no reference to the Instruments of Unity. Chapter 3 set out the structures, with no reference to any biblical or theological rationale. Chapter 4 introduced new concepts of the attributes of the church, and the principle of subsidiarity. This principle was returned to in chapter 5, under the theological basis of *koinonia* drawn from an understanding of the Trinity. Chapter 6 offered questions about the nature of the Instruments of Unity.

4.2.2. “The Theology of God's Gracious Gift: The Communion of the Trinity and the Church”

4.2.2.1. Analysis

Chapter 2 of *The Virginia Report* was broken into three sections, the first two locating communion in salvation history and the third exploring how it is lived in Baptism, Eucharist and ministry. As in the first chapter, the first section opens with a very significant paragraph:

2.1 God's gracious gift of steadfast loving kindness was from the beginning known by the people of God in the form of covenant. From the prophets came the conviction that God's faithfulness was never ending even when God's people were forgetful and betrayed the divine trust.

The notion of the “covenant” as a foundation for relationships within the Communion is first articulated in this sentence. The report states that the sign of God’s love is seen from the creation, and the post-flood covenant is specifically referred to.⁵³ The next paragraph moves on to the communication between God and Moses in Exodus 3.14, where God describes himself as the “I AM.” This relational title has the effect of identifying the relationship between God and Moses, and, from there, the whole people of Israel. Thus, the Commission did not see the significant covenant relationship in the law, but in “God's sacred relationship with his chosen people,” articulated in Deut.7:6-8a. They saw the notion of being a chosen people in a relationship as vital.⁵⁴ The story continues in the words of the prophets, who interpreted the covenant to show the people that even in times of desolation and suffering, God would bring restoration:

And in the midst of despair and anguish Jeremiah speaks of God's loving act of restoration:

But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people (Jer. 31:33).⁵⁵

The New Testament section begins with a prayer of Jesus from Matt. 11:25-27 where “Jesus spoke of this God of steadfast loving kindness and faithfulness as his Father.”⁵⁶ It is not immediately obvious why this text is chosen above others. It is an unusual one to choose. The prayer of Jesus in John 17 is more common. With no exegesis the quotation from Matt. 11 sits awaiting interpretation by the reader.

The report continues with the assertion of Jesus as God with us,⁵⁷ and focuses on the point of the death of Jesus and the revelation that the communion of love would be shared by believers following his death, offering an edited version of the beginning of John 15.

As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you; abide in my love. No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends. I have called you

⁵³ Ibid., 2.2.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 2.4.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 2.5.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 2.6.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 2.7.

friends, because I have made known to you everything I have heard from my Father. You did not choose me but I chose you. And I appointed you to go and bear fruit, fruit that will last, so that the Father will give you whatever you ask him in my name. I am giving you these commands so that you may love one another (John 15, 9, 13, 15-17).⁵⁸

It is at this point that John 17 is returned to, and it is used to show that “our unity with one another is grounded in the life of love, unity and communion of the Godhead. The eternal, mutual self-giving and receiving love of the three persons of the Trinity is the source and ground of our communion, of our fellowship with God and one another.”⁵⁹ The Holy Spirit is also referred to here, as the Trinitarian foundation is laid with reference to verses from John 14,⁶⁰ but deeper exegesis is not entered into. The account of salvation history continues with the consideration of the foundation of the church at Pentecost. “The Spirit empowered the community to pray, ‘Abba, Father,’ as free, adopted, children of God (Rom. 8:15-17, Gal. 4:4-7). ‘Clothed with power from on high’ (Luke 24:49), the community is empowered to go forth to proclaim the Good News of God to all peoples and nations.”⁶¹ The very being of the church is said to be founded on the outpouring of the love of God who is Father, Son and Holy Spirit.⁶²

The second part of chapter 2 turns more specifically to a consideration of “The Communion of the Trinity and the Life of the Church.”⁶³ The concept of the *Body of Christ* is introduced, along with other images of the Church such as “the temple of God (1 Cor. 3:16), a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people God claims as his own (1 Pet. 2:9).”⁶⁴ All of these, it is claimed, talk of participation in the divine nature and our relationship with one another. The key text of 1 John 1:3 is set out in full in the Report.⁶⁵ The participation of the church with the Godhead is said to be a source of eschatological

⁵⁸ The reference should read John 15: 9, 13, 15-17. The separation of the verses is not made clear in the text.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.9.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.10. Specifically John 14:16-17; 20-21.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2.11.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 2.12.

⁶³ Section heading. This section is very dependent upon *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)* Faith and Order Paper No. 111 (Geneva: WCC, 1982).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.12.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.12.

reality. “The Church is the icon of the future toward which God is directing the history of the world.”⁶⁶ The church lives out salvation history for the world, and looks forwards to the coming of the Kingdom.⁶⁷

There is a subtle revision of the covenant within the text at this point. The Old Testament covenant is described as unconditional, but when considering the New Testament the report talks of the “faithful Christian community” being a living and visible sign of the coming reign. The charting of salvation history is completed with these words:

Its mission is to be the living and visible sign of that divine reign, when He will dwell with them as their God; "they will be his people, and God himself will be with them; he will wipe every tear from their eyes. Death will be no more; mourning and crying and pain will be no more; for the first things have passed away (Revelation 21:3-4).⁶⁸

In the Old Testament the people of Israel are the sign of God’s rescue from destruction despite their failings. In contrast the church is to be a sign of the coming Kingdom, and must, by its faithfulness, present to the world the future perfection.

The third section of chapter 2 is entitled “The Communion of the Trinity and Mission and Ministry,”⁶⁹ and brings into focus the theology of the joint participation in mission and ministry of humans and the Triune God. It begins with: “A living faith in the God of Jesus Christ draws us into the life of the Holy Trinity. This means living as Jesus lived his life empowered by God's Spirit.”⁷⁰ It is this Spirit that is said to send the community out in mission.⁷¹

The practical expression of this is seen in the liturgy of the church,⁷² especially Baptism and Eucharist. Baptism is said to be participation in Christ’s ministry,⁷³ and “the Eucharistic celebration demands reconciliation and sharing among those who are brothers

⁶⁶ Ibid., 2.13.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 2.15.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid., Section heading.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 2.16 supported by Luke 4:18-19.

⁷¹ Ibid., 2.17.

⁷² Ibid., 2.18.

⁷³ Ibid., 2.19.

and sisters in the one family of God, and constantly challenges those who participate to search for appropriate relationships in social, economic and political life (Matt. 5:23f; 1 Cor. 10:16f; 11:20-22; Gal. 3:28).⁷⁴

Living out the union with Christ is expressed in ministry, a participation in Christ's ministry of reconciliation.⁷⁵ Thus the report is able to say:

2.23 To be baptized and to participate at the Table of the Lord is to be entrusted with Christ's one, continuing mission through the Church. The baptised are called to unity and interdependence. United to Christ, each member of the Body relates to the other members; they are interdependent with and through Christ. To celebrate the Eucharist together reveals and builds this mutuality. "We who are many are one body for we all partake of the one bread." In Eucharist the Spirit affirms and renews communion in Christ and the gifts given us to participate in the divine mission.

The report then moves to three paragraphs that can be read as a conclusion to this chapter. Section 2.24 is worthy of careful study:

2.24 The Holy Spirit bestows on the community diverse and complimentary [sic] gifts. (cf. BEM, Ministry 5) God the Creator, blesses people with many talents and abilities. The Holy Spirit graces individuals with special gifts. The outworking of one person's gift in the Church is unthinkable apart from all the others. The **mutuality and interdependence** of each member and each part of the Church is essential for the fulfilment of the Church's mission. In the early Church, those who spoke in tongues needed interpreters of tongues; Paul's mission to the Gentiles complemented Peter's mission to the Jews. The ministry of serving tables in the early Church freed the other disciples to preach God's word. The gifts of all contribute to the building up of the community and the fulfilment of its calling.⁷⁶

The Body of Christ motif is the only model of the church drawn upon in the report.

The gifts are initially outlined in individualistic terms but then there is then a category switch to not only "each member," but also "each part" of the church. This sentence contains the dominant partnership motifs of the Anglican Communion, mutuality and interdependence.⁷⁷

The move from individual to each part might be a legitimate extrapolation, but it is not immediately obvious from the biblical texts or the theology put forwards thus far. The change from individual to corporate membership of the body requires further justification.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 2.20, a direct quote from *BEM*, "Eucharist," 20.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 2.21 and 2.22.

⁷⁶ Emphasis mine.

⁷⁷ Note the dropping of "responsibility" from "mutual responsibility."

The section concludes with a firm identification of the Church as the Body of Christ, dismissing other pictures and calling for spiritual charisma to be centred on Christ,⁷⁸ and for the diversity of gifts to be enjoyed as they build up this body.

4.2.2.2. Critical Assessment

Chapter 2 was intended to be very significant within the report as a whole, and forms theological foundation. In the context of this thesis, it is possible to ask if it is a sufficient explanatory model with the strength to be an exploratory model. The information to fully judge its legitimacy as an explanatory model is not available. The approach of chapter 2 places the idea of communion in the context of the whole of salvation history. This broad-sweep meta-narrative locates communion as fundamental to the life of all Christians. The Bible is appealed to at every point, but it is selectively used. This is inevitable in a short report, but no justification is given for why some verses and concepts are promoted over others. For example, the metaphor of the Body of Christ is appealed to above other images of the church without explanation. The study is said to be of “communion.” Communion is one of the English words that are used to reflect the Greek word *koinonia*, but only one of the New Testament verses where *koinonia* is central is considered within the text. In addition we have no information on the hermeneutic at work in the interpretation of the chosen biblical texts. A defence of why these particular texts were used and not others and a range of detailed exegesis, perhaps in an appendix, would have enabled an assessment of the chapter as an explanatory tool. In addition, while there are a few references (all to *BEM*), there is no bibliography. The sources of the document are not available for scrutiny.

The judgement as to its usefulness as an exploratory tool is more complex. An indication of its weakness as an exploratory model is that there is no reference to this chapter in the rest of the text of *The Virginia Report*. This gives cause for concern in assuming that this chapter is sufficient as either an explanatory or exploratory model.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 2.25.

4.2.3. “Belonging Together in the Anglican Communion”

Chapter 3 entitled “Belonging Together in the Anglican Communion” provides an accurate and significant description of the Anglican Way of doing theology and of the structures of the Anglican Communion. The section on the Anglican Way offers a model of the distinctive Anglican method of discerning the mind of Christ through the acceptance of the authority of Scripture read in the light of tradition and reason.⁷⁹ This principle is taken as foundational for this thesis – defining the standard for the way of doing Anglican theology. The rest of the chapter does not claim to act as an exploratory model. It is a description of real interactions, but it is not an abstraction of those interactions. In contrast to much of the rest of the document, the whole chapter is transparent on its sources.

The description of the Anglican Communion, in worship and the orders of bishops, clergy and laity, is clear and concise. In section 5, “The Structures of Interdependence,” there is recognition of the tensions of living in a Communion where provinces have full autonomy, but at the same time need one another in mission and so belong together. The following section of paragraph 3.28 is a careful and accurate expression of the issues:

The life of the Communion is held together in the creative tension of Provincial autonomy and interdependence. There are some signs that the Provinces are coming to a greater realisation that they need each other's spiritual, intellectual and material resources in order to fulfill their task of mission. Each Province has something distinctive to offer the others, and needs them in turn to be able to witness to Christ effectively in its own context. Questions are asked about whether we can go on as a world Communion with morally authoritative, but not juridically binding, decision-making structures at the international level.

It is the question of the relationship between autonomous provinces and the whole of the world Communion that is addressed in the following chapter. This chapter concludes with an accurate description of the four Instruments of Unity, giving a historical summary and an account of their place. It regards as unresolved questions on the place of the Primates' Meeting as a potential council to offer guidance on doctrinal and moral issues. The final paragraph poses the question:

⁷⁹ Ibid., 3.5-3.11.

At the end of the decade one question for Anglicans is whether their bonds of interdependence are strong enough to hold them together embracing tension and conflict while answers are sought to seemingly intractable problems.⁸⁰

4.2.4. “Levels of Communion - Subsidiarity and Interdependence”⁸¹

The principle of subsidiarity is introduced in section 3 of chapter 5 of *The Virginia Report* as a proposed answer to the questions raised in chapter 3. The use of the principle of subsidiarity is a significant innovation, taken up in *The Windsor Report*.⁸² Subsidiarity is used as an exploratory model, a means of understanding processes of discernment, and for proposing new directions. The concept was derived from European political thought and so it is legitimate to consider how it is constructed as an explanatory model, as well as how it is used as an exploratory model.

The principle of subsidiarity was developed by the Roman Catholic Church from the 1891 Papal encyclical “*Rerum Novarum*” and by three subsequent Popes in the encyclicals “*Quadragesimo Anno*” (1931), “*Pacem en Terris*” (1962) and “*Centesimus Annus*” (1991).⁸³ It is a fundamental assumption of much of European Christian Democratic thought, and was introduced into the British consciousness with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. *The Virginia Report* shows no knowledge of the provenance of the theory of subsidiarity, but quotes the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition. “Subsidiarity - a central authority should have a subsidiarity function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed

⁸⁰ Ibid., 3.54.

⁸¹ Ibid., 4.8-21 and 5.17-20.

⁸² *TWR*, 38-9.

⁸³ Joan Lockwood O’Donovan, “Subsidiarity and Political Authority in Theological Perspective” in *Bonds of Imperfection – Christian Politics Past and Present*, eds. Oliver O’Donovan and Joan Lockwood O’Donovan, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 225-7.

“*Rerum Novarum*” (1891), *The Vatican*, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html.

“*Quadragesimo Anno*” (1931), *The Vatican*, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html.

“*Pacem en Terris*” (1962), *The Vatican*, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html.

“*Centesimus Annus*” (1991), *The Vatican*, http://www.vatican.va/edocs/eng0214/_index.htm.

effectively at a more immediate or local level.”⁸⁴ The report argues that this was the principle followed by the early church, which, it is claimed, never regarded the local church as autonomous. As evidence the report cites Paul’s concern for the inter-relationships between local churches.⁸⁵ Again this claim is unsubstantiated and would not be uncontested.

Joan Lockwood O’Donovan, in a thorough analysis of the principle of subsidiarity, argues that it is not a biblical construct; rather its foundations are in Thomist concepts of natural law, public society, and common good.⁸⁶ Her thesis is that “the modernizing of the Thomist political framework has reinforced its Aristotelian character at the expense of its traditional Christian aspects.”⁸⁷ She argues that the concept is far more complex than set out in the popular definition; that it can be manipulated to mean almost anything; and that, in its present state, it has no basis in Scripture or tradition. There is no history of the application of subsidiarity to church structure, it is not biblical (and therefore not in line with Anglican methodology as set out in *The Virginia Report*) and it is plastic and versatile. O’Donovan points out that the theory has “proved serviceable to quite antagonistic visions of European political organisation.”⁸⁸ The practice of subsidiarity is a radical threat to individual human rights and has proved impossible to sell to individualistic societies.⁸⁹

The Virginia Report shows no awareness of the complexity of subsidiarity and applies it directly, using it as an exploratory model. The application of subsidiarity is that all decisions should be made at the “lowest” level possible and only referred to “higher” levels of authority if the unity of the church is at stake.⁹⁰ It is stated that some issues will need consideration across provinces to ensure that an individual province does not “become

⁸⁴ TVR, 4.8, quoting *The Oxford English Dictionary*.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 4.9.

⁸⁶ O’Donovan, “Subsidiarity,” 226.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 225.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 239-242.

⁹⁰ TVR 4.10-13.

bound by its culture.”⁹¹ The issue of the ordination of women was used as an example of how a province needed to consult prior to continuing with a step that threatened the unity of the whole.⁹²

Some of those who support the principle of subsidiarity point to the principle of sending decisions down to the grass roots, and this is the implication of paragraph 5.17:

5.17 The Holy Catholic Church is fully present in each of its local embodiments. Decisions about the life and mission of the Church should be made in that place and need only be referred to wider councils if the matter threatens the unity and the faithfulness of teaching or practice of the Church catholic, or where the local church encounters genuinely new circumstances and wishes advice about how to respond.

This seems a very simple and workable principle that enables local decision making to be effective. However, the final paragraph of the section illustrates the reverse of a system based upon subsidiarity:

5.20 The world-wide Anglican assemblies are consultative and not legislative in character. There is a question to be asked whether this is satisfactory if the Anglican Communion is to be held together in hard times as well as in good ones. Indeed there is a question as to whether effective communion, at all levels, does not require appropriate instruments, with due safeguards, not only for legislation, but also for oversight. Is not universal authority a necessary corollary of universal communion? This is a matter currently under discussion with our ecumenical partners. It relates not only to our understanding of the exercise of authority in the Anglican Communion, but also to the kind of unity and communion we look for in a visibly united Church.

The consultative nature of the instruments of communion is questioned and a proposal is made for legislation, oversight and a “universal authority.” This is a radical and far-reaching proposal that, if implemented, would change the whole nature of the Communion. The principle of subsidiarity is being transferred to an exploratory model that appears to support the concept of decision making at the grass roots, but in practice develops authority structures that centralise power. This model is developed without being properly established as an explanatory model.

⁹¹ Ibid., 4.14.

⁹² Ibid., 4.16-17.

4.2.5. Summary

The Virginia Report presents itself as an abstract document for application in the complex world of the Anglican Communion. That is, it offers itself for use as an exploratory model. However, the sources for the conclusions within the report are not open to scrutiny and so it is impossible to investigate fully its explanatory adequacy. While, the report was only welcomed at the 1998 Lambeth Conference and commended for study but not accepted,⁹³ it was very influential in the work of the Lambeth Commission on Communion.

The Virginia Report connected the concept of covenant to communion and focused on the concept of the Body of Christ as the central motif for the church as communion. It offered a clear statement of the Anglican Way of seeking the mind of Christ through Scripture understood by tradition and reason, and describes the reality of the Communion, posing questions on the need for developments in the relationship between autonomous provinces and the whole. The principle of subsidiarity was stated uncritically and this prepared the way for the recommendations of *The Windsor Report*.

4.3. *The Windsor Report*

The Windsor Report emerged from the crisis in the Anglican Communion resulting from the consecration of an openly gay divorcee in an active relationship with another man as the Bishop of New Hampshire, the endorsing of the blessing of gay relationships in the Canadian Diocese of New Westminster, and the intervention of a coalition of conservative bishops from Asia, Africa and South America in the life of dioceses of ECUSA without the permission of the diocesan bishops. The report is the product of the Lambeth Commission on Communion that was again chaired by Archbishop Robin Eames. The mandate of the Commission ruled out the discussion of the issues surrounding human sexuality itself and

⁹³ “1998 Lambeth Conference. Resolution III.8 - *The Virginia Report*,” *The Lambeth Conference Official Website*, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1998/1998-3-8.cfm>.

focused the Commission on the nature of the communion in the reality of division.⁹⁴ It also ruled out any revolutionary change by limiting the Commission to continuity with existing positions.⁹⁵

Archbishop Eames offered continuity with *The Virginia Report* and this was strengthened by the presence of three other IATDC members on the Lambeth Commission; Dr Esther Mombo, Dr Jenny Te Paa and the Rt Revd Tom Wright. The structure of *The Windsor Report* replicates that of *The Virginia Report*. It moves from theological foundations, echoing the meta-narrative of chapter 2 of *The Virginia Report*, to practical application, where subsidiarity is commended. Like *The Virginia Report*, sections A, B, and C set up a simple abstract model. One difference is that in section D this is applied to the real and complex situation of the Communion. The analysis below will focus on the sections intended as a basis for action, or, in the language of this thesis, the exploratory model.

4.3.1. Biblical Foundations

The meta-narrative construct of chapter 2 of *The Virginia Report* is echoed in section A of *The Windsor Report*. The report begins with the sentence: “God has unveiled, in Jesus Christ, his glorious plan for the rescue of the whole created order from all that defaces, corrupts and destroys it.”⁹⁶ The people of God are said to be an anticipatory sign of the Kingdom.⁹⁷ In the second chapter the motif of the Body of Christ is referred to, at this point

⁹⁴ *TWR*. The mandate is set out on page 13.

⁹⁵ The report is divided into four sections which do not directly respond to the four points of the mandate. They are:

Section A: The Purpose And Benefits Of Communion.

Section B: Fundamental Principles.

Section C: Our Future Life Together.

Section D: The Maintenance Of Communion.

The focus of the media was on Section D where the quiet chiding of the Provinces of TEC and Canada were located along side the rebuke to those conservative bishops who had taken it upon themselves to intervene in dioceses where the bishop had not welcomed them. These were the focus of the Primates and ACC –13, along with a call to engage in a “Listening Process” and the development of an Anglican Covenant.

⁹⁶ *TWR*, 1.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 2. See *TVR* 2.14, 2.15.

from Ephesians.⁹⁸ The unity of the church and the communion of its members are said to be rooted in the life of the Trinity and designed for mission.⁹⁹

Paragraph 4 focuses on the context of Corinth and once more on the image of the Body of Christ.¹⁰⁰ Lewis points out that, whereas the Body of Christ was the dominant biblical image of the church in *The Virginia Report*, in *The Windsor Report* it is the only image.¹⁰¹ 1 Corinthians is the only place which is offered as a biblical foundation for communion, and the only text quoted which contains the word *koinonia* is 1 Cor. 1:9 which speaks of the of the Corinthians' fellowship, or communion, with Jesus Christ.¹⁰² It is interesting that paragraph 4 emphasises the administering of discipline and the call to purity, but not the harsh rejection of factionalism (1 Cor. 1:10-17) which is the main focus of 1 Corinthians and which is addressed by the image of the body in 1 Cor. 12.

This opening section is summed up in these words:

As we Anglicans face very serious challenges to our unity and communion in Christ - challenges which have emerged not least because of different interpretations of that holiness to which we are called, and different interpretations of the range of appropriate diversity within our union and communion - Paul would want to remind us of the unique source of that unity, our common identity in Christ, and its unique purpose, the furtherance of God's mission within the world.¹⁰³

Again the themes of *The Virginia Report* are seen in the sense of purpose, the mission to the world. The faults of the narrow selection of biblical verses and the failure to offer an indication of the interpretative method are also present.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 2. See *TVR* 2.13, 2.17, 2.25 and 2.26.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 3. See *TVR* 2.6-2.26.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 4.

¹⁰¹ Christopher Lewis "On Unimportance" in Andrew Linzey and Richard Kirker eds., *Gays and the Future of Anglicanism* (Winchester, UK: O Books, 2005), 155-6. The image of the body appears in most of the opening paragraphs of the report and is taken further as recent disunity is seen as an "illness" with "symptoms." See section headings for *TWR* 22-30 and 31-33.

¹⁰² *TWR*, 4.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 5. See *TVR* 2.16-2.26.

4.3.2. Practical Consequences

When the “practical consequences of a healthy communion”¹⁰⁴ are considered the image of the Body is taken up once more. This time the reference is from Ephesians and an emphasis is given to Christ as the head. Again, echoing *The Virginia Report*, a rosy picture of the Anglican Communion is painted in terms of the structures of the church.¹⁰⁵ In the next paragraph Toronto 1963 is referred to, and the “Ten Principles of Partnership” are said to have been developed from the commitment to “mutual interdependence in the Body of Christ.”¹⁰⁶ No awareness is shown of the dysfunctional nature of the PiM process that led to the writing of the “Ten Principles.” Instead, it is claimed that they have been lived out and honoured, and a few examples are offered to support this claim.¹⁰⁷ These are seen as signs of health.¹⁰⁸

The report looks at the issues which have led to the forming of the Lambeth Commission and, again drawing upon *The Virginia Report*, sees subsidiarity as one of six key elements in Anglican relationships,¹⁰⁹ but adds to this a concept not in *The Virginia Report*, *adiaphora*.¹¹⁰ *Adiaphora* are defined as “things which do not make a difference, matters regarded as non-essential, issues about which one can disagree without dividing the church,”¹¹¹ and are derived from Rom. 14:1-15:13 and 1 Cor. 8-10. *The Windsor Report* argues that clarity is offered if a decision is clearly *adiaphora*. The Report states that *adiaphora* was a concept developed by the English reformers and a “major feature of Anglican theology.”¹¹² However, several Anglican theologians were surprised by its

¹⁰⁴ Section heading. *Ibid.*, 6-11.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 7. See *TVR*, Chapter 3 “Belonging together in the Anglican Communion.”

¹⁰⁶ *TWR*, 8.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 36-37, 87-95.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 88.

inclusion and saw it as an innovation in Anglican Theology.¹¹³ Many see it as positive,¹¹⁴ but others point to its complexity.¹¹⁵

The theology of *adiaphora* has roots in divisive disputes as the second generation Lutheran Church sought to find an identity in changing political situations. Melanchthon proposed the concept to enable Lutherans to accept the Leipzig Interim, a settlement hammered out between Elector Moritz and Emperor Charles V.¹¹⁶ Charles would accept Lutheran theology if Moritz could persuade the Lutherans to accept Catholic traditions of worship. This compromise was considered a possible way to reconcile the Lutherans and the Church of Rome. Melanchthon found a way of accepting ceremonial acts as matters that were not essential, or *adiaphora*. Competing Lutheran leaders, questioning where it would end, chided Melanchthon for his weakness and asked if transubstantiation itself could be *adiaphora*.¹¹⁷ Those who opposed its adoption in the English church of the time, both puritans and catholics, echoed this fear.

For A. G. Dickens *adiaphora* was among the most attractive of all the Reformation doctrines. He argued that it enabled an escape from the demand to acquiesce to propositions, and was the mark of liberal, tolerant, reformed theology.¹¹⁸ It was fundamental to the theology of Frith, who was executed in 1533, not because he denied transubstantiation and purgatory, but because he did not see them as essential to the faith.¹¹⁹ The English liberal reformers, such as Starkey and Brinklow, also took such a stand.¹²⁰ In the English Reformation *adiaphora* was used to argue for toleration and freedom, and the issues

¹¹³ See, for example, "Response to the Windsor Report - Bishop Epting," *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/commission/reception/responses/p1.cfm>. "The long section on 'adiaphora' (Paragraphs 87 ff), while helpful overall, sounds more Lutheran than Anglican."

¹¹⁴ For example, "Response to the Windsor Report - Anthony Thistelton," *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.aco.org/commission/reception/responses/pdf/comm_thiselton.pdf.

¹¹⁵ For example, "Response to the Windsor Report - Robert Hughes," *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.aco.org/commission/reception/responses/pdf/theo_revprofroberthughes.pdf.

¹¹⁶ Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 346-9.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 363-4.

¹¹⁸ A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (Glasgow: Fontana, 1st ed.1964, revised 1967), 462.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 116-7.

¹²⁰ A.G. Dickens, *Reformation Studies* (London: Hambleton Press, 1982), 429-431.

surrounding who was to judge what was essential were side-stepped. The pressure for conformity in Melanchthon's Germany and in mid sixteenth century England came from the civil powers. In 1556, John Ponet, the Bishop of Winchester, adopted *adiaphorism*, and while he assigned to the crown powers over "things indifferent," the essentials, he argued, were left to individual conscience.¹²¹ Ponet argued that Bishops could enforce non-essential things, such as the style of vestments worn by clergy, but not essentials, such as belief in purgatory, which was for the individual to believe or reject.

Adiaphora is established as an explanatory model and applied as an exploratory model in *The Windsor Report*. Paragraph 88 endorses the understanding of *adiaphora* set out above. It was noted that transubstantiation was regarded as non essential, even though it is a core doctrine that divided the church. However, when the concept of *adiaphora* is combined with subsidiarity and authority this understanding is reversed.¹²² The report states that essential items need to be decided at a higher level and the decisions need authority.¹²³ While *adiaphora* has biblical and theological history, its combination with subsidiarity has no precedent. The combination of the two concepts of subsidiarity and *adiaphora* together reverses the theology of Melanchthon and the English reformers from a positive embracing of tolerance and individual conscience to a structural formalism. Whereas Melanchthon saw the notion of *adiaphora* as a way to compromise, in combination with subsidiarity it becomes a symbol of no compromise. In contrast to the diversity that Dickens claimed for its application by the English Reformers, it becomes legislative and authoritarian.

Authority in Anglicanism was not previously institutionalised with distinct "higher" levels and theoretically belief was ultimately the responsibility of individuals who were able to read the Bible for themselves. Subsidiarity is an innovation, which, while it was clearly

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 430.

¹²² *TWR*, 94.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 94-95.

present in *The Virginia Report*, had not been accepted by the Lambeth Conference. It was not supported in *The Windsor Report* by any further theological work.

Thus, *The Windsor Report* recommended the development of clearer authority structures that it saw as being rooted in the model of *The Virginia Report*. For example, *The Windsor Report* recommended that the Primates' Meeting should have "enhanced responsibility"¹²⁴ and become the "Primates' Conference – the Lambeth standing Committee."¹²⁵ They recommended the Archbishop of Canterbury have an authoritative role supported by a "Council of Advice."¹²⁶ They also recommended the adoption of an Anglican Covenant.¹²⁷ The covenant would, they argued:

Make explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between the churches of the Communion. The Covenant could deal with: the acknowledgement of common identity; the relationships of communion; the commitments of communion; the exercise of autonomy in communion; and the management of communion affairs (including disputes).¹²⁸

The main innovations of *The Windsor Report* were in the combination of the concept of subsidiarity with the requirement to define *adiaphora* and, more pertinently, those that were not. This led to a search for a centre of authority and to the suggestion of the formalising of relationships by the adoption of a Covenant.

4.3.3. Summary

The Windsor Report replicated many of the strengths and weaknesses of *The Virginia Report*. It is set out in a similar style and functions in a similar manner. Both are constructed to act as exploratory models, but fail to convince as explanatory models. This is highlighted in the simple reference to the significance of *adiaphora* to the English Reformers without the evidence of a sound foundation on critical studies.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 104, quoting from *To Mend the Net: Anglican faith and order for renewed mission*, by Drexel Gomez and Maurice Sinclair eds. (Carlton, Texas: Ekklesia, 2001).

¹²⁵ *TWR*, 106.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 108-112.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 113-120, especially 118-119.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 118.

Following *The Windsor Report* energy was released in practical action. These included the forming of a “Panel of Reference” to settle disputes in line with the idea of subsidiarity and *adiaphora*, moves towards the development of an Anglican Covenant, and the reinvigorating of a process of listening to the experience of gay and lesbian Christians.

The work of the Panel of Reference illustrates the problem of implementating subsidiarity. The panel followed up three cases that were deemed to require a “higher” authority to solve disputes that were intense and impossible to resolve at the local level. The panel met and gave judgements, but those on the losing side did not accept the judgements and appealed to alternative authorities, including the courts.¹²⁹ The “authoritative” decision of the panel did not result in any noticeable difference within the dioceses and the conflicts remained. The panel ceased its work in April 2008, because it was clear to all that it would not succeed.¹³⁰ The end of the Panel of Reference was not the end of the move towards authority structures in the Communion, but it illustrates the problem with such an approach in a voluntary community.

4.4. IATDC 2006¹³¹

The Lambeth Commission used money that had been intended for IATDC and so they were unable to meet between 2003 and 2006. In 2006 they intended to offer a theology of “covenant” along with a study of the role of bishops in communion. Three papers were produced: “Responding to the Proposal of a Covenant,” “The Anglican Way: The

¹²⁹ This can be illustrated by the judgement on the dispute in the Diocese of New Westminster. “13th October 2006 - Report on the Diocese of New Westminster” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/reference/docs/report_october.pdf. The parties have been in continued dispute since the report, going to civil courts in June and July 2009.

¹³⁰ “Panel of Reference,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/reference/index.cfm>.

¹³¹ “Theological Resources for Anglican ‘Communion’ Issues” (IATDC 2006), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/iatdc/docs/2006resources.cfm>. I was present as a staff member at this meeting of IATDC. In view of the subject matter of this PhD thesis, I was asked to prepare a paper on *koinonia* and Philippians that was distributed to the members. It was offered as a text for critical reflection. The group accepted the paper and included a conclusion from it. Paragraph 1.5 “Paul chooses a special term (‘koinonia’) that has both commercial and social implications to describe his covenant friendship with the Philippians. They were in ‘partnership’ together for the spreading of the gospel and the mission of the church to the Gentiles in God’s name. Although Paul and the Philippians are in different locations doing different tasks, they are nevertheless partners ‘in Christ’, sharing the risks as well as celebrating the successes of the gospel.” The implications of this were not fully considered.

significance of the Episcopal Office for the Communion of the Church,” and a “Summary Argument.” Focus here is on the first of these three papers with some supplement from the “Summary Argument.”

Once again the product of the commission can be seen in the terms of a model. The intention was to offer guidance to the process of covenant design following *The Windsor Report*.¹³² The paper replicates the style of the *Virginia* and *Windsor Reports*, and adopts the meta-narrative approach to the Bible, this time with a sharper focus on covenant. It is stated that God established the covenant with Abraham as a response to the fall.¹³³ The covenant is expressed in the law that established a covenant community,¹³⁴ and by the prophetic assertion of a new covenant of love fulfilled in Jesus,¹³⁵ who at the Last Supper inaugurated a new covenant community.¹³⁶ The practical living out of this community took the form of differing models,¹³⁷ including one based on the Essene community, and Pauline communities, such as the Philippian church.¹³⁸ It was recognised that the community of the early church was never perfect and marked by sharp disputes.¹³⁹

It is in this context that the significant principle of subsidiarity, and the required concepts of *adiaphora* and a locus of authority, are considered and developed further. Paragraph 1.7 sets up an interesting dynamic. The priority of unity is established as “a vital strand” for covenant living, but, as in *The Windsor Report*, it is the example of the expulsion of an individual for incest in 1 Cor. 5:8 which is offered as an example of something which intolerable, that is, not *adiaphora*.¹⁴⁰

¹³² Ibid., “‘Responding to the Proposal of a Covenant’ reflects on the biblical and ecclesiological background to the idea of covenant, and observes ways in which the concept of covenanting may be fruitfully employed to demonstrate a way in which Anglicans seek to stay together in times of controversy.”

¹³³ “Responding to a proposal of a covenant - October 2006,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/iatdc/docs/2006covenant.cfm>.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 1.3.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 1.4.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 1.4.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 1.5.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 1.5.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 1.6.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 1.7 see *TWR*, 4.

Subsidiarity is treated as a principle which has been accepted and a dependable basis for building the structures required for maintaining unity.¹⁴¹ To assist with criteria for deciding at which level a conflict should be considered, the commission reasserted three criteria that it had presented to the Primates in 2003.¹⁴² These were “intensity, extent and substance.”¹⁴³ To enable the interpretation of a covenant the group proposed “an instrument to interpret it.”¹⁴⁴ A new source of authority, an “interpretative body” was proposed. This would be a group of the best Anglican theologians, “people whose competence and wisdom as theologians was recognised and respected by all.”¹⁴⁵ In the case of making judgements on intensive, extensive and substantive issues, theologians who are respected by all are hard to find.

Once again the formation of the model is not open to scrutiny, except that previous models set out in *The Virginia Report* and *The Windsor Report* are accepted as exploratory models with their conclusions sharpened, but not questioned. The Anglican Communion has a wealth of experience in reconciliation ministry in Southern Africa, Northern Ireland, and Burundi, and through organisations such as the Society of the Cross of Nails, but none of this experience is drawn upon. Neither was the experience of marriage guidance experts sought. The imposition of solutions from impartial observers does not seem to have worked

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 3.2.

¹⁴² Ibid. See “Reflections offered to the Primates of the Anglican Communion” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/ecumenical/commissions/iatdc/20031015primates.cfm>. Paragraph 21. “A problem arises over innovations about which there are different views in the Church concerning the relative weight or significance to be accorded to a matter. Such are the matters in question. How ought the Church to proceed in such situations? A principle here might be that if the dispute is: intense (e.g. generates high degree of sustained and unresolved debate that threatens the unity of the Anglican Communion; or that requires urgent attention) extensive (e.g. not confined to one section or region of the Church; has significant implications for mission and ecumenical relations; has a wider social impact) and substantial (concerning an actual issue, and not for example, simply being generated by the media) then the matter cannot remain simply for the local Church (e.g. the diocese) to handle.”

¹⁴³ Ibid., 3.2.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 3.3.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 5.2. See, in contrast, David Beetge, “The future of the Anglican Communion” in *Christianity and Homosexuality – A Resource Booklet for Discussion* (London, St Martin-in-the-Fields, 2005), 14-18. Bishop Beetge was a member of the Lambeth Commission on Communion.

in international relationships or in resolving marriage disputes.¹⁴⁶ The proposal of *The Windsor Report* of a covenant is supported by IATDC, with a clear understanding that it will involve a move from a dynamic relationship model based upon mutual responsibility (as proposed by Warren and Bayne) to a structured model in juridical mode. It is envisaged that “higher” levels ruling on theological disputes will give clarity, make judgements that are authoritative for the whole church.

The IATDC report might not be thought of as significant. It did not have any official endorsement, and was not widely studied. However, three members of the Commission were members of the Covenant Design Group, and the consultant to the design group – Norman Doe – made frequent reference to it in his commentary to the Covenant for the 2008 Lambeth Conference.¹⁴⁷

4.5. The Application of *The Virginia Report* Model in the Covenant Drafts

An Anglican Covenant was suggested by the Lambeth Commission in paragraph 119 of *The Windsor Report*. The Covenant can be considered the application of *The Virginia* and *Windsor Reports* as exploratory models. The preparation of a final text for a Covenant is still in progress at the writing up stage of this thesis. The Covenant will be a valid subject for academic study in the future, and its effect on the Communion is unknown, so any study at this stage is both limited and temporal. As such, the final judgement on the usefulness of the Covenant and, by extension, the fruitfulness of *The Virginia* and *Windsor Report* model, will not be fully known for some time. However, there are indications as to the fruitfulness of the model as an exploratory model, in the acceptance or otherwise of the three drafts of the Covenant submitted to the Communion by the Design Group. The aim of this section is to

¹⁴⁶ Adam Kahane, *Solving Tough Problems – An Open Way of Talking, Listening, and Creating New Realities* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004). Kahane shows the complete fallacy of imposing thought out solutions to human conflict.

¹⁴⁷ Norman Doe, *An Anglican Covenant – Theological and Legal Considerations for a Global Debate* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008), 249-50. Over 30 references in the index.

offer a brief history of the development of the drafts and to focus on the discussion on the place of the model in the text.

Three drafts of an Anglican Covenant have been presented to the Communion. In 2005 the Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates' Meeting took up the proposal for a Covenant and commissioned a paper entitled "Towards an Anglican Covenant" that commended moves towards the development of a text.¹⁴⁸ The next meeting of the Joint Standing Committee appointed a Covenant Design Group to further the project. Five of the nine members of the Design Group had either been members of the Lambeth Commission on Communion or of IATDC. The chair, Drexel Gomez, had participated in writing *The Windsor Report*, as had the consultant Norman Doe and the secretary Gregory Cameron. Victor Atta-Baffoe and Katherine Grieb had contributed to *The Virginia Report* and were continuing members of IATDC. The first draft, the Nassau Draft,¹⁴⁹ was presented to the Primates' Meeting in February 2007.¹⁵⁰ It was circulated for study along with an introduction, commentary, and appendix. A year later the Design Group met again and produced the St Andrew's Draft.¹⁵¹ Due to the unavailability of two members of the original group, Ruby Nottage, who had been on the Lambeth Commission, and Eileen Scully, a member of IATDC, participated in the second round of drafting. The St Andrew's Draft was presented to the Lambeth Conference later that year. The next meeting of the Design Group, at Ridley College, Cambridge, focussed on the comments received from the

¹⁴⁸ "'Towards an Anglican Covenant.' A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of *The Windsor Report*" (2005), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/consultation/index.cfm>.

¹⁴⁹ "An Anglican Covenant Draft prepared by the Covenant Design Group" (2007), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/report/draft_text.cfm.

¹⁵⁰ "The Communiqué of the Primates' Meeting in Dar es Salaam 19 February 2007," *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/primates/resources/downloads/communique2007_english.pdf.

¹⁵¹ "An Anglican Covenant - St Andrew's Draft Text" (2008), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/st_andrews/draft_text.cfm.

bishops and in a document entitled “A Lambeth Commentary.”¹⁵² This document encouraged further study around the Communion and a consultation process that ended with the preparation of the Ridley Cambridge Draft (RCD).¹⁵³ The intention was for ACC –14 to approve the text for adoption in the provinces. However, the Council called for further consideration of section 4 and established a small working group, which is to report to the Standing Committee of the Communion in December 2009.¹⁵⁴

The history of the development of the text is also required to understand the significance of section 4. The introduction of the Nassau Draft maintained the meta-narrative style of both *The Virginia Report* and *The Windsor Report*, and placed the context of the Anglican Communion in the saving purposes of God.¹⁵⁵ The final paragraph of the “Report of the Covenant Design Group” claims that this process is not a new way of being Anglican, but a statement of what has always been. However, in the introduction it says “This (Anglican) Communion provides us with a special charism and an identity among the many followers and servants of Jesus.”¹⁵⁶ This is an innovation. Anglicanism has never previously claimed a special charism and identity separate to the Church Catholic.¹⁵⁷ The drafters appear to suggest that the Covenant will establish the Anglican Communion as a “Church” with an identity and charism, rather than a temporal expression of the one Church Catholic.

The Nassau Draft was composed of 7 sections. Sections 1 and 7 were a preamble and a declaration, which were omitted in the following drafts. Sections 2 to 5 described the reality of the Communion and evolved through the redrafting process into three sections in

¹⁵² “A Lambeth Commentary on the Saint Andrew’s Draft for an Anglican Covenant” (2008), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/a_lambeth_commentary.pdf.

¹⁵³ “An Anglican Covenant - The Third (Ridley Cambridge) Draft” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm>.

¹⁵⁴ ACC –14, “Resolution 14.11: The Anglican Communion Covenant.” The Standing Committee of the Communion was formerly the Joint Standing Committee of the ACC and the Primates. The change was made at the same ACC meeting.

¹⁵⁵ Nassau, “An Introduction to a Draft Text for an Anglican Covenant,” first paragraph.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ There are many texts to substantiate this claim. A good selection of them are found in Colin Podmore, *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (London: CHP, 2005) 38-41.

both the St Andrew's and Ridley Cambridge drafts. In his address to ACC-14 Archbishop Gomez indicated that these sections had won the overwhelming support of the Communion.¹⁵⁸ The subsections are linked by references to the historic formularies and sources of the Anglican Communion, such as the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral,¹⁵⁹ to other significant documents in the life of the Communion resulting from Commissions, the ACC, and Lambeth Conferences,¹⁶⁰ and to texts from the ecumenical movement.¹⁶¹ This gives them grounding in the traditions of the Church and, through that, to the biblical witness.¹⁶² There are questions as to the sufficiency of the models that shape this section, but there is recognition that such models are required.

In contrast, section 4 of the RCD has proved contentious. It is the key section for this thesis as it attempts to answer the question of how geographically and culturally separated churches might live together in one communion. The purpose of this study is to understand if the exploratory models used in the formation of the section are based upon reliable and relevant explanatory models. This process is more difficult as, in contrast to sections 1-3, there are no references made to external texts. The Covenant struggles with the complexity of allowing autonomous churches to live a common life of witness and worship.¹⁶³ Section 3 proposes a method that includes spending "time with openness and patience in matters of theological debate and reflection, to listen, pray and study with one another in order to

¹⁵⁸ "When you look at the Ridley Cambridge Draft, I think there is every reason why you at this meeting of the ACC should be able to agree with the bishops at the Lambeth Conference that the description of our Anglican inheritance and our Anglican mission is largely straightforward and uncontroversial." From "The Covenant: an Introduction by Archbishop Drexel Gomez. Address to ACC-14" (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.aco.org/acns/enclosures/Covenant%20Presentation%204%20May%20handout.pdf>.

¹⁵⁹ RCD, 1.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 2 and 3.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 3.

¹⁶² The Nasau Draft included a list of Bible verses at the beginning of each section. These were criticised in the response to the Covenant by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, as Presidents of the General Synod of the Church of England: "(6) The biblical texts currently at the beginning of each section of the Covenant should be omitted. They suggest a way of handling the biblical material that not all Anglicans share and it is not always clear how the texts relate to the material that follows. It would be better for biblical references to be integrated into the body of the text as in the case of the IATDC report on the Covenant." "Church of England Response to the Draft Anglican Covenant" (2008), *The Church of England*, <http://www.cofe.anglican.org/news/pr0108.html>.

¹⁶³ RCD, 3.2.2.

discern the will of God.”¹⁶⁴ This has roots in the traditions of the ACC,¹⁶⁵ and through that in the biblical witness. The following three sections speak of seeking a shared mind through engagement with the Instruments and Commissions of the Communion,¹⁶⁶ acting with care and caution¹⁶⁷ and, in situations of conflict, to participate in mediated conversations.¹⁶⁸

Section 4 of the RCD is intended to seek ways forwards when these actions break down. The following actions are proposed:

(4.2.1) The Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and of the Primates’ Meeting, or any body that succeeds it, shall have the duty of overseeing the functioning of the Covenant in the life of the Anglican Communion. The Joint Standing Committee may nominate or appoint another committee or commission to assist in carrying out this function and to advise it on questions relating to the Covenant.

(4.2.2) If a question relating to the meaning of the Covenant, or of compatibility to the principles incorporated in it, should arise, the Joint Standing Committee may make a request to any covenanting Church to defer action until the processes set out below have been completed. It shall further take advice from such bodies as it feels appropriate on the nature and relational consequences of the matter and may make a recommendation to be referred for advice to both the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting.

(4.2.3) If a Church refuses to defer a controversial action, the Joint Standing Committee may recommend to any Instrument of Communion relational consequences which specify a provisional limitation of participation in, or suspension from, that Instrument until the completion of the process set out below.

Such a process retreats from the more detailed procedures set out in the St Andrew’s Draft and shifts the responsibility for making decisions to implement “relational consequences” to the Joint Standing Committee rather than the Primates’ Meeting or the ACC.¹⁶⁹ However, it retains the notion of a centralised response to conflict, in line with the implications of subsidiarity as an exploratory model. The reliance on subsidiarity is made explicit in paragraph 55 of the Windsor Continuation Group Report to the Archbishop of

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 3.2.3.

¹⁶⁵ ACC –3, 55.

¹⁶⁶ RCD, 3.2.4.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 3.2.5.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 3.2.6.

¹⁶⁹ Submission to the Primate’s as an external council, which was implied in the Nassau draft, had been regarded as “unlawful” for the Church of England. See “Church of England Response to the Draft Anglican Covenant”: “From a Church of England perspective, Stephen Slack has confirmed that it would be unlawful for the General Synod to delegate its decision making powers to the Primates, and that this therefore means that it could not sign up to a Covenant which purported to give the Primates of the Communion the ability to give ‘direction’ about the course of action that the Church of England should take.”

Canterbury,¹⁷⁰ which was quoted by Archbishop Gomez in his address to ACC –14.¹⁷¹ The principle of subsidiarity remains the only discernible exploratory model underlying section 4 of the RCD. It has been shown that the principle of subsidiarity has no biblical basis, is not argued for theologically, has not been tested within the Christian tradition, and has not had universal consent in the secular world, but it is the driving force for section 4. As such Section 4 of the RCD is unlikely to be a sufficient explanatory model for mission relationships within the Anglican Communion.

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to seek to understand the sources of models for the Anglican Way, or “communion,” and to offer a critical commentary in order to see if they are sufficient as exploratory models. The analysis of historical developments demonstrates a desire to form theological models. *The Virginia Report*, even though it was not accepted by the 1998 Lambeth Conference, has acted as the model in style and in content for *The Windsor Report* and the Covenant design process. *The Virginia Report* acts as an abstract exploratory model based upon an approach that emphasises a biblical meta-narrative. It also offered the principle of subsidiarity as a model without reference to any biblical basis. As such *The Virginia Report* is not a single model but is treated as such.

This study has raised questions over the reliability of the model as an explanatory model. There is a lack of transparency in the process that led to the formulation of the model presented to the Communion. The real objects and interactions used to formulate abstract and impersonal statements are not open to investigation. In contrast there is evidence of a trend to use selected proof texts in the formulation of the meta-narrative. There is evidence also of a failure to engage with the fullness of Christian tradition when considering the use

¹⁷⁰ “The Windsor Continuation Group Report to the Archbishop of Canterbury” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/windsor_continuation/docs/WCG%20Report%20Final%20090105.pdf.

¹⁷¹ Gomez, “The Covenant.”

of *adiaphora*, and the failure to discuss the complexity of political thought surrounding subsidiarity. This raises questions as to whether the process of formulating *The Virginia Report* has been in the Anglican Way of discerning the mind of Christ as defined in the report itself. *The Virginia Report* defines the distinctive nature of the Anglican Way as accepting the authority of Scripture understood by tradition and reason. It is by no means clear that the riches of Christian thought have been fully applied to the consideration of Anglican identity.

In the previous chapter the declared aims of the PiM process were identified as an appropriate measure to judge the effectiveness of the process. It was shown that the process had failed to achieve these goals. This led to the conclusion that any model based on the process, such as the “Ten Principles,” was unlikely to be a useful exploratory model. It is not so simple to measure the model presented by both *The Virginia Report* and *The Windsor Report*. The full measure will be seen in the effectiveness of the Covenant, especially if the element of subsidiarity is incorporated into the final text. However, the lack of consensus over section 4 of the RCD indicates that there are potential problems ahead for the widespread adoption of the Covenant as it presently stands. This would represent some indication of unease with the underlying model.

In considering the failure of both mission partnership and Anglican identity we have seen that the failure to construct an adequate exploratory model from real objects and interactions has been a hindrance to both the process of forming mission partnerships and to developing an understanding of Anglican identity. The original architects of the modern Anglican Communion, Warren and Bayne, attempted to construct such a model, but the missional model was not communicated sufficiently well to enable planning and to critique action, and Bayne admitted to failing to offer any form of model for Anglican identity.

The missiological perspective is that Anglican identity and Anglican mission are interrelated. This is supported by William Temple’s famous statement that “The Church is

the only society that exists for the benefit of those who are not its members.” The point is emphasised by Emil Brunner who said: “The Church exists by mission, just as a fire exists by burning. Where there is no mission there is no church.”¹⁷² Identity and mission are intrinsically linked, and a model that works for one but stifles the other is unlikely to be fruitful. A consideration of partnership across the boundaries of geography, culture and unequal economics is a consideration of both mission and identity. The boundaries between the mission and identity are impossible to define, as where there is no mission there is no church.

The proposal of this thesis is that the Anglican Communion requires a biblical model of partnership across the divides of geography, economics and culture for both identity and mission. The construction of such a model cannot be by the simple application of proof texts, but has to take seriously critical methods of engagement with New Testament texts. This is the challenge for the following chapters in this thesis. In addition, as an effective exploratory model, any model will have to be fruitful in enabling planning. The aim is to develop an explanatory model that is applicable as an exploratory model for partnership across churches divided by geography, culture and economics in order to have a critical tool to consider the present situation and a tool for planning for future relationships.

¹⁷² Emil Brunner, *The Word and the World* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1931), 108.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. THE STUDY OF *KOINONIA* AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Introduction

The previous chapters of this thesis have shown that the Anglican Communion defined its relationship as one of mutual responsibility and interdependence, without a sufficient exploratory model. The lack of an exploratory model led to the reinforcement of relationships where power was retained in the hands of the older giving churches, with the newer receiving churches feeling that they had little to offer. We have seen that the response to crises in the life of the Communion was an attempt to construct guidelines within which the Communion's life could continue. The search for guidelines may be understood as a search for an exploratory model formed from an explanatory model. It is further argued that the products of the commissions appointed to find such a model did not offer adequate explanatory models. It has been noted that the Bible rarely featured in the search for such models.

The following three chapters will focus on the use of the Bible as a potential source of real objects and interactions from which to form an explanatory model. Some of those involved in the commissions referred to suggest that an adequate biblical model was behind the texts analysed, in the previous work on *koinonia* developed for bilateral and multilateral ecumenical conversations. This chapter investigates its potential. The chapter recognises the significance of the work on *koinonia* in the ecumenical sphere, but argues that the methodological issues surrounding the study of *koinonia* in the Bible demand an alternative approach.

5.1. *Koinonia* in Anglican Reports

Biblical scholars such as Mary Tanner, Patricia Kirkpatrick, and Tom Wright were influential members of IATDC, and the Lambeth Commission and had a significant role in laying the foundations for the discussion of the meaning of "communion." The basis of their

contribution to the debates was a study of *koinonia*. Mary Tanner was particularly influential and brought her extensive experience of the ecumenical movement to both the Eames Commission and IATDC. Tanner, an Old Testament scholar, was then the Moderator of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches (WCC). The WCC Faith and Order Commission was at the time concentrating on the concept of *koinonia* because it was providing a creative basis for bilateral and multi-lateral ecumenical conversations. She brought this experience to the Anglican commissions.

There were very good reasons for the ecumenical movement to use *koinonia* as a starting point in ecumenical discussions. It was argued that the concept was of central significance in the New Testament (especially in Paul), and it had the advantage of not being a locus of historic division.¹ It was not fundamental to the ecclesiology of any of the major denominations and allowed room for diversity.² As a result all the major documents of the Anglican Communion responding to divisions – *The Eames Report*,³ *The Virginia Report*,⁴ and *The Windsor Report*⁵ – sought to establish *koinonia* as the common ground on which unity could be recovered. Assumptions were made that because it had been a “useful lens” through which issues dividing Christian churches could be viewed, it would be a productive basis for considering the complexity of the Anglican Communion. Mary Tanner herself refers back to a paper on *koinonia* written in 1993 by the Lutheran biblical scholar John Reumann, and presented to the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order. This text was circulated among those working on Anglican commissions.

¹ “Common Statement of the Tenth Round of the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue,” *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*, <http://www.usccb.org/seia/koinonia.shtml>, para. 10.

² J. Reumann, “*Koinonia* in Scripture: Survey of Biblical Texts” Faith and Order Paper no. 166 in *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, eds. T. F. Best and G. Gassmann, (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994), 51-3.

³ *Women in the Anglican Episcopate: theology, guidelines and practice*. The Eames Commission and the Monitoring Group Reports (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1998), 14-34.

⁴ *The Virginia Report* in *ACC –10 Being Anglican in the Third Millennium, Panama 1996*, eds. N. Curie, and J. Rosenthal, (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1996), 2.13.

⁵ *The Windsor Report*, The Lambeth Commission on Communion (London: ACO, 2004), 4.

Reumann's work is a survey of biblical texts, a study of a word as a concept, with conclusions presented in the form of "Doxological Summaries," – a weaving together of biblical texts in prayer form.⁶ Establishing the meanings of words is a significant part of the work of biblical scholarship. It might be argued that a study of the biblical concept of *koinonia* would provide a sufficient explanatory model for the construction of an ecclesiology to be used as an exploratory tool for a church that defines itself as "communion" (one English translation of *koinonia*). However, the value of simplistic lexicographical studies has been questioned ever since Barr published *The Semantics of Biblical Language* in 1961.⁷

Reumann's study is described as "exhaustive" in the introduction to the paper and he draws upon a range of works in German, French, Italian and English. He makes direct reference to primary sources (including classical Greek texts) along with other lexicographical studies. There is no doubt as to the thoroughness of his work. However, there is the wider issue of the use to which the study is put, and a specific issue on the nature of the study, especially the use of doxological summaries.

The influence of Reumann's work is seen in *The Windsor Report*. His emphasis on the Corinthian correspondence as being the focus of *koinonia* theology is echoed in the opening section on biblical foundations. This explains the emphasis placed on 1 and 2 Corinthians in the text.⁸ The following sentence illustrates the way the concept of *koinonia* is used in *The Windsor Report*: "Paul reminds them that a faithful God has 'called them into the fellowship (*koinonia*, 'communion') of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord' ([1 Cor.] 1.9)."⁹ The use of the brackets reminds the reader that fellowship has a deeper meaning, an implied biblical perfection, which is then set as the ideal of communion – the very subject of the Lambeth Commission. Thus *The Windsor Report* portrays *koinonia* as an image of perfection towards

⁶ Reumann, "Koinonia," 53; 55; 56; 60.

⁷ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: OUP, 1961).

⁸ *TWR*, 4.

⁹ *Ibid.*

which the Communion should return.¹⁰ The use of brackets tends to elevate the word *koinonia* into an ideal concept. This is echoed in a paragraph defining the Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans: “We are a fellowship of people united in the communion (*koinonia*) of the one Spirit and committed to work and pray together in the common mission of Christ.”¹¹ The use of brackets and transliterated Greek once again conveys a notion that there is a biblical state of “fellowship” or “communion” defined by the true *koinonia* that needs to be recovered in the present era.¹² *Koinonia* is presented as a concept that defies translation, rather than a word with differing meaning in different contexts.

5.2. Methodological problems with the use of *Koinonia*

The elevation of a word to represent an ideal is a criticism Barr levelled at Kittel’s *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT)*. For Barr, the dictionary consistently confused the study of a concept with the study of a word.¹³ Kittel contended in the introduction to his *TDNT* that he was interested in more than what he called “external lexicography” or simple dictionary definitions of words. He talked of words having meaning above and beyond their use within texts, and considered the *TDNT* as an investigation of the “internal lexicography” of the words of the Bible.¹⁴ In contrast, Barr observed that meaning comes from context, not from words alone.¹⁵ Kittel does not explore what he means by “internal lexicography,” and so it takes on an almost mystical quality, appealed to by the use of the transliterated and bracketed *koinonia* in *The Windsor Report*. Barr complains that it is not clear in *TDNT* where the search for meaning of a word ends and the exploration of

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ GAFCON Final Statement June 28, 2008 – “A Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans,” available online: http://www.gafcon.org/news/gafcon_final_statement/.

¹² See also the use of *koinonia* in the VR.

¹³ Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics And Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989), 120.

¹⁴ Gerhard Kittel ed. Introduction to *TDNT*, I, vii.

¹⁵ Barr, *Semantics*, 249. Anthony Thiselton, “Semantics and New Testament Interpretation” in *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1979), 75-6.

concepts begins.¹⁶ The same is true of *The Windsor Report* and the GAFCON final statement.

Reumann was not to blame for the inappropriate use of his work, but in paragraph 7 of his own paper he presents his aim as being “to set forth biblical teaching on *koinonia* and related terms.” He continues by emphasising that for the church, the Bible is formative and authoritative. The impression is given that divisions will be bridged by jointly constructing “a possible ‘*koinonia* theology’ and ecclesiology.”¹⁷ When applied to the Anglican Communion, the sense is given that the rediscovery of true *koinonia* will return the Communion to the state it was in before the emergence of divisive issues such as the ordination of women, the acceptance of gay partnerships, and the ordination of an openly partnered gay man to the episcopate. The focus is then on the study of a word/concept from biblical texts, not the study of biblical texts from knowledge of the meaning of words and concepts.

Reumann follows Panikulam’s 1979 word study by distinguishing the New Testament concept from both Greek and Hebrew understandings.¹⁸ Panikulam argues that the New Testament introduces a new understanding of *koinonia* peculiar to itself.¹⁹ He proposes this based upon Hauck’s entries on *koinonia* and its cognates in *TDNT*.²⁰ For Panikulam, the New Testament offers the real sense of *koinonia* as opposed to the Old Testament and to Greek mythology, where the concept is said to be “disfigured.”²¹ This is an example of “theological lexicography” which was the initial impulse for word studies begun by Hermann Cremer in the late 19th Century.²² Panikulam removes the texts from their

¹⁶ Barr, *Semantics*, 207-211.

¹⁷ Reumann “*Koinonia*,” 40.

¹⁸ George Panikulam, *Koinonia in the New Testament - A Dynamic Expression of the Christian Life* *Analecta Biblica* 85 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁰ Friedrich Hauck “*koinonia*,” in *TDNT*, vol. 3, ed. G. Kittel, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 789-809.

²¹ Panikulam, *Koinonia*, 4.

²² Moises Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning – An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 23.

wider social and cultural context. Thiselton argues that to remove “propositions in the New Testament from the specific situation in which they were uttered and thereby to treat them ‘timelessly’ is not only bad theology: it is also bad linguistics.”²³ It can be assumed that Biblical writers such as Paul and John were neither reinventing the word or the concept of *koinonia*, even if they were applying them to fresh situations.²⁴

Reumann does argue that there was no one fixed understanding in the Greco-Roman culture of *koinonia* at the time of the New Testament. The word was used freely in common life and in a variety of ways by different groups aligned to a variety of philosophical schools.²⁵ However, this does not dissuade him from seeking a Pauline theology of *koinonia* and, even a New Testament theology of *koinonia*. The thrust of the paper is that there is a concept which is biblical *koinonia*, even though that concept cannot be contained in an English word, rather than the word *koinonia* being used in normal speech to communicate a variety of different meanings made clear by context.

Reumann reinforces the impression of a distinct New Testament concept of *koinonia* by emphasising the discontinuity with the Old Testament. He asserts that the New Testament notion of *koinonia* between humans and God is completely alien to the Hebrew Bible.²⁶ He does this by investigating Hebrew words which might have been possible to translate as *koinonia* in the Septuagint, and shows an absence, even an opposition, to the concept in the life of the people of Israel recorded in the Hebrew Bible. He avoids the “logico-grammatical parallelism,” the tendency to argue that ways of speech and writing, including the absence of words for some concepts, means that a community does not have the concept for which another community has a word.²⁷

²³ Thiselton “Semantics,” 79.

²⁴ Ibid., 23-4, Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics*, 110.

²⁵ Reumann “*Koinonia*,” 41.

²⁶ Panikulam, *Koinonia*, 4. Reumann “*Koinonia*,” 42.

²⁷ Thiselton, “Semantics,” 76-7, Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics*, 111-2.

The result is that *koinonia* is considered in discontinuity with both Greek culture and Jewish religious tradition. In his conclusion Reumann says: “*Koinonia* involved for the New Testament Christians the expression of a world of shared gospel experiences and associations in Christ and the Spirit, but presented in the vocabulary and ideas of Greek thought. Thus the Greek term was brought into the service of the gospel. The gospel, in turn, reshaped the social categories of that word.”²⁸ This discontinuity may not be as marked as he argues. Contact with Hellenistic culture slowly introduced the Greek concepts of *koinonia* into the thought and language of the people of Israel. At first the word was used to signify contact that must be avoided with those who were unclean. True Jews were told to avoid such *koinonia* with the unclean. Later on, however, the word was also introduced to signify the community of rabbis themselves. Those who climbed the grades entered into bonds of fellowship. Such terms began to be used in a religious context of those who took part in the Passover. Philo takes on the language in contrast with the tradition, and used *koinonia*, *koinoneo* and *koinonos* for the relationship between God and humans. Hauck comments, “the distance maintained in Israelite theology is in him [Philo] transformed into the proximity of the Greek world.”²⁹ The Essene community may have understood their communal meals as meals of fellowship with one another and with God.³⁰

Panikulam is likely to be mistaken when he says that Wisdom 8:18 is about “fellowship between man and man.”³¹ The book of Wisdom is considered a product of Alexandrian Judaism, written during the early period of the Roman domination of Egypt.³² It offers a similar context to the later writing of Philo, and is an indication of the growing influence of Hellenistic thought on Judaism. In chapter 8, wisdom is seen as having a

²⁸ Reumann “*Koinonia*,” 64.

²⁹ Hauck, “*Koinonia*,” 803.

³⁰ Brian Capper, “The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting - The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, vol. 4, ed. R.J. Bauckham, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 323-57.

³¹ Panikulam, *Koinonia*, 4

³² David de Silva, *Introducing the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 127-133.

personal quality and takes the personal pronoun “she.”³³ She is attributed with “sharing God’s life” (8:2) and choosing what God will do (8:4). It is a relationship with wisdom that the writer desires. In verse 18 he is able to talk of having “friendship” with her and of seeking her “society.”³⁴ De Silva sees the depiction of wisdom as affording “the most intimate fellowship between God and human beings. She participates in God and, entering human souls makes them friends with God (Wisdom 7:27-8)... She becomes the bridge by which human beings become connected to the Divine.”³⁵ Greek culture and thought had an influence upon Jewish concepts of God in Second Temple Judaism. It is likely that the Essene community further developed these concepts and possible that their ideas are taken up in the community of property in the Acts of the Apostles.³⁶

The literature of Second Temple Judaism, the writings of Hellenistic Jews such as Philo, and the accounts of the Essene communities, suggest a continuity not hinted at in Reumann’s account. It is unlikely that Paul introduced the notion of *koinonia* into Jewish religious dialogue: it is likely that he was in continuity with tradition, even if he introduced a new dimension linked with his understanding of the person of Christ.

A further issue in Reumann’s work is the use of the doxological summaries. Reumann concludes his study of the Pauline usage of *koinonia* with a translation from Italian of a weaving together of Pauline verses containing the word. This prayer was written by Ettore Franco in 1986 and translated into English by Reumann.³⁷

We return thanks to you, our Father
 because you have called us to communion with your son (cf. 1 Cor. 1:9)
 and because you have granted as the down payment [first instalment] of the Holy Spirit
 (cf. 2 Cor. 1:2, 13:13)
 to make of us,
 through communion with the body and blood of Christ,
 a single body, your church (cf. 1 Cor. 10:16-17).
 For this we pray you:

³³ de Silva, *Apocrypha*, 148.

³⁴ Translation from the New Jerusalem Bible

³⁵ de Silva, *Apocrypha*, 149.

³⁶ Capper, “The Palestinian Cultural Context,” 323-57.

³⁷ Reumann “*Koinonia*,” 53.

that in our participation in the Gospel (cf. Phil. 1:5) we may become effective
 in acknowledging all the good that is among us in relation to Christ (cf. Philemon 6)
 and that our love grow ever more (cf. Phil. 1:9)
 contributing to the needs of the poor (cf. Rom. 12:13)
 and being able with one mind to think the same thing (cf. Phil. 2:2)
 in manner becoming so through communion with the passion of Christ,
 co-participants in his resurrection (cf. Phil. 3:10-11; 1Cor. 1:7).
 To you be glory through Jesus Christ our Lord
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit
 now and forever. Amen.³⁸

This summary is undoubtedly useful, especially in an ecumenical forum. It allows common worship and leads to practical action. However, it leaves the process subject to “illegitimate totality transfer.”³⁹ Disparate verses from Pauline letters are combined to produce a synthesis. Thiselton says an illegitimate totality transfer occurs when “the semantic value of a word as it occurs in *one context* is *added* to its semantic value in *another context*; and the process is continued until the *sum* of these semantic values is then *read into a particular case*.”⁴⁰ Barr described this as the error of “assuming, for example, that the full New Testament concept of Church can be read into any one occurrence of the word *ekklesia* – such as Matt. 16:18.”⁴¹ Thiselton, following Barr, defines this as the “One word/one concept fallacy.”⁴² The summary carries the danger of presenting the meaning of *koinonia* in the totality of the combined verses. This is reinforced as Reumann “supplements” the core Pauline concept with additional material from the Johannine school, Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter and Acts. For each grouping he himself develops a doxological summary as a conclusion.

Thiselton argues that in one place the correct meaning of any term is that which contributes the least to the total context.⁴³ The danger of doing otherwise is that the totality defines the specific, rather than the specific adding to the totality. Reumann’s use of a doxological summary falls squarely into this trap. The “biblical” concept of *koinonia* is seen as the product of the whole. If there is a core concept of *koinonia* in the New Testament it is

³⁸ Ibid. Formatting as presented in the text.

³⁹ Barr, *Semantics*, 218.

⁴⁰ Thiselton, “Semantics,” 84, emphasis his.

⁴¹ Barr, *Semantics*, 218. See Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics*, 122.

⁴² Thiselton, “Semantics,” 85.

⁴³ Ibid., 84.

most likely to be discovered by an attempt to find commonality in usage, and, to use another mathematical idiom, to find the lowest common denominator.

Reumann's study remains significant and helpful in the life of the church. It was a basis for many exciting ecumenical dialogues because it gave common ground on which to discuss contentious issues. However, the problem identified in this thesis is not contentious issues dividing denominations, but how a church can realise the vision of mission partnership across divisions of geography, economics and culture. In 1963 the Anglican Communion was not split on theological lines, but it was split into "giving/older" and "receiving/newer" provinces. The failure to overcome those differences leads us to search for other methods to understand and develop policy for action.

The attempt to find a solution to the issues facing the Anglican Communion through a word study fails both the methodological standards set for New Testament Study and to meet the needs of the Communion. If the Bible is to be used to develop a model for partnership a different approach is required.

Conclusion

The search for an explanatory model for partnership in the study of the New Testament concept of *koinonia* appears attractive, especially to those who have used such a method in ecumenical conversations. However, methodological objections to the study of a presumed real object, the word *koinonia*, should not be overlooked. Respected biblical scholars, such as John Reumann, appear to have failed to take proper account of the scholarly consensus on semantic study in the construction of a *koinonia* based explanatory model. As such any ecclesiology developed from the model is likely to be insufficient.

The way *koinonia* was used as common ground in bilateral conversations gave hope to some that it might have the same role in the discussion of conflict in the Anglican Communion. However, this indicated a failure to understand the nature of the issues facing the Communion. The Communion was struggling to discover a way of partnership in

mission across divides of culture, economics and geography. The crises over issues arose in the context of confusion over inter-Anglican relationships, not just over differences in theological understanding.

This thesis proposes that the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi is an alternative real instance that can be used to distil an explanatory model. The Anglican Way of doing theology requires that biblical scholarship be taken seriously. The rejection of the concept of *koinonia* as a basis for an explanatory model of partnership is based on methodological objections. Missiologists have noted that “specialists in the respective disciplines of missiology and Pauline studies traverse disciplinary boundaries only infrequently.”⁴⁴ The following chapter explores this uneasy relationship and suggests a methodology for such engagement. The specific issues raised by a missiological study of Philippians seeking to utilise New Testament scholarship, is also discussed. Chapter 7 uses these conclusions in distilling an explanatory model.

⁴⁴ Kent L. Yinger “Paul and Evangelism – A Missiological Challenge from New Testament Specialists” *Missiology: An International Review*, vol XXXVII, no. 3 (July 2009): 393.

CHAPTER SIX

6. DEVELOPING MISSIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES FOR ENGAGING WITH NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP AND THEIR APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS

Introduction

The previous chapters of this thesis have established the need for an exploratory model to assist planning and critique action in developing partnership relationships in the Anglican Communion. Such a model requires the development of an explanatory model from an external real interaction. The Anglican Way of theology, as described by *The Virginia Report*, places the emphasis on the study of Scripture, understood by tradition and reason. This is taken to mean that Anglican theology should be biblically based and use the best scholarly tools available. A study of the concept of *koinonia* was rejected in the previous chapter, as it did not meet the standards set by biblical scholars, following James Barr.

This thesis is a missiological work, not a work of New Testament scholarship. Missiology is a relatively young discipline, and the relationships between the specialist subjects and missiology are still evolving.¹ The use of New Testament texts will be in critical continuity with missiologists such as Roland Allen (*Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?*),² Andrew Walls ("The Ephesian Moment"),³ and David Bosch (*Transforming Mission – Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*).⁴ However, the demands of the Anglican Way require a deeper engagement with biblical scholarship than has been usual in missiology. New Testament scholarship is of vital importance if the real instance of the relationship between Paul and the Philippian community is to be investigated with integrity.

The first task of this chapter is to establish the relationship between the interdisciplinary generalism of missiology and the specialism of New Testament scholarship.

¹ For an account of the development of missiology see Craig Van Gelder, *The Missional Church in Context: Helping Congregations Develop Contextual Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 13-27.

² Roland Allen *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962).

³ Andrew Walls "The Ephesian Moment" in his *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002), 72-84.

⁴ David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (New York: Orbis, 1991).

The second task is to apply those principles to the study of Philippians. The aim is to establish a methodological base for the development of an explanatory model in chapter 7.

6.1. Developing Missiological Principles for Engaging with New Testament Scholarship

Robert Plummer describes the problematic relationship between missiologists and New Testament scholarship in the introduction to his book *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission*.⁵ He argues that many New Testament scholars “judged missionary topics as only peripherally important,” and that “existing studies devoted exclusively to missionary subjects rarely meet the demands of rigorous biblical theology.”⁶ In his survey of previously published material relevant to his subject he observes that “while New Testament scholars have neglected missionary themes, missiologists have produced mainly more popular works and have failed to construct a well-crafted Biblical theology of mission.”⁷

Plummer identifies David Bosch as an exception to this generalisation, and Bosch provides a beginning point for a search for method. As early as 1985, Bosch identified the problem of the failure of interaction between missiology and New Testament scholarship.⁸ In setting out his hermeneutical principles in *Transforming Mission*, Bosch draws on the work of Fiorenza to challenge the notion that “the New Testament writings are primarily ‘documents of an inner-Christian doctrinal struggle’ and early Christianity as ‘confessional’ history.”⁹ Instead he agrees with Hengel that “the history and theology of the early church are, first of all, ‘mission history’ and ‘mission theology’.”¹⁰ He does not deny that theological conflict within the early church is reflected in the writings, but argues that the most significant difference between the writers is their differing missiological approaches and interests. These are possible to see as complementary missiological perspectives, rather

⁵ Robert, L. Plummer *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 2-5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ David J. Bosch, “Mission in Biblical Perspective,” *International Review of Mission* vol. 74 (1985): 531-8.

⁹ Bosch, *Transforming*, 15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

than theological arguments. He does this, not to paper over real disagreements, but places the conflicts in the context of active evangelism and the founding of new churches.

Bosch argues that missiology has been influenced by missionaries who naturally identify with Paul as he is portrayed in the New Testament. Missionaries identify with both the “biographical” picture of Paul in Acts, and Paul the writer of letters. Bosch argues that the story of Paul the missionary being called in to Europe by “the Macedonian man,” set the paradigm for the modern missionary movement.¹¹ Missiology has tended to paper over the critical complexities of the historical reliability of Acts and assumed Pauline authorship for all letters bearing his name. On the other hand, biblical scholarship has not always recognised the missionary dimension of Paul's theology. Biblical scholars and preachers often treat his works as if they were primarily concerned with dogmatic systems.¹²

The premise of this work is that Bosch is correct in saying that the theology and practice of the New Testament are not separable as theory and practice, but are inseparable as “missionary theology.”¹³ This has been the assumption of most missiologists since Roland Allen published *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* in 1912. Allen contested that the biblical account of Paul's method of evangelism, and the formation of indigenous churches, should be replicated in modern missionary practice. He presented the case for considering evidence of how Paul behaved, as recorded in Acts and in Paul's letters, as of equal significance to his “teaching.” The next two chapters seek to understand how Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi related to one another, not just what Paul taught about partnership, but how he lived it out.

Missionary Methods was intended as an outright attack on the common procedures of the missionary era and, as such, was a direct attack on those who worked with Allen and those who ran the missionary societies which had sent him and others to “unreached” places.

¹¹ Ibid 339-40. See Acts 16:9.

¹² Ibid., 124.

¹³ Ibid.

Not surprisingly the executives of missionary societies were eager to undermine his methodology. In his preface to the 1927 edition Allen finds himself “surprised and pleased to find that little fault was found with my statement of the Apostolic practice.” His response was to their objection that Paul’s context was far removed from the context of their time.¹⁴ The challenge for this work remains the same as that for Allen, first to discover the reality of the practice, and second to establish a link between that and the present context. The scrutiny of the reconstructed “Apostolic practice” outlined in this thesis is expected to be more vigorous than that given to Allen’s reconstruction and is the focus of chapter 7. The second question of applicability is left for chapter 8.

Since Allen, missiologists have considered the significance of both word and deed in the New Testament, investigating and seeking to apply mission theology as theory and practice. Zac Niringiye – who has combined the work of evangelist and missiologist with that of an executive of a mission society and latterly a bishop – puts it like this: “We should not fall into the false dichotomy between theology and practice; between substance and form; between word and works.”¹⁵ For him Jesus and the first disciples are the standard for contemporary proclamation praxis.

These assumptions are one indication of the continuing influence of *Missionary Methods* in the English-speaking church.¹⁶ Almost a hundred years after first being published it is still in print and reads with a freshness that amazes successive generations. It is regarded as essential reading for any serious missiologist, and its method is assumed by many to be a successful paradigm. It was commended by the ACC for study,¹⁷ was formational in the thinking of significant people such as Lesslie Newbigin, the pioneer of the

¹⁴ Allen, introduction to *Methods*, vii.

¹⁵ D. Zac Niringiye, “To Proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom (ii),” in *Mission in the 21st Century*, eds. Andrew Walls and Cathy Ross (London: DLT, 2008), 12.

¹⁶ Robert Plummer, *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 8.

¹⁷ ACC – 6, *Bonds of Affection, Proceedings of ACC –6, Badagry, Nigeria, 1984*, 12-3; 62-3.

Church of South India and a popular missiologist,¹⁸ and is often quoted in sermons.¹⁹

However, the tendency to broad-brush assumptions and the failure to engage in any serious critical study has meant that the study is sidelined by New Testament scholarship. Although F.F. Bruce quotes an identical passage from *Missionary Methods*, both in a general work on Paul and in a commentary on Acts,²⁰ until Plummer, Allen is virtually ignored by other scholars. Until recently New Testament scholarship and missiology have inhabited separate worlds with very little interaction.

This divide should be a concern for both missiologists and biblical scholars. Allen was able to say that his picture of Paul's method was correct, without scrutiny from biblical scholarship. For example, he assumes an absolute continuity between the account of Paul's mission in Acts and the accounts in Paul's letters. In contrast, when E.P. Sanders (in a popular work) considers Paul's missionary strategy, he immediately draws the reader's attention to the conflict between the account in Acts and the words of Paul himself in his letters.²¹

Conversely, Sanders makes no use of contemporary missiological experience in attempting to reconstruct Paul's strategy. Sanders postulates that Paul evangelised a town by renting a room, plying his trade of sewing leather tents, and using the opportunity to talk with whoever came in or walked past.²² Paul makes a number of references to tentmaking in his letters,²³ and associates his manual work with his hardships.²⁴ Some commentators see

¹⁸ Lesslie Newbigin *Unfinished Agenda – an Autobiography* (Geneva: WCC, 1985), 166.

¹⁹ For example, "Presiding Bishop preaches at eucharist, UTO ingathering July 12, 2009," *The Episcopal Church*, http://www.episcopalchurch.org/79901_112412_ENG_HTML.htm

²⁰ F.F. Bruce, *Paul, Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 18. F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 68.

²¹ E.P. Sanders, *Paul* (Oxford: OUP, 1991), 19.

²² Bosch, *Transforming*, 20.

²³ 1 Cor. 4:12; 9:1-18; 2 Cor. 6:5; 11:23 and 27; 1 Thess. 2:9; 2 Thess. 3:8. Also referred to in Acts 18:3; 20:34-35.

²⁴ 1 Cor. 4:10-12 and 2 Cor. 11:27.

the hours spent in work as a distraction from the separate work of proclamation.²⁵ Other scholars, considering 1 Thess. 2:9, agree with Sanders' reconstruction,²⁶ but none of the commentators ask of missiology if such a method would be effective. The method does not seem to accord with any theory relating to the rapid spread of the gospel.²⁷ As it appears not to be replicable it is unlikely to have been effective. We know that Paul was effective, otherwise his works would not have been collected, and this places questions on the reconstruction. Allen shows little understanding of the nature of the New Testament writings, and Sanders of the realities of rapid evangelistic expansion in "unreached" places.

As Plummer and Bosch point out, missiologists are themselves complicit in this comfortable division. Allen made little engagement with the biblical scholarship of his time. While he has a few references to Harnack's commentary on Acts, most of his numerous references to the Bible depend upon his own interpretation based upon a classical education that he obviously felt gave him adequate insight into the world of the New Testament. Contemporary missiologists continue to use New Testament texts without reference to New Testament scholarship. Andrew Walls' essay "The Ephesian Moment" displays no interaction with Ephesian scholarship. Walls avoids critical questions of authorship by concentrating on a reconstruction of an event (which he describes as the "Ephesian moment"), without engaging with critical questions. He manages to avoid questions of authorship by simply omitting any reference to the author. He argues for the significance of the "moment" as a historical reality, without entering into discussion of when that "moment" might have been, or even if it really happened.

Zac Niringiye is one of many missiologists writing in the collection of essays *Mission*

²⁵ For example: Robert Thomas, "1 Thessalonians," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, ed. F. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 254. Also, Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 73.

²⁶ Charles Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians* NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 104. Also Paul Barnett, "Tentmaking," in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 926.

²⁷ See F.F. Bruce, *Paul, Apostle*, 18.

in the 21st Century, published for the 2008 Lambeth Conference. Many of them make extensive use of the Bible, but none make any reference to biblical scholarship as they interpret biblical verses. Some do engage with hermeneutical theory – referencing works on liberation or feminist hermeneutics by writers such as West, Lee, Schussler-Fiorenza and Sugirtharajah in their essays – but when they seek to apply the praxis of Jesus or Paul sourced from New Testament texts, there is no demonstration of engagement with critical scholarship.

In *Transforming Mission*, Bosch demonstrates an awareness of the limitations of such an approach. For example, in his methodology he follows Saunders rather than Allen in ruling out fusing the Paul written about in Acts with Paul the writer of letters. He recognises that Acts is a secondary source, not to be confused with primary source material. However, his concern also seems to be to avoid difficult questions and, like Walls, he avoids critical questions of authorship. Therefore, when reconstructing Paul’s method he restricts himself to a consideration of the seven letters regarded by scholarship as indisputably genuine and ignores all others.²⁸

It is true that Bosch does establish his hermeneutical principles, and in doing so engages with New Testament scholarship. He offers a brief history of form and redaction criticism, illustrating the subjectivity of the results of their search for the real Jesus.²⁹ In contrast he proposes “critical hermeneutics” as a step beyond the work of social-scientific scholars such as Theissen and Meeks. He regards their work as vital in assisting understanding, but flawed, as they always remain on the outside looking in. In contrast “the critical hermeneutic approach goes beyond the (historically-interesting) quest of making explicit early Christian self-definitions... It desires to encourage between those self-

²⁸ Bosch, *Transforming*, 123.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 20-2.

definitions and all subsequent ones, including those of ourselves and our contemporaries.”³⁰ Bosch argues that there is no objective reality, but that reality is “*intersubjective*” and, as such, always open to interpretation.³¹ This conclusion leads him into a search for the self-definition of Jesus, witnessed to by the self-definition of believers changed by their belief. This complex philosophical basis results in the conclusion that: “The point is that there are no simplistic or obvious moves from the New Testament to our contemporary missionary practice.”³² Bosch accepts that there is a correlation between the New Testament and missionary practice, but contends that it is not simple relationship; an implicit critique of Allen.

However, while Bosch engages in a dialogue with New Testament scholarship, his own “critical hermeneutic” is ultimately dependent upon missiologists such as Schottroff and Stegemann and an unpublished thesis in Afrikaans by South African DT Nel, not to established hermeneutical methodology.³³ When he discusses biblical texts the vast majority of his references to secondary texts are to missiological works and not to works by biblical scholars. Bosch offers a vision that the gap can be bridged, but he is still firmly a missiologist. His method has strengths and validity, but Bosch maintains a separation from New Testament scholarship.

The temptation for the missiologist is to tread this well-worn path and to focus on the interaction between method in the Bible and method today, treating the text as open to direct interpretation and nimbly avoiding complex critical controversy by skirting round critical issues. However, the Anglican Way requires deeper engagement and demands more of the missiologist. A requirement for the development of an explanatory model is a real instance, fully recognising that any “reality” is always open to interpretation. If a real instance is taken from the Bible, then the questions biblical scholars ask of a text are vital. Questions as to the

³⁰ Ibid., 24.

³¹ Ibid., emphasis his.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., 22 and 24.

meaning of words, the literary form, and historical, sociological and cultural contexts cannot be ignored. A genuine test of the reconstruction of Paul's method cannot ignore the wealth of biblical scholarship, however inconvenient it might be for the missiologist.

It is not a simple and straightforward task for missiologists to use New Testament scholarship, as there are serious methodological difficulties. Three significant ones present themselves. Firstly, there is no consensus within Biblical scholarship. There is not *a* single answer from biblical scholarship on almost any subject. The missiologist is faced with an array of publications, using a number of hermeneutical methods, each resulting in more than one opinion. This perhaps is the reason Walls skirts over the authorship and date of Ephesians. There is no scholarly consensus that can be relied upon, and therefore he avoids the question.

Secondly, the consensus among missiologists that Paul was writing mission theology is not shared by all New Testament scholars. New Testament scholarship has its own concerns, and the priorities of New Testament scholarship are not the same as those of missiology. This means that much of the content of books and papers seems irrelevant to the missiologist, and gives the impression that missiology is also irrelevant to New Testament scholarship.

Thirdly, the dynamic of the missiologist engaging with New Testament scholarship cannot leave the interpretation unchanged. The practical testing of the theory forces the theorist to amend and review and, as such, the distinctions begin to blur. The missiologist will ask questions that challenge New Testament scholarship. For example, when Sanders contends that Paul could have engendered a mass missionary movement by renting a room and chatting with some passers-by, the missiologist will ask questions about replicability. This reconstruction may be a possible interpretation of the New Testament text, but the missiologist will ask if it is realistic as a method for the conversion of so many in such a short period of time. A positive answer will offer a direction for mission activity, but a

negative one should challenge the scholar to consider further options for interpretation and reconstruction.

These difficulties should be acknowledged and consciously engaged with for the Bible to be taken seriously as a source for missiological thinking. The temptation to avoid engagement leads to a limitation on the potential for mutual enlightenment. Bosch does not use all the New Testament texts because he does not want to make a judgement on who wrote them, and so runs the danger of ignoring information useful to his project. Walls does not identify the time or writing of Ephesians, which leaves the reader with nagging doubts as to the reality of his “moment.” Helpful though his analysis is of our present day reality, questions remain as to whether the “Ephesian moment” is anything more than an illustration rather than a source.

The opportunity of engaging with New Testament scholarship and the problems outlined above require the missiologist to consciously admit the difficulties. The following principles may assist.

First, the missiologist is forced to make judgements on the range of material presented. The missiologist will have no special linguistic insights and will be dependent on the New Testament scholar for the historical or cultural contexts of texts. However, it is the responsibility of the New Testament scholar to present a case, not only to their peers, but also to those who seek to use their work in other contexts. A reasonable expectation of scholarship is that the presentation of arguments is comprehensible and open to scrutiny.

Second, confidence is required in the scholarly and practical consensus of missiology that the New Testament is missiological at its root. Any hermeneutical method that ignores this is of little use to the missiologist. It is the consensus of missiologists that the texts of the New Testament were written in the context of mission and for the cause of mission. The consequence is that the text is used as a mirror rather than a window – the approach of many

historical-critical studies.³⁴ The missiologist often looks to understand the texts that make sense in the context of mission, and is tempted to choose a method that offers the best hope of producing a desired result. In response, a healthy hermeneutic of suspicion is vital if a process of interpretation is to be more than the confirmation of conventional wisdom and prejudice. Burrige's alternative to seeing texts as windows or mirrors is the proposal of using texts as "stained glass."³⁵ This involves the recognition that the glass can be seen through, but what lies on the other side is coloured by it and sometimes indistinct. Also, that while it will reflect light, again it is not a perfect mirror. Burrige encourages the interpreter to consider the picture itself. He proposes Christology as the key to gospel hermeneutic.³⁶ Missiology will be proposed as the key for a hermeneutic of Philippians. The picture in the stained glass is of Paul encouraging communities towards a common life for a missiological goal. The communities are both those he is directly addressing behind the glass and those presently reading in front of the glass.

Third, it should be expected that confidence in the results of missiological thinking might lead to interpretative innovation. The impact of feminist, African and Asian voices in the hermeneutic method is well known; the perspective of a missiologist is likely to be similarly challenging. However, if the missiologist proposes an exegesis distinct from all New Testament scholarship, then he or she is entering into that world and will be required to demonstrate competence in that field, including depth of linguistic study, hermeneutic method and expertise in the culture of the world of the New Testament. Without those skills the best course will be to refer questions and not solutions back to New Testament scholars for further engagement.

³⁴ Richard Burrige, *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive approach to New Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans: 2007), 23. "However, in recent decades has been a reaction to the use of the gospels as 'windows' to look at what lies behind the text. After all, we do not know who wrote them, or when or for whom. What historical critics think they see *behind* the text may just be their own concerns reflected *in front of* the text. Thus many modern literary approaches view texts as more like *mirrors* than windows."

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 24-5.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 25.

The missiologist has a final task separate from the Biblical scholar: the demonstration of the usefulness of the exercise in practical reality. The real test of continuity between the time of the New Testament and our present realities is in the use of the model as an exploratory tool. This is the question of replicability as the question moves from “is it true?” to “is it helpful?” Allen’s critics objected to his method because they thought it could not be applied, while others have been excited by it because they could see the value of its application in the replication of Paul’s missionary methods.

The aim of this thesis is to construct a replicable model to be used as an exploratory model. The construction of the explanatory model requires the application of the principles outlined above. To build a model of partnership, a real instance is sought which might be considered a successful partnership in mission. The record of the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi (the letter of Paul to the Philippians) offers the best hope of discovering the dynamics of such a relationship. In the following section we will seek to understand how the application of the above principles to Philippian scholarship might enable us to develop a model.

6.2. Philippians - New Testament Scholarship and Partnership

It is a common missiological assumption that Paul’s letter to the Philippians is a single communication between two partners engaged in a common global missionary endeavour expressed by each in their locality.³⁷ This conclusion is reached by a *prima facie* reading of the text. Concern for those who experience and proclaim the gospel permeates the letter. Those partnering in the gospel are identified as the Philippians (1:5), Paul himself (even when he is in chains) (1:7, 12), new partners preaching out of rivalry and pure motives (1:15-18), Timothy (2:22), Epaphroditus (2:25) and Euodia and Syntyche (4:2-3). Paul’s concern is that the life of the community witnesses to the gospel in unity (1:27-2:18 and 4:2-

³⁷ This is the premise of John Hargreaves in his *A Guide to Philippians* TEF Study Guide, 18 (London: SPCK, 1983).

3) and gentleness (4:5). He interprets the gift given by them in terms of a gift to God for mission and not as a gift to him (4:10-20). The warnings in chapter 3 are against abandoning the gospel in action and proclamation.

This reading underlies the missiological hermeneutical approach of this thesis, which has similarities and differences to reader-response criticism. Reader-response criticism can be seen in some forms as a rejection of the possibility of obtaining knowledge of the authorial intention, and as a rebellion against the dominance of historical criticism.³⁸ Here the assumption made is that missionary activity is the uniting context of author, initial readers and present readers. As such, the reader-response of those presently engaged in mission is a significant hermeneutical perspective alongside the historical context of writer and intended reader. This contrasts with some forms of feminist, queer or black criticism that sets a requirement for a hermeneutic of suspicion because it is argued that the Bible is primarily interpreted by straight, white men and written by straight, white men. This is not to deny the insight of such approaches, but the key difference for any missiological approach is a belief in the continuity in mission activity, then and now. This approach values historical criticism in its variety of forms, as it provides a method to develop understandings of the past context from the social context and the literary form of the text. Transcultural missiologists constantly move from one context to another, and work with people using diverse reasoning and language, so they are well aware of the significance of such expertise.

However, the missiologist is immediately confronted by two problems when attempting to use the work of Philippian scholarship. Firstly, there is no consensus on the key historical and literary issues surrounding the text, and secondly, not all New Testament scholars share the missiological perspective of this thesis.

³⁸ Paula Gooder, *Searching for Meaning – An Introduction for Interpreting the New Testament* (London SPCK: London, 2008), 127.

When the missiologist engages with Philippian scholarship there is a realisation that the scholarly debate is not only about the text but also about the history of critical scholarship itself, and the history of Philippian scholarship in particular. All works of scholarship engage not only with the text, but also with the history of interpretation, thus creating a reception history. Although it would be very helpful as a missiologist to be able to pick up a book on the present consensus on Philippians from New Testament scholarship, such a work does not exist because there is no consensus. Entries on "Philippians" in *The Cambridge Companion to Paul*, or *The Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* seek to offer the reader the balance of arguments, but, by offering all sides in a debate, they highlight the impossibility of consensus.³⁹

6.2.1. The Integrity and Purpose of Philippians

The debate over the *integrity* or *unity* of the canonical letter to the Philippians can serve to illustrate this point. Any simple assumption that the text of the letter is a single entity is challenged by engagement with scholarship. The proposition that the canonical letter of Philippians is composite was well known in the 19th century, but it came to prominence in the 1950s with the publication of five studies in German, English, and French, advancing a three-letter theory.⁴⁰ In the following years the three-letter theory received backing from an impressive group of scholars most recently by John Reumann in his 2008 commentary.⁴¹ The list of scholars who in response asserted a single letter theory is equally

³⁹ For example, the author of the entry on Philippians in *The Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* is G.F. Hawthorne, one of the very few major scholars who argues for Caesarea as the location for Paul's imprisonment when writing the letter. He concludes his entry with support for his view glossed as a consensus approach (when it is a minority view). Gerald Hawthorne, "Letter to the Philippians," in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 709-11. In contrast Morna Hooker writing in *The Cambridge Companion to Paul* opts for Rome, thus demonstrating that consensus is unachievable. Morna Hooker "Philippians" in *The Cambridge Companion to Paul*, ed. James Dunn (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 105-6.

⁴⁰ Jeffery Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians – Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity* JSNT Supplement Series 136 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 124-31.

⁴¹ Reed lists over thirty scholars in support of a three-letter construct. *Ibid.*, 128. See also John Reumann, *Philippians – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible Commentary (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008).

significant.⁴² Reed concludes that: “There is no firm scholarly consensus on the issue of integrity, if such a measurement is possible; however the boundaries are clearly drawn, resulting in several significantly different readings of Philippians.”⁴³

The proponents of the three-letter theory point to the awkward shift in tone in the transition to chapter 3, and the strangeness of the thank you note that concludes the canonical letter. In the English language one of the most influential proponents of the composite letter theory was F.W. Beare.⁴⁴ His argument is that there is strong internal evidence of disjointedness within the canonical letter at two significant points. The first is at the beginning of chapter 3, where in v. 1 Paul seems to finish a section using the words *to loipon*, translated “and finally” in the then influential RSV – and *khairete*, which can mean either “rejoice” or “farewell.” For Beare “farewell” seems to combine with “and finally” to represent an end.⁴⁵ From 3:2 Paul changes tone as he launches into a harsh condemnation of his opponents. He then returns to complete the greetings in 4:4. The second disjunction is a letter of thanks from 4:10 to the end. Thus Beare postulates three letters with 3:2 - 4:4 as an interpolation from a second letter, and 4:10-20 as a distinct third letter. He maintains that all three were written by Paul and at around the same time, but put together by a redactor.

The consequence of Beare regarding 4:10-20 as a separate letter is that he treats it as an entirely different entity and interprets it without reference to the rest of his commentary.⁴⁶ His reconstruction of the history places the writing of the thank you note immediately after the arrival of Epaphroditus and with the other two letters sent back later with him. His grounds for the reconstruction is that “It is inconceivable that the Apostle should never have

⁴² Reed lists over seventy scholars who have written in support of the single-letter position, including major commentators such as Hawthorne, Fee, and O’Brien. Reed, *Discourse*, 129.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ The commentary is frequently referred in the commentaries of Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, WBC vol. 43 (Waco: Word, 1983), Peter T. O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), Marcus Bockmuehl, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (London: A and C Black, 1997) and Gordon D. Fee, *Paul’s Letter to the Philippians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), and its agenda set the foundations for their responses.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 3-4. See a full account in Loveday Alexander, “Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians,” *JSNT* 37 (1989): 96-97.

⁴⁶ Beare, *Philippians*, 149-57.

acknowledged its [the gift's] receipt during the months that must have passed before Epaphroditus recovered from his dangerous illness and was ready to travel home again.”⁴⁷ It is not clear that the cultural construct that makes the immediate acknowledgement of a gift “inconceivable” is that of 1st century Greco-Roman culture, or of 20th century Western European culture.

An early criticism of Beare’s hypothesis was the improbability of three letters being sent from Rome to Philippi in the relatively short time-frame of Paul’s imprisonment there. In order to support the three-letter thesis Reumann hypothesises that Paul writes from Ephesus and so is able to maintain a steady flow of communication.⁴⁸ He then constructs an “assumed” situation for the interpretation of 4:10-20 as the first of the three letters, and even a “speculative” reconstruction of the Philippian letter that might have accompanied the gift.⁴⁹ In doing so the presumed nature of the letter leads on to a historical reconstruction, which in turn determines Reumann’s interpretation.

Responses in support of the unity of the letter have been varied. Some have conceded the discontinuity in the letter, and, while asserting its integrity, effectively interpret it as three letters combined in one, without a common theme. Others have proposed a rhetorical framework, which places the focus of the letter on division and disunity. A third group has seen the literary form of the letter as a letter of friendship.

Hawthorne’s response is typical of the first grouping. He concedes that the merging Pauline letters was not unheard of,⁵⁰ and that it is likely that Paul wrote more than one letter to his most favoured community. However, while this is true, it merely admits a possibility of it being a composite letter. Some evidence had emerged in the tradition that there were

⁴⁷ Ibid., 4, see also 150.

⁴⁸ Reumann *Philippians*, 7. Rome is considered by most scholars to be the location of Paul when he wrote *Philippians*.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 699-700.

⁵⁰ Pointing to Romans 16 and 2 Corinthians. Hawthorne, introduction to *Philippians*, xxx.

more than one letter written by Paul to the Philippians,⁵¹ but the evidence is weak and again only opens the possibility of the insertion of a letter, rather than providing definitive proof.⁵² Questions arise as to why the two letters would not have been kept distinct, and why the one would have been placed within the final greetings of the other. He argues that the three-letter construction gives as many problems as it tries to solve.

Hawthorne recognises that the argument is centred on the “closing remarks” in 3.1, the disjointedness of 3.2-4:4, and the incongruity of the thank you note at the end. In response he also challenges the RSV translation of *to loipon* in 3:1 as “finally.” Rather, he argued, it should be translated as “and now,” “furthermore” or “well then” (Hawthorne’s preferred choice).⁵³ *Khairete* can be translated “farewell” or “rejoice.” Hawthorne argues for the latter, thus connecting rather than disjointing the following section from the rest of the letter.⁵⁴ In considering chapter 3 he points out the thematic, conceptual and linguistic links between it and the rest of the letter.⁵⁵ Hawthorne depends upon a lexicographical approach to counter the first disjunction.

Hawthorne shares the cultural perspective with Beare in regarding the position of the thank you note as an anomaly. He differs from Beare in his belief in the integrity of the letter as a single whole. As such he seeks a significant reason for a note of thanks to be placed at the end of the letter rather than the beginning.⁵⁶ In order to do this he postulates an exegesis that paints Paul as a reluctant receiver who delivers a “thankless” thanks. This is to develop an interpretative solution to this problem in order to accommodate 4:10-20 as a part of the single letter. He talks of Paul being “troubled” by the gift and reluctant to address the issues

⁵¹ Ibid. Hawthorne refers to an “ancient Syriac stichometry” and Polycarp’s remark in his epistle to the Philippians (3.2) that Paul had written letters (plural) to them.

⁵² Ibid., xxx-xxxi.

⁵³ Ibid., 123-4.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 124. Alexander gives fuller and compelling support to Hawthorne’s translation. Alexander, “Letter forms,” 96-7.

⁵⁵ Hawthorne, introduction to *Philippians*, xxxi.

⁵⁶ Ibid., xxx.

of money because of his desire to be independent.⁵⁷ The effect is to posit a conflict over money between Paul and the Philippian community as a solution to the second disjunct.

The next two approaches to the problem of the disjunctions use literary critical methods. In 1984 both Swift (in English) and Schenk (in German) independently considered Philippians as a unified piece of rhetoric.⁵⁸ These studies were followed by the more influential work of Watson in 1988 and of Bloomquist in 1993.⁵⁹ Ben Witherington III's 1994 commentary on Philippians is the most thorough attempt to apply this method to the text and can be used as an example of the approach.⁶⁰ Witherington is a leading proponent of rhetorical criticism.⁶¹

The effect of using rhetorical structure is to place the emphasis on an assumed *probatio*, or in Witherington's case, four separate "appeals,"⁶² which in turn places the emphasis on the discontinuity between Paul and those he is persuading and upon the problems they are experiencing. The result is to see the letter as a critical denunciation of heretical groups, covered by a sugar coating of flattery. Despite the title of his commentary - *Friendship and Finances in Philippi* - his approach supports the contention that the focus of the letter was division and disunity. Marshall points out that those who consider the letter as rhetoric argue that Paul's purpose in writing sections praising the Philippians - such as 4:10-20 - is only to secure sympathy for his main points. This, he contends, "smacks of trying to

⁵⁷ Ibid., 194-5.

⁵⁸ A full commentary on the use of the rhetorical critical method in relationship to Philippians is in Reed, *Discourse*, 156-68. Swift R.C. "The theme and Structure of Philippians," *BSac* 141 (1984): 234-54. Schenk, W. *Die Philipperbriefe des Paulus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984).

⁵⁹ D.F. Watson, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its implication for the Unity Question" *NovT* 30 (1988):57-88. L.G. Bloomquist, *The Function of Suffering in Philippians* JSNT Sup 78 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

⁶⁰ Ben Witherington III, *Friendship and Finances in Philippi* (Pennsylvania: Trinity, 1994).

⁶¹ Ben Witherington III *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1995), and *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1998). For their significance see Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 24. See Witherington's own definition and application of the method in Gooder, *Searching*, 71-9.

⁶² Ibid., 50-109.

force the material into a predetermined mould.” Instead he commends Philippians as a work of “personal communication.”⁶³

Witherington’s own justification for his rhetorical approach – set out in only nine pages – is that Paul knew about rhetoric and that he used it elsewhere. No further justification is offered for his contention that the whole letter is best understood as a formal rhetorical argument.⁶⁴ Many scholars question the value of rhetorical criticism generally, especially in the macro level. Fee,⁶⁵ Bockmuehl,⁶⁶ Reumann⁶⁷ and Reed⁶⁸ all argue that, while there is evidence for rhetorical conventions at the micro level, there is no evidence for the formal structuring of letters in rhetorical form in contemporary culture and, by extension, in the New Testament. Reed argues that there is no evidence for the merging of rhetorical and epistolary genres either in theory or practice in contemporary writing.⁶⁹ He therefore questions the application of rhetorical structure to any of Paul’s letters. When it comes to the specific application to Philippians, Reed points out that none of the proponents agree on a common structure. Witherington’s division of the text is one among many and it does not seem to have any more validity than any other structure.⁷⁰ The arguments put forwards for viewing Philippians as rhetoric seem to have very little substance in objective terms.

A third response to the three-letter theory also focuses on literary form. Reed focuses on Philippians as an expression of the epistolary genre, specifically as a letter of friendship. Loveday Alexander proposed Philippians conformed to the structure of known family letters in order to show that it can be seen as a single letter without the need to postulate the existence of a redactor. Alexander compared the letter form of Philippians with

⁶³ I. Howard Marshall, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (London: Epworth, 1992), 118.

⁶⁴ Witherington, *Friendship*, 11-20.

⁶⁵ Fee, *Philippians*, 15, see note 40.

⁶⁶ Bockmuehl, *Philippians*, 38-9.

⁶⁷ Reumann, *Philippians*, 9-13, see note 2.

⁶⁸ Reed, *Discourse*, 156-168.

⁶⁹ Jeffrey Reed, “The Influence of Rhetorical Theory on Graeco-Roman Letter Writing,” published as an appendix to Reed, *Discourse*, 442-54.

⁷⁰ Reed, *Discourse*, 165-6.

contemporary letters of friendship and found significant correlation between their structure and forms.⁷¹

Alexander believes that formal textual analysis has been too quick to expect theoretical structures to work for every letter and sets out a pragmatic approach. She studied the structure of family letters in Greek/Roman culture and found that they often follow the form outlined below:

- A. Address and greeting. (// Phil. 1.1-2).
- B. Prayer for the recipients. In contemporary letters these prayers would be to the pagan gods, but Paul prays to his God. (// Phil. 1.3-11).
- C. Reassurance about the sender. Family letters were only written where there was a distance between members of the family and this therefore was the main point of the letter, often marked with the disclosure formula “I want you to know....” (// Phil. 1.12-26 including the disclosure formula in v. 12).
- D. Request for reassurance about the recipients. A natural concern to have news from home. (// Phil. 1.27-2.18).
- E. Information about the movements of intermediaries. There was no postal service as such for ordinary people to send personal messages. Letters would be sent with trusted friends who happened to be making the journey, or who were commissioned to make the journey. As such they were important people and their work was worthy of recognition. (// Phil. 2.19-30).
- F. Exchange of greetings with third parties. This was an important part of the letter as much space was given over to it. The need to pass on greetings from the companions of the writer and to send greetings to those with whom the recipient may come into contact, are vital within a society based upon personal relationships. (// Phil. 4.21-22).

⁷¹ Alexander, “Letter-Forms,” 87-101.

G. Closing wish for health. (// Phil. 4.23).⁷²

As can be seen above, the letter to the Philippians has many common features with family letters. If the structure is accepted the main point of the letter becomes the relationship.⁷³ Paul knows that his friends in Philippi are anxious about him and he seeks to reassure them that, while he is in danger of death, he is happy with his state because it has advanced the gospel. While he eagerly hopes for death, as this will bring full unity with Christ, if he is released he will be able to visit them again.⁷⁴ He wants news of them and how they are, and this takes the form of exhortation. He talks of intermediaries so that news can be shared between them and he uses the common formulae for opening and sending greetings.

Alexander gives support for Hawthorne's reading of *loipon* as "furthermore" in 3:10 by producing examples of this use within friendship letters. Significantly, she produces examples of a "thank you" section after the receipt of material aid at the end of family letters. Alexander offers a literary/cultural response to the concerns raised by Beare and Hawthorne over, what was to them, the strange placement of the thank you note. Such a structure is no longer to be seen as a radical departure from cultural norms and places the note within the central purpose of a single unified letter.

Reed builds on the work of Alexander and contrasts it with those who have proposed a multiple letter theory or a rhetorical framework.⁷⁵ To this he adds a study of the "texture" of Philippians – the microstructures within the text – and concludes that the text is best understood in epistolary form as a personal letter with multiple themes.⁷⁶ He argues that it is the desire of biblical scholars to discover a macro theme in Philippians which has led them to propose three letters with three themes, and the counter proposals of a letter with clear

⁷² Ibid., 91-4.

⁷³ Ibid., 95.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 95.

⁷⁵ Reed, *Discourse*, 153-295.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 401-18.

separate sections or a single rhetorical structure. In contrast the structure and texture of Philippians points to a letter, personal in nature, with the writer moving from theme to theme. He disputes claims that such a reading would render the letter “artless,” suggesting chains of coherence rooted in concern for his friends rather than a theological theme.⁷⁷

Reading Philippians as a single letter of friendship agrees with the assumption that the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi was one of mission partnership. It defines the coherence of the letter in the relationship between Paul and the community in Philippi and not in the themes within the letter.

6.2.2. Unity and or Disunity? – Seeking a Theme for Philippians

Reed’s conclusion that “The very genre of the discourse, namely a personal hortatory letter, allows for multiple purposes and themes,” does not fit well with some scholarly approaches to Philippians.⁷⁸ Reed contends that the desire to find a macro-theme for the letter has led to top-down approaches where a theme is identified and a structure imposed on the interpretation of the text to justify the claim.⁷⁹ Reed himself highlights the work of Black (especially as Black also uses discourse analysis) but other scholars appear to be concerned to identify a macro-structure or an overall theme for Philippians.

One example of the desire to find a macro-theme is the work of Davorin Peterlin, who argues that “the topic of disunity is the element which thematically binds the whole letter together.”⁸⁰ He constructs a historical context for the Philippian letter that postulates disunity among the members, strife between Epaphroditus and some of the others, and problems between Paul and some or all of them.⁸¹ Peterlin builds a picture from verses in the text and then uses this picture to interpret the text as a whole. For example, he draws on the

⁷⁷ Ibid., 415-8.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 414.

⁷⁹ Ibid., see extensive footnote 25.

⁸⁰ Davorin Peterlin, *Paul’s Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church*, Supplement to NovT vol. LXXIX (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1995), 217.

⁸¹ Ibid., 9.

concept of the “thankless thanks” to say that in 4:10-20 Paul is walking a tightrope of thanking those who sent him some money, while not offending those who saw this as against the will of God. Paul thanks them, but tells them they should not have sent the money, he would have been fine without it, thus satisfying both sides in the reconstructed dispute. In his conclusion he offers a detailed reconstruction of events as fact-based upon his proposed reading of the situation, without any external evidence to support it.⁸² Peterlin enters into a “hermeneutical spiral” where he has identified a theme, sought it in the text and used that evidence to support the initial thesis.⁸³ The text is presumed to reflect the central theme of Paul’s thought and read in a manner that supports the original thesis.

Oakes offers a reason for establishing that *Philippians* is primarily concerned with disunity and division in the Philippian community. The reason is that it places *Philippians* in the “main stream” of Pauline thought. He argues that regarding it as a “friendly ‘chat’, with a rather alien outburst in chapter 3” leads to it being “disconnected” from Pauline studies.⁸⁴ In contrast to Peterlin he bases his study on an archaeological model that challenges an assumption made by most commentators that: “Philippi was almost unique among the cities Paul addressed in his letters: it differed from other places he evangelized because of its Roman-ness and lack of a Jewish community.”⁸⁵ Oakes shows this to be false and that the Philippian community was not a wealthy comfortable church, but one that suffered economic hardship, heightened by the decision to follow Jesus.⁸⁶ He does this by a thorough analysis of evidence from inscriptions and social data. He argues that the town was predominantly Greek, with wealthy army veterans only making up only 1.5 to 5 per cent of the population. The town was probably a service town for the wider agricultural population and unlikely to

⁸² *Ibid.*, 219-24.

⁸³ Ralph P. Martin, “A Centre of Paul’s Theology,” in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 93.

⁸⁴ Peter Oakes, *Philippians- From people to letter*, SNTS 110 (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), 212.

⁸⁵ Reumann, *Philippians*, 3.

⁸⁶ Oakes, *Philippians*, 212.

have been rich.⁸⁷ Overall he estimates Philippi to have been 40 per cent Roman and 60 per cent Greek, with the power lying in the hands of the Romans. He argues that this balance would have been reflected in the make-up of the church.⁸⁸

Oakes is careful and detailed in his construction of his archaeological model, but, in contrast, his missiological assumptions are sweeping and offer no external reference points. In his analysis of the likely make-up of the church he argues that farmers would not have been able to hear the gospel from Paul because Paul would have been more likely to build links with craftspeople and traders. Missiological research in previously unreached areas shows that indigenous people develop their own means of primary evangelism.⁸⁹ Oakes' missiological assumption is flawed. His conclusion of the make-up of the church is possible, but missiological experience makes it unlikely. This does not weaken his case that wealthy army veterans, predominantly Roman in culture and outlook, did not dominate the church. It strengthens it, opening the possibility of the inclusion of the rural population in the church. However, it illustrates how he uses missiological claims without evaluating missiological models.

More problematic is another assumption. Oakes argues that the majority of the town and the church were mainly poor and politically excluded. His model leads him to discuss the economic implications of accepting Christ, terms and argues that suffering for Christ was an economic reality for the members of the church. Allegiance to Christ would lead, he argues, to further exclusion from the wealth-creating structures of the community.⁹⁰ He makes his case well, but following this he makes a category jump from his commendable

⁸⁷ Ibid., 17. See chart. Also, 53-4.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 76.

⁸⁹ For example, see Elizabeth Knox, *Signal on the Mountain* (Canberra: Acorn Press, 1991), 115-6. The community of Ibwijili begged Price, a white missionary, to settle amongst them but as they had not heard anyone for eight years they sent the chief's brother to the town of Mpwapwa to receive and impart instruction and so produced their own missionary. Similar innovations lead to the seemingly instant conversion of villages not visited by missionaries. This is not an isolated case. Further detailed studies of the significance of indigenous evangelists in the same region see Mwita Akiri, "The Growth of Christianity in Ugogo and Ukaguru (Central Tanzania): A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Role of Indigenous Agents 1876-1933" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999).

⁹⁰ Oakes, *Philippians*, 89-99.

work to discover the social-economic situation of the Philippian Church to a sociological and missiological conclusion that the evidence does not support. His proposal is that “the presence of so substantial suffering will always have an effect on the issue of unity in a church.” This claim is not substantiated within his thesis.⁹¹ He argues, reasonably, that “suffering in a church increases the importance of unity.”⁹² The desire for unity can sociologically increase in a community finding itself vulnerable to persecution. However he goes on to argue that “suffering also produces forces which threaten unity.”⁹³ This leads him to an exegetical model which places the disunity of the Philippians as the key to understanding the text.⁹⁴ It might be argued that wealth and the avoidance of suffering in the Corinthian Church gave the room for disunity that was not available to the poorer Macedonian congregations. He does not offer any evidence in support of his claim that poverty and persecution inevitably bring increased risk of disunity. The present divisions in churches exist in wealthy parts of the world where Christians are not persecuted.⁹⁵ The jump from significant and legitimate archaeological model to unsubstantiated conjecture seems to be motivated by a desire to place Philippians as a key Pauline text, defined as one concerning disputes and divisions.⁹⁶

Hawthorne and O’Brien both regard the relationship as the primary focus of Philippians. Hawthorne lists eight purposes for the writing of the letter with first being: “The simplest purpose to imagine is that, having a deep affection for the Philippians (cf. 4:1), he

⁹¹ Ibid., 99-100.

⁹² Ibid., 100.

⁹³ Ibid., 102.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 121-8.

⁹⁵ In the Anglican Communion, There have been protracted divisions and extensive lawsuits in the Diocese of Virginia – among the wealthiest dioceses in TEC. Division is also acute in Anglican churches in poor nations such as Tanzania. See Mkunga Mtingele “Leadership and Conflict in an African Church: An Enquiry into the Context Nature, Causes and Consequences of Conflict and Conflict Management in the Anglican Church of Tanzania during the period of Indigenous Leadership Circa 1960 – Circa 2000” (PhD diss., The Open University, 2004). Also, division occurs where Christians face persecution, such as Sudan. The causes of conflict and division in churches are complex and cannot be accounted for solely by poverty and persecution.

⁹⁶ Oakes, *Philippians*, 212.

wanted to write them (sic).”⁹⁷ O’Brien’s first two listed reasons for the writing of the letter are also about relationships: Paul had an opportunity to write and wanted to communicate with his friends thanking them for their gift and telling them of his situation.⁹⁸ However, both frequently place issues to do with the relationship between Paul and the Philippians in the footnotes of their commentaries, rather than in the body of the text. Relationship is viewed as the key purpose of the letter, but not considered interesting in the interpretation of the letter.

6.2.3. Philippians – A Letter of Partnership or Friendship?

Paul Sampley offers a different approach.⁹⁹ He understands the letter in the context of a formal relationship of partnership rather than mere friendship. His argument is that Paul is in a *societas* relationship with the Philippians, that is, an unwritten, but nevertheless, formal and legal partnership. Sampley understands that Paul interprets *societas* in the context of the gospel, but insists that it is the foundation of the relationship between the two parties. *Societas* is known to be translated into Greek as *koinonia*,¹⁰⁰ a word used frequently in the letter, but Sampley does not rely primarily on semantics for his claim. He starts with a study of a classic model of a consensual *societas* from a detailed study of Roman legal cases and contemporary literature. He defines consensual *societas* as: “A prevalent partnership contract of Roman law, where each of the partners contributed something to the association with a view towards a shared goal.”¹⁰¹

In chapter 2 of his book Sampley sets out a model of consensual *societas*. Such relationships were formed in the image of the partnerships between inheritors, relationships that allowed them to maintain a common estate. On the death of a father the surviving sons

⁹⁷ Ibid., xlvii.

⁹⁸ O’Brien, *Philippians*, 35-8.

⁹⁹ J. Paul Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 12. This is not a claim to equivalence between the words, but a claim that one possible meaning of *koinonia* in certain contexts is *societas*.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 11.

did not break up the estate, but continued to share in its benefit and loss. Thus the partners in a *societas* relationship voluntarily accepted a filial model and relationship.

Sampey identifies thirteen aspects to the *societas* relationship:

1. The focus was the shared goal. This was often financial, but there could be other goals.
2. Membership was firmly consensual. That the parties agreed to the partnership was the prime indicator of involvement.
3. There was no written contract and no witnesses were required.
4. Each one contributed to the partnership. Normally they contributed property, land, labour, skill or status.
5. The partners shared all expenses incurred by any party for the sake of the partnership.
6. There was no requirement for any of these to be held in common. This was not a separate venture with its own property, money or workers. If they were held in common it ceased to be a consensual *societas*.
7. People of radically different status and economic background could join together in such a partnership. Even slaves could be in partnership with persons of any rank.
8. Within the partnership each partner was equal. One could not coerce the other and each shared in the profits and in the liability. Neither was to advance their interests above those of the other.
9. The aim of the *societas* could be very short term or could be very long term.
10. The *societas* was often between two individuals, but there are records of *societas* between an individual and a group and between two groups.
11. The *societas* was considered closed for a number of reasons including: when the aim was achieved; when one or both parties no longer had the goal in common; or when a partner died (although they could be replaced by an heir).
12. The *societas* was enforceable in the courts. No party was allowed to break the partnership without the losses or profits being equally shared. Indeed the records of

partnerships are often from court cases settling a dispute where one party has attempted either to take all the profits or been left with all the loss.

13. The punishment for breaking the rules of the partnership could be financial, but more often involved the loss of personal standing.¹⁰²

Fundamental to a *societas* relationship is the sense of common purpose that underlies the model. They were not in the partnership because of friendship, but because of an understanding that they could gain something together which could not be gained alone. Because the relationship had no written contract, the sign of partnership was the shaking of hands. This leads Sampley to consider what he regards as Paul's account of the Jerusalem Council in Galatians 2.¹⁰³ Sampley focuses on the sharing of right hands between Paul and the "pillars" in Gal. 2:9, which he takes as signifying agreement. This was a contemporary mark of the forming of *societas* and for Sampley signifies an agreement of partnership for a common missionary venture to both Jews and gentiles as equals.¹⁰⁴

Sampley offers three main reasons for suggesting that Paul and the Philippian community have a *societas Christi*. Firstly, the receipt Paul writes for the gift or payment that he has received via Epaphroditus. Secondly, the appearance of the word *koinonia* used in the sense of partnership known in *societas* and finally, the prominent use of the terminology of *societas*.¹⁰⁵ The evidence he offers in support of these claims is predominantly from the thank you note of Philippians 4:10-20.¹⁰⁶ Firstly, he identifies the significance of Paul accepting money from a church he had established himself.¹⁰⁷ Secondly, he points to the frequent use of commercial technical terms, many of which are *hapax*

¹⁰² Ibid., 11-20.

¹⁰³ The issues of whether there was one council or two and whether the Pauline account is of the same meeting as the one in Acts is not debated by Sampley. There are significant questions about the historicity of Acts 15, but he does not discuss them.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 41. See: Richard Longenecker, *Galatians*. WBC. Vol. 41 (Waco: Word, 1990), 58.

¹⁰⁵ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 51.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 52-60.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 52.

legomena in the Pauline corpus.¹⁰⁸ The prime example he offers is the “technical commercial term *apechō*, ‘I have received’, so common in papyrus receipts.”¹⁰⁹ He argues that other technical phrases, such as *eis logon*, “in settlement of an account,” *doma*, “payment,” and *cheria*, “request,” are comprehensible if Philippians 4:10-20 is seen as a theologically modified receipt of payment, not a “thank you” note. The use of technical financial language is comprehensible if Paul is acknowledging that the Philippians have kept their side of the agreement.¹¹⁰ Sampley then points to the way the sense of equality between Paul and the Philippian community is frequently emphasised. He also highlights that the demand for unity in the text is repeated and is stated in the need for a “common mind,” a necessary prerequisite for *societas*.¹¹¹

Peterman offers a strong critique of Sampley in his monograph on the gift Paul received from the Philippians.¹¹² Peterman shows that in Roman culture technical financial terms were used to denote personal relationships.¹¹³ Therefore, he questions the claim that technical terms imply a social contract. While he accepts that *koinonia* may be used to translate *societas*, he points out that *koinonia* does not always mean a contractual *societas* and he quotes instances in Seneca’s *De Beneficiis* where this is not the case.¹¹⁴ Finally, he argues that Sampley’s construction is unnecessarily limiting and offers his own research on reciprocity in Roman society – using *De Beneficiis* as a guide¹¹⁵ – as a more natural alternative.¹¹⁶ Peterman is focused in his study on the exchange of gifts and not on the way

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 52-3.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ ibid., 55-61.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 62-72.

¹¹² Gerald Peterman, *Paul’s Gift From Philippi – Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving* SNTS 92 (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 123-7.

¹¹³ Ibid., 59-64.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 126.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 51.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 127. He makes four more points questioning the internal logic of Sampley’s case. He questions if the Philippians have the required unity for such a relationship, the Paul rejects the right to support with the church in Corinth and the right to support would be a right even if the “partner” were considered unworthy. Each of these will be looked at in detail in the next chapter. Fee picks up on the criticisms made by Peterman in two footnotes and adds that there is little hard linguistic evidence as well as pointing out that Capper uses

in which Sampley's work provides illumination on the cultural assumptions surrounding the whole relationship.

Fee's critique of Sampley is influenced by Capper's use of his work to postulate a dispute between Paul and the Philippians.¹¹⁷ He also understands Sampley's construct as too rigidly defined in financial terms, reducing the personal element in the relationship.¹¹⁸ Stephen Fowl refers to Fee and Peterman as the reason for replacing partnership with the consciously weaker concept of "friendship."¹¹⁹ Reumann dismisses the proposal of a legal *societas* on the grounds that it would need re-establishing every time there was a point of division or any member of the Philippian community died and because Paul would not seek recourse to the courts to settle any dispute.¹²⁰ Instead he invokes familial relationships as a better model.

These criticisms show that proving Sampley's thesis of a formal contract may not be possible given the limited information available and there is a consensus among most scholars that it is unlikely. The weakness of Sampley's approach is that he argues that because some of the features of *societas* are present in the text, they all must be present in the underlying reality; a prescriptive approach. While this key element of Sampley's work may not be useful, missiologist insights may offer a way of understanding the significant aspects of his research.

Transcultural missiologist David Maranz has written on the frustrations encountered between westerners and Africans when it comes to the use and management of money.¹²¹ He argues that differing cultural and economic contexts lead to huge differences in the way

Sampley to construct a false dispute between Paul and the Philippians. Fee, *Philippians*, 436. Reference to Brian Capper "Paul's Dispute with Philippi: Understanding Paul's Argument in Phil. 1-2 from his Thanks in 4.10-20," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 49 (1993): 193-214.

¹¹⁷ Fee, *Philippians*, 436-7, note 4. Capper postulates a dispute based upon Paul's failure to live up to the *societas* contract due to his imprisonment. Capper, "Paul's Dispute with Philippi," 193-214.

¹¹⁸ Fee, *Philippians*, 438, note 8. See also, 81-5.

¹¹⁹ Stephen Fowl, *Philippians – Two Horizons New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 205-35.

¹²⁰ Reumann *Philippians*, 146-7.

¹²¹ David Maranz, *African Friends and Money Matters – Observations from Africa* (Dallas: SIL International, 2001).

money is regarded by western and African cultures. He identifies 89 points of difference. His final observation – point 90 – is that people of all cultures act logically in reference to money (unless they have issues of low intelligence or mental disturbance). This point is very significant. Westerners behave in ways that are illogical or strange to Africans and Africans behave in ways that are incomprehensible to Westerners. “This observation points out that all people are logical and act in accord with their society’s rules. The outsider finds it strange or misunderstands only because he or she doesn’t share the people’s logic.”¹²² In this context the cultural lens through which Philippians 4:10-20 has been viewed may be considered. The positioning of the thank you note at the end of the letter seems strange and illogical to modern readers. When we observe someone acting illogically over money Maranz asks us to “assume that the person is acting logically according to the rules of his culture, unless you have a good reason to believe otherwise.”¹²³ The understanding of Philippians 4:10-20 requires a deeper understanding of the sociological assumptions of the time; they should not be judged by our logic.

The exchange of goods or services works within consistent cultural rules. It is inevitable that the cultural assumptions underlying the exchange of goods, services and money in the Roman Empire followed a consistent logic and so the assumptions underlying the *societas* relationships are likely to be those underlying all partnership relationships. If this is the case the understanding *societas* of relationships is likely to assist the understanding of the partnership between Paul and the community of Christians in Philippi, even if it is not a formal, quasi-legal relationship itself. Therefore, understanding the underlying concepts on the exchange of goods, services and money in contemporaneous society is vital for the proper understanding of the relationship.

¹²² Ibid., 195.

¹²³ Ibid.

Reumann proposes that the relationship between Paul and the Philippians is “more flexible than legal understandings in a *societas* theory” and argues that the theory is best seen as a metaphor.¹²⁴ Perhaps the relationship is best seen in familial terms. Sampley argues that *societas* is the replication of family relationships where no family bonds exist. Biblical scholars do not question the validity of Sampley’s model of *societas*, what is questioned is if Paul and the Philippian church were in such a relationship. If we accept that the model is correct, we can expect it to offer insight into the cultural assumptions of partnership, even if parties had not shaken hands on a formal contract as Sampley suggests. These insights themselves then form an exploratory model that can be applied to Philippians to investigate the underlying relationship. Discovering resonance and dissonance may offer insight into the Pauline/Philippian concept of mission partnership.

Peterman criticises the way in which Sampley has allowed, or perhaps been understood to have allowed, the model to define the interpretation of the text rather than using the model to be used to comprehend the social mind set of writer and reader. He argues that the model as used by Sampley turns the “thank you” note into a piece of dry finance, rather than rich theology, or by Capper, to postulate resentment where he sees co-operation. This is not the only way to use the model. Accepting these criticisms does not invalidate the significance of Sampley’s work.

Peterman’s own historical research into conventions of giving and receiving is also of great significance in this context. He argues that the gift from Philippi and the thank you in return can only be understood within the context of contemporary conventions.¹²⁵ His source texts are centred on, but not limited to, Seneca’s *De Beneficiis*. From these sources he forms a model that illuminates the cultural understandings, which are taken for granted by both writer and intended readers, and he argues for the significance of financial sharing in

¹²⁴ Reumann, *Philippians*, 695.

¹²⁵ Peterman, *Paul’s Gift*, 99-103.

Paul's concepts of partnership.¹²⁶ He argues that, "In the Greco-Roman world social reciprocity played an integral part in the conventions that dominated inter-personal relationships. Gifts and favours were not to be taken for granted and carried serious obligations."¹²⁷

Peterman argues that the giving of a gift from either an individual or a group to another individual or group requires a response. If the gift is accepted and repaid then a lasting relationship is formed. If it is rejected enmity may result. There is therefore a sense of obligation with one side taking status over the other if gifts are not regarded as equal. Praise and honour often feature in verbal and written thanks, and commercial phrases frequently appear in such thanks. There is no notion of thanking the gods for the gift of humans.¹²⁸ Like Sampley's work these conventions offer insight into the cultural background for the exchange of gifts between the Philippians and Paul and offer a model with which to explore the relationship looking for resonance and deviation from the cultural norm.

Another model is used by Peterman to investigate the relationship between Paul and the Philippians. He uses a contrast with the Corinthian correspondence as a critical tool to understand the relationship between Paul and his community and the Church in Philippi.¹²⁹ Peterman argues that Philippians is the product of a functioning relationship that Paul would have wished to have had with all the churches he founded,¹³⁰ while "the Corinthian correspondence provides an example of a negative relationship."¹³¹ For this model to function it needs to be established that the divisions highlighted in the Corinthian correspondence were not only internal, but also between Paul and the Corinthians as a whole. In contrast, commentators traditionally understood Paul to have been an independent

¹²⁶ Ibid., 198.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 88.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 88-9.

¹²⁹ Peterman, *Paul's Gift*, 9.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 101 and 108.

¹³¹ Ibid., 9.

arbitrator between various factions within the Christian community in Corinth.¹³² Fee points out that this understanding is problematical for three reasons: firstly, while there were divisions, they appear to be either socio-economic (1 Cor. 11:17-34), or competitive – in the sense of one party arguing it was better than another (1:10-12). The parties do not seem to have had theological disputes.¹³³ Secondly, the tone of the letter is rhetorical and combative towards the whole Church; Paul attacks them as a whole, rather than encouraging one wing against another.¹³⁴ Finally, the letter is addressed to the whole church and groups are not singled out; there is no sign of arbitration, only condemnation.¹³⁵ In response he offers a proposed reconstruction. His premise is: “*the historical situation in Corinth was one of conflict between the church and its founder.*”¹³⁶ Contrasting the Corinthian literature with Philippians may offer insight into both.

There are significant differences between the two relationships. Unlike the Philippians, the Corinthian Church did not share a common goal with Paul; some of them claimed authority over him, while others demanded he assert his authority over the church; they disputed the fundamentals of the faith (including the resurrection); internally they were hopelessly divided; neither they nor Paul were eager for communication by letter or visit; they were not willing to share resources, refused Paul an interest in their growth, and rejected their liability in his suffering. These may assist us to identify the marks of partnership between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi.

Both Sampley and Peterman offer insight into the cultural context of the exchange of goods and services in the cultural context of the partnership between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. The question for this thesis is not which one is right, but to discover how insights from each will enable us to better understand

¹³² Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 4-5.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* Emphasis his.

the relationship. The proposal is to seek resonance and dissonance between the models and the text.

6.2.4. Using the Models of Sampley and Peterman as Exploratory Models

Both Sampley and Peterman develop their ideas from the contemporary literature. They have effectively developed explanatory models of partnership relationships and of conventions of giving and receiving. If we use their work as exploratory models we are able to seek resonance and dissonance between the models and the text of Philippians. This process involves reading and re-reading the text of Philippians against the available models seeking points where the two resonate and isolating points in the model that are unobservable in the text.¹³⁷ There is unlikely to be direct equivalence. And so there is likely to be a simplification of the 13-point model of Sampley. It is likely that there will be some points of resonance between the two models. What we are seeing is clarity about the elements of partnership observable in the text of Philippians.

Reading the text against the 13-point model of *societas* relationships developed by Sampley yields 6 potential points of resonance and 2 points of dissonance. The points of resonance are that there was a shared goal, the membership was consensual and each one contributed to the partnership. In addition, despite the partners having a potentially different status, they were equals and the victories and liabilities were shared. Also there appears to have been a possibility that the partnership might have closed.¹³⁸ The points of significant dissonance are that there is no record of formal agreement and no prospect of legal enforceability.

¹³⁷ This method set out in theory by Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 17, and in practice, 48-50.

¹³⁸ Sampley also notes that a *societas* relationship did not have a written contract, but the absence of a written contract cannot be cited as evidence of resonance: a friendship relationship or one of enmity would not have a written contract. Similarly with property not held in common. He also argues that the relationship can be between individuals or groups, as either is valid, resonance is inevitable and so irrelevant. There is no evidence of the rules being broken.

Peterman's analysis of reciprocity is slightly different, as he is not setting out a model of partnership, rather a model of giving and receiving. Reading the text in this context the question of whether the parties are of equal status comes to the fore, and is at this point an open question. Resonance is found in the acceptance of the significance of a gift and the use of commercial language. A significant point of dissonance is found in the use of divine language within the thank you note in Philippians. Peterman's contrast with the Corinthian correspondence offers three further points of resonance. These are that there was some common basis of belief between the groups, a clear requirement for the unity of each partner community and that they were eager to keep in touch with one another.

Combining the points of resonance we can identify seven marks of partnership in Philippians for further exploration:

1. common purpose
2. equality of status
3. common basis of belief
4. unity within each community
5. eagerness to communicate and to be with one another
6. complementary resources and skills
7. willingness to share in one another's struggles and victories.

None of these are considered at this point proven, but each are worthy of further investigation.

Conclusion

The significance of this chapter has been to establish a methodological approach for the interaction between missiology and biblical scholarship. There is a growing awareness among missiologists of the need to take New Testament scholarship seriously, but there has been very little work on how the disciplines might benefit from one another. The focus in this chapter has been on how the missiologist can use the products of biblical scholarship.

This is then applied to the study of Philippians. Debates on the integrity of the text have shed light on its literary form and emphasised the significance of the relational element of the text. Models of contemporary partnership relationships, and of reciprocity in giving and receiving have been used to identify significant elements within the text as marks of partnership. Having identified these seven marks, the task is to analyse each, questioning the validity of the identification in the hope of developing an explanatory model of partnership from the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. The search is for a model to be developed within the bounds of the Anglican Way.

The review of Philippian scholarship offers encouragement to the missiologist seeking to investigate the *prima facie* case for using the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi as a source for a model of partnership. While there is no consensus, there is significant scholarly support for the initial proposal that Philippians is a single communication between two partners engaged in a common global missionary endeavour expressed by each in their locality. An attempt to investigate the dynamics of the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi might yield a model of partnership that may in turn inform mission partnership across geographic and economic divisions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

7. DISTILLING A MODEL OF PARTNERSHIP

Introduction

The first three chapters of this thesis set out an argument for the development of an exploratory model of partnership to be used as an explanatory model to guide planning and critical assessment of partnership programs in the Anglican Communion. In chapter 5 it was argued that such a model should not be based upon a concept study of *koinonia* because to do so contradicts established methodological norms of the use of semantics in biblical interpretation. The previous chapter considered the difficulties encountered by the missiologist when attempting to use biblical scholarship. A possible solution was offered and then applied to the letter of Paul to the Philippians. The use of two exploratory models to examine the text of Philippians resulted in the identification of seven elements of partnership in the letter.

The task of this chapter is to investigate these seven elements in order to distil a seven-point model of partnership from the relationship between Paul and his community, and the community of Christians in Philippi. This requires the continuing engagement between missiology and Pauline scholarship. To find an exploratory model there is a requirement to seek an explanatory model based upon a real instance. The real instance of the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi requires an attempt at historical reconstruction. However, we have seen that historical reconstruction is liable to merely reinforce assumptions and is often built upon speculation. The danger of approaches that find a macro-theme for the letter has been noted. Such approaches typically identify a theme and impose a structure on the interpretation of the text in order to justify the claim. The danger of a circular argument is to be avoided.

It is not claimed that partnership is the theme of the letter. Rather, it is claimed that the literary form of the letter and the correlation to contemporary forms of reciprocity and

societas indicate that partnership forms the *context* in which the letter was written. The subject of the study is not an imposed theme, but a consideration of the social and cultural assumptions that underlie the relationships within which the letter was written and read. Dunn argues that it is legitimate to reconstruct the situation of the writing of the text.¹ He argues that New Testament scholars have brought us to the point where the words of the text are well established and their meanings understood. The work of countless philologists and lexicographers can be relied upon.² While claims to value free interpretation are to be treated with suspicion, the historical method is a vital element if an explanatory model is to be established.³

The aim of this chapter is to develop an abstract model of mission partnership that can be used to interrogate existing partnerships and give direction to future mission partnerships. The method of forming such an abstract model set out in this chapter is described as *distillation*. The aim is to separate out a simple desired product from the complex mix we are presented with. In a distillation process the desired product is always present in the complex mix. Here we are seeking to find an element present in the text and isolate it from others in order to serve a further purpose.

The initial task has been to identify seven elements of partnership within the text by searching for resonance and dissonance with the models of partnership and reciprocity described by Sampley and Peterman. The task of this chapter is to take the identified themes of resonance and attempt a historical reconstruction based upon the work of commentators and other specialists, and from that to write a brief abstraction. Collectively the abstractions

¹ James Dunn, "Historical Text as Historical Text," in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer* JSOT Supplement 195, eds. J. Davies, G. Harvey and W.G.E. Watson (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 344-7.

² *Ibid.*, 341-4.

³ Anthony Thiselton, "Biblical Studies and Theoretical Hermeneutics," in *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*, ed. John Barton (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 108. Richard Bauckham, *Scripture and Authority Today*. B12. (Cambridge: Grove, 1999), 20.

will then form a model to be used in the next chapter as an exploratory model to examine mission partnership in the Anglican Communion.

The method used in this section is to take each of the seven identified markers of partnership in turn and to seek further information on them from the text. Works of New Testament scholarship are relied upon in this process. It was noted in the previous chapter that Peterman identifies a contrast between Philippians and 1 Corinthians. It is argued that this contrast stems from the different relationship Paul had with each community. Careful consideration of the contrasts offers further understanding of the nature of the partnership between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. Following an analysis, a short distillation of the main points will lead on to an abstraction for each point. Finally the abstractions will be brought together as a model.

7.1. Common Purpose

7.1.1. Analysis

Sampley states that in a *societas* relationship “the shared goal ... was the focal point.”⁴ If the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi was a partnership, it is likely there was a common purpose. If the relationship in Philippians is without a shared goal, then it is better described as a friendship.⁵ A common purpose is more than mutual support. It has an aim that is perceived to be achievable.

The common purpose of the partnership between Paul and the Philippian Church was “the gospel” (Phil. 1:5). Wright states that “when Paul refers to ‘the gospel’, he is not referring to a system of salvation, though of course the gospel implies and contains this, nor even to the good news that there now *is* a way of salvation open to all, but rather to the proclamation that the crucified Jesus of Nazareth has been raised from the dead and thereby

⁴ J. Paul Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 13.

⁵ For an argument for friendship see; Stephen Fowl, *Philippians – Two Horizons New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 205-35.

demonstrated to be both Israel's Messiah and the world's true Lord. 'The gospel' is not 'you can be saved, and here's how'; the gospel, for Paul, is 'Jesus Christ is Lord.'⁶ In Philippians the Christological hymn of 2:6-11 is an expression of the gospel. It broadens Wright's definition to include the whole of the incarnation, but concludes in the same place; the proclamation that Jesus is the Lord to whom every knee shall bow. It consists of the hope of salvation and the demand for a life of obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ.⁷ Participation in the gospel is in a life of joy and obedience to the good news that Jesus is Lord.

In 1 Corinthians Paul defines his own task as to "preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 1:17). He is able to name the very few he baptised, and he mentions them by name in 1:14 to emphasise that he did not take on the role of baptising and that he did not have the function of leading and offering pastoral care for the church. His was a very special function and Paul defines himself as a man compelled to this calling by declaring, "Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!" (9:16). He continues by saying that if he preaches with enthusiasm he will be rewarded, but even if he has no enthusiasm he is "simply discharging the trust committed to me" (9:17). The repeated emphasis on the first person singular in this passage implies that Paul's evangelistic calling is not shared in the Corinthian context. Some scholars argue that this was because Paul reserved the task of evangelism for himself.⁸ Others, such as O'Brien, argue that Paul's call to the Corinthians to imitate him (4:16, 11:1) is evidence

⁶ Tom Wright, "New Perspectives on Paul" (paper presented at the 10th Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference, 2003), *NT Wrightpage.Com*, http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_New_Perspectives.htm.

⁷ See, Oliver O'Donovan, "Good News for Gay Christians," *Fulcrum*, <http://www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/news/2007/20070108odonovan7.cfm?doc=179>. "There is an elementary point about Christian ethics that I have sought to emphasise ever since the opening pages of my *Resurrection and Moral Order* published twenty years ago: there is no Christian ethics that is not "evangelical," i.e. good news. There can be no change of voice, no shift of mood, between God's word of forgiveness and his word of demand, no obedience-without-gift, no gift-without-obedience. The gift and the obedience are in fact one and the same. They are the righteousness of Jesus Christ, encompassing and transforming our own lives, past, present and future. To preach the good news, then, is precisely what we do in expounding Christian ethics, if we expound Christian ethics faithfully. Preaching the good news is the only form of address of which the Christian church as such is capable, whether speaking to Christians or to non-Christians." See, Oliver O'Donovan, *Resurrection and Moral Order* (Leicester: Apollos, 1986).

⁸ Paul Bowers, "Church and Mission in Paul," *JSNT* vol. 14, no. 44 (1991): 89-111.

of his desire that all be involved in evangelism.⁹ Plummer points to Paul's commendation of Priscilla and Aquila as evidence that the apostle does not reserve evangelism to himself.¹⁰ However, he argues that Paul is merely asking the Corinthians to be involved in "passive witness."¹¹ His rejection of financial support, which we will look at in further detail later, shows how in Corinth his calling is separate from theirs. This is in contrast to his relationship with the Philippians where Paul rejoices in their partnership in the gospel and their participation from the first day until the point of the writing of the letter (4:15-16). They sent him aid while he was preaching in Thessalonica and they were the only church to do so at that point.

Sampley's model regards the partnership arrangement as only valid while the task is being pursued.¹² The failure of one party to fulfil their part in the task marks the end of the partnership. The partnership between Paul and the Philippians is in question because of Paul's imprisonment. The question for the Philippians is whether Paul is able to continue with his part of the partnership while he is in chains. This is made clear in the first chapter of the letter. Once the opening greetings, thanksgivings and prayer have concluded, Paul uses what Alexander describes as a *disclosure formula*, "I want you to know," to highlight the main point of the letter as a whole.¹³ Other examples of his use of a disclosure formula are where Paul writes, "I do not want you to be unaware," with some important warning following.¹⁴ The exact phrase is common only within letters of friendship where the writer uses it to mark out the main point of the letter.¹⁵ The Philippians are aware that he is in

⁹ Peter T. O'Brien, *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995), 83-107.

¹⁰ Robert L. Plummer, *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* Paternoster Biblical Monographs, (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 95.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 96.

¹² Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 15.

¹³ Loveday Alexander, "Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians," *JSNT* 37 (1989), 92. Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, WBC vol. 43 (Waco: Word, 1983), 33.

¹⁴ For example, Rom. 1:13; 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; 1 Thess. 4:13.

¹⁵ Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 33. Gerald Peterman, *Paul's Gift From Philippi – Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving* SNTS 92 (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 107.

prison, and what he wants them to know is that his imprisonment has served to advance the gospel. If the letter were one of simple friendship then the focus would be on Paul's physical, spiritual and emotional well being. However, this is a letter of partnership; partnership with the purpose of proclaiming the gospel. Paul is anxious to say that he is keeping up his end of the relationship even though he is denied freedom of movement and association. Paul is interested not in himself, but only how the gospel is being proclaimed.

The task of the partnership was developing in two ways: first the palace guard and "everyone else" are hearing the gospel (1:13). Such an entry into the heart of the Roman Empire would be unthinkable in any other circumstances, and the notoriety of his position gives further opportunities for evangelism. The majority of commentators favour Rome as the place of the writing of *Philippians*,¹⁶ and they emphasise the rotation of the guards as giving Paul a changing group to preach to.¹⁷ Secondly, others, seeing his lack of freedom, are participating in evangelism. They are becoming bold and widening the partnership. This gives support to the analysis of church growth by missiologist Bob Jackson, who asserts that while good leadership is vital for church growth, those, generally smaller churches, which lose consistent contact with clergy, grow.¹⁸ He argues that, while clergy are important, it is their skills rather than their talents that are significant. That is, those who pass on replicable skills enable sustained growth, those with talents for preaching and evangelising offer short term growth followed by decline when they leave.¹⁹ The talent of Paul might have inhibited others in the expression of their gifts.

¹⁶ Ephesus and Caesarea are both proposed as alternatives, but the internal evidence supports the traditional location of Rome. The arguments for Ephesus and Caesarea are based on assumptions that once Paul had left the East he would not want to return, but to travel West, and that the distance was too great for numerous letters to be sent back and forth between him in Rome and Philippi. The former is conjecture, and the latter assumes that the letter - as we have it - is a composite. which has been shown to be unlikely. Rome presents no problem for the interpretation of the letter in contrast to the other options. See, Gordon Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 34-7.

¹⁷ For example, *Ibid.*, 112-3. The connection is made with Phil 4:22 where Paul is able to send greetings from those in Caesar's household. This is not a reference to important and influential members of the household, but to the soldiers, servants and slaves with whom Paul came into contact.

¹⁸ Bob Jackson, *Hope for the Church* (London: Church House, 2003), 42.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 157.

The task orientation of the partnership is further emphasised by the next three remarkable verses. Paul is pleased that there are those who preach Christ out of rivalry and selfish ambition, because what is important is that the task is completed, namely, the gospel is preached (1:15-18). He is noted for his hostile reaction to those who oppose him theologically, and his dismissal of those who disagree with his strategy, so it is surprising that he is prepared to rejoice in the action of rivals. One explanation is that, even unwittingly, these people are furthering the aims of the partnership. They may not be in full partnership with Paul and the Philippians and they may be unsuitable to be sent to represent Paul, in contrast to Timothy (2:20-21), but they are fulfilling the task of the partnership, by preaching the gospel.

The letter continues as Paul seeks to encourage the Philippians to fulfil their role and give them advice on how they might do better. After a brief reflection upon his own state he turns to encourage them to conduct themselves in a manner worthy of the gospel (1:27). Their task will continue whether Paul lives or dies, whether he comes to them or not. The task orientation of the partnership is established in the call for unity so they will stand firm together to proclaim the gospel (2:1-18, 4:2-3), the call to resist those who put confidence in the flesh so they do not fall into the trap of proclaiming a gospel that is not good news (3:1-4:1), and the acceptance of the gift in the context of the financial support the Philippians have previously given to Paul's task of sharing the good news (4:15). The Philippians do not only have a role in financial giving to the cause of the gospel, but also to active testimony (1:27). They had a significant role in proclamation even when he was present, which Paul recalls in his appeal to Euodia and Syntyche (4:3).

7.1.2. Distillation

For Paul and the Philippians the task which defines the partnership is the gospel, not only in its living out, but more importantly in its proclamation of Jesus as Lord. Others would be in fellowship with Paul and share his beliefs and values, but he is willing and eager

to share with the Philippians in the task that he so categorically defined as his own in Corinth. The partnership was in danger if Paul was not able to fulfil his part, but Paul assures them that his work continues and even, surprisingly, had widened and strengthened. He exhorts the Philippians to keep on track with their part of the contract, potentially hindered by division, and much of the teaching is aimed at this.

7.1.3. Abstraction – Partners have a common purpose

A partnership depends upon a clear, common task in which all partners can be involved. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: what is the purpose of the partnership? Are the parties involved able to play their role in achieving the goal?

7.2. Equality of Status

7.2.1. Analysis

The question of power and authority is key to understanding the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi. Sampley discovered evidence of the way the *societas* model cut across deeply entrenched social structures. He showed that “people of diverse economic and social backgrounds might be drawn together into *societas* by the mutual valuation of a particular aim.”²⁰ These partnerships were formed between equals within the arrangement with no one side at liberty to coerce the other.²¹ If power is located in one party, equality is impossible.

To be clear about the power relationships this section will begin with the clarification of terms in the context of Paul and the early church. Holmberg in his book *Paul and Power* uses a common definition of power first written by Amitai Etzioni. Etzioni defined power as “an actor’s ability to induce or influence another actor to carry out his directives or any other norms he supports.”²² Power is always present in every relationship and a powerless partnership does not exist. Power can be used in a variety of ways, one of which is by

²⁰ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 13.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 14.

²² Amitai Etzioni, *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1961), 3. See H, Holmberg, *Paul and Power* (Lund: Gleerup, 1978), 8.

exercising authority. Authority here is understood as the claim to legitimacy in the exercise of power.²³ Sociologist Max Weber defined three forms of authority as *traditional*, *charismatic* and *legal*, and his definitions are a common starting point for those discussing authority today.²⁴ The authority of Paul was neither traditional nor legal, and so we are considering *charismatic* authority – not in the theological sense of a gift of the Spirit, but in the sociological sense of encouraging personal devotion through individual leadership.²⁵ In this case it is impossible to fully disentangle the sociological from the theological because any claim in this context to human authority is by appeal to being gifted in the Spirit. However, the questions we are asking – does Paul have the ability to induce or influence his own community and the community at Philippi to carry out his directives or any other norms he supports, and does he legitimise this by inducing personal devotion? – are sociological. Does he have power, and does he exert authority?²⁶

Roland Allen accused the missions of his time of continually issuing directives to indigenous Christians. The exertion of power was authorised by appeal to law developed through traditions.²⁷ He does not reject the notion that Paul was ready at times to exert

²³ In this sense we are using “authority” as the legitimisation of power, a translation of Max Weber’s definition of “*autorität*” as the “*legitime herrschaft*.” Max Weber, “Politics as a Vocation,” in *Max Weber, Essays in Sociology*, eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), 77-128. See, Max Weber “Politik als Beruf,” *Zeno.org*, <http://www.zeno.org/Soziologie/M/Weber,+Max/Schriften+zur+Politik/Politik+als+Beruf>. This definition contrasts with Skinner’s definition of authority as “nurture,” which he derives from the etymological root of the Latin *augere*. Skinner contrasts authority as nurture with the Latin *imperium*, which is “order, command, power, mastery, government, and also military power.” John Skinner “Ideology, Authority, and Faith,” in *Authority in the Communion: Essays presented to John Howe*, ed. Stephen Sykes (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1987), 34-5. The reason preferring Weber’s definition is that Skinner is confusing the etymological diachronic meaning for the real meaning, rather than accepting that the synchronic meaning of authority is driven by present convention, not the ancient source.

²⁴ Weber, “Politics,” 78-9.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 79. Weber’s own definition is: “There is the authority of the extraordinary and personal gift of grace (charisma), the absolutely personal devotion and personal confidence in revelation, heroism, or other qualities of individual leadership. This is ‘charismatic’ domination, as exercised by the prophet or — in the field of politics — by the elected war lord, the plebiscitarian ruler, the great demagogue, or the political party leader.”

²⁶ Weber also noted the utilisation of money to influence others. The power imbalance potentially created by the donor/receiver relationship will be considered below in section 7.6. This section will concentrate on the potential legitimisation of power through charismatic authority.

²⁷ Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St Paul’s or Ours?* 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 117-8.

authority,²⁸ but he argues that this was rarely exercised and only in one church, and only when responding to the “outrageous conduct of unreasonable and disorderly men.”²⁹ His missiological experience leads him to believe that Paul enabled the churches he founded to thrive and grow in his absence because he had set them broad principles, not narrow laws.³⁰ The missiological assumption of replicability asks how churches founded by Paul would have been able to survive his death if they were in a state of permanent dependency.³¹ This state of permanent dependency has led to the churches failing to mature, and has been identified by both Mtingele in Tanzania and Titre in the Congo.³²

In contrast to Allen some New Testament scholars write as if they assume that Paul has power and exerts authority over the churches in his sphere of influence.³³ Belleville argues this authority resides in his claim to be an apostle: “Paul defines the source of his authority as ‘given by the Lord’ (2 Cor. 10:8; cf Rom. 1:1). This authority stems specifically from his status as ‘Christ’s apostle’ (1 Thess. 2:6), which gives him the right to exert his personal influence when necessary (1 Thess. 2:7).”³⁴ Best sees the claim to authority residing in Paul’s role as a founder of churches. Paul is the “Father” of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 4:15) in the sense that he is the one who brought them to new birth in Christ, and their primary source for the gospel.³⁵ Best is able to write, “there is equally no doubt that he [Paul] exercised authority.”³⁶ Paul seems to have been claiming a right to be a special person within the emerging church of the first century. The Corinthian correspondence highlights that his

²⁸ Ibid., 111.

²⁹ Ibid., 112.

³⁰ Ibid., 124-5.

³¹ Ibid., 111.

³² Ibid., 124. Mkunga H.P. Mtingele, “Leadership and Conflict in an African Church: An Enquiry into the Context Nature, Causes and Consequences of Conflict and Conflict Management in the Anglican Church of Tanzania during the period of Indigenous Leadership Circa 1960 – Circa 2000” (PhD diss., The Open University, 2004), 99-103. Ande Titre “To Teach, Baptise and Nurture New Believers (ii),” in *Mission in the 21st Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission* ed. Andrew Walls and Cathy Ross (London: DLT, 2008), 37-45.

³³ See, for example: Linda Belleville, “Authority,” in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 55-7.

³⁴ Ibid., 55.

³⁵ E. Best, “Paul’s Apostolic Authority?” *JSNT* 27 (1986), 3-25.

³⁶ Ibid., 3.

contested status as an apostle is important to him and others.³⁷ The evidence seems to point to Paul as having (or seeking) power and authority over the churches he founded.

In contrast the Philippian church does not appear to have any special status. Those who accept the Lukan account of Paul's evangelisation of Philippi,³⁸ place the Philippians in the list of churches that would describe Paul as their "Father."³⁹ If Acts is accurate, Paul is the one who brought them to new birth in Christ; he is their primary source for the gospel. O'Brien regards the omission of the apostolic title in Philippians as evidence that the claim was not contested and his authority was secure.⁴⁰ O'Brien assumes that Paul holds charismatic authority over the Philippians, and power is not equally shared.

The power/authority relationship between Paul and his own community and between the Pauline community and the community of Christians in Philippi is therefore of vital concern in the formation of a model for partnership in the context of the Anglican Communion where churches are described by words such as founding, giving, stronger, older, receiving, traditional, Spirit-filled and declining. All these terms delineate power relationships legitimated either by tradition, law or charisma. Each one may be used as a claim to authority within the Anglican Communion.

Unequal power relationships and the claiming of authority bring into question the reality of partnership. However, Sampley identifies that while *societas* relationships were formed between those of differing status within society, the relationship within the

³⁷ Anthony Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 65-7 and 669-73.

³⁸ Acts 16:11-40, with support in 1 Thess. 2:2.

³⁹ The leading commentators on Philippians take an approach of cautious optimism towards the historical reliability of the Lukan account of the initial conversion of Philippi. Bockmuehl is perhaps typical. He is aware that the historical status of Acts has been defended by those he describes as "blithely uncritical" and dismissed by those who "combine a radical scepticism about Acts with an unshakable faith in their own methods." He points to recent scholarship providing a "more positive and more nuanced assessment of the value of Acts as a historical source," and follows this lead (*Philippians*, 11). This approach is followed both by more liberal commentators such as John Reumann, *Philippians – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible Commentary. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008) and more conservative commentators such as Fee (*Philippians*, 27), Hawthorne (*Philippians*, xxxiv-xxxvi) and Peter O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 5-8.

⁴⁰ O'Brien, *Philippians*, 49-50.

partnership was required equality.⁴¹ The purpose of the following analysis is to see if it is possible to identify how issues of inequality might have been overcome. First we will study how Paul understood himself as an apostle, and, secondly, how he understood himself as “father” of those he had converted, both the churches he founded and the individuals within them.

7.2.1.1. Paul the Apostle

The title “apostle” is not used in Philippians, and this might suggest that it is not an issue to be considered. However, O’Brien’s claim that the inequality was understood, and the significance Paul gives to the title in other contexts, means that it cannot be ignored.

It is possible to interpret the claim to apostleship as a claim for charismatic authority in order to legitimise the use of power. Thiselton argues that Calvin and others saw it this way, and that such claims were considered “innocent” until the work of Nietzsche and Foucault highlighted the nature of power and its abuse.⁴² The question of whether Paul used a title to gain authority becomes one that relates the present to the past. Any re-evaluation of the link between Paul’s use of “apostle” is in the context of present awareness of potential abuse. Having said this, there is some evidence that such a realisation is not limited to the post-modern mind. Calvin is well aware of the potential abuse of authority.⁴³ Indeed it is a frequent theme as he draws parallels with the abuse of the Catholic Church and of contemporaneous civil authorities and recalls Christians to accept only the authority of God unmediated.⁴⁴

New Testament scholars recognise the limitations of lexicographical studies in understanding Paul’s use of *apostolos*. Barnett says the “The word *apostolos* (‘apostle’) was

⁴¹ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 17.

⁴² Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 65-7.

⁴³ Calvin, J. *Commentary Upon the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. H. Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 reprint), 78.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 120-1 and 350.

used only infrequently in the Greek language prior to the New Testament times.”⁴⁵ It is the New Testament usage, and in particular Paul’s own use of the word, that is of significance for this study. Paul uses the title *apostolos* in the salutations in his letters, except in Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Philemon. The omission of the title in Philippians is of special significance to this thesis and is best understood following a discussion of its use in the other epistles.⁴⁶

Once again the contrast between the Corinthian correspondence and Philippians is relevant. In his commentary on 1 Corinthians, Thiselton states that in 1831 F.C. Baur first proposed that Paul used the title “apostle” as a polemic to gain equality of power with the Peter led Judaizing party.⁴⁷ Rengstorf added to the debate in 1933 when he argued that the lexicographical approach of understanding *apostellein* as “send away,” “send out” was too simplistic. In response to the lack of any significant Greek use of the word, he proposed an understanding based on Jewish customs in the *Mishnah*. He drew a parallel between *shiliach*, the authority figure for the community, and *apostolos*. He introduced the understanding of apostleship as capable of being passed on. He argued that it was an institutional title capable of mechanical succession.⁴⁸ This has the effect of introducing, in Weber’s terms, a notion of traditional authority. In 1942 Käsemann challenged the understanding that Paul used the apostolic title to enforce his authority over the Corinthians. Instead Käsemann argued that the demand for “legitimation” came not from Paul, but from his opponents. It was the Corinthians who were demanding he exert authority over them, not Paul demanding they accept his authority. In his essay “Ministry and Community” Käsemann built a dichotomy between Luke’s institutionalised apostolate as a *theologia gloriae*, and Paul’s *theologia*

⁴⁵ Paul Barnett, “Apostle,” in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 45. See also, Karl Rengstorf, “*apostolos*,” in *TDNT*, vol 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, 407-8.

⁴⁶ The theme of this section is to understand Paul’s usage and so the study will be of the letters commonly attributed to him in scholarship.

⁴⁷ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 670-1.

⁴⁸ Rengstorf, “*apostolos*,” 407-47.

crucis, where the apostle is grounded in the “mind of Christ,” and whose sufferings entail “weakness” rather than power and authority.⁴⁹ As an apostle, Paul lives out the scandal of the cross by rejecting authority, by becoming a slave and embracing weakness (1 Cor. 9:19-23, 2 Cor. 6:3-10, 2 Cor. 11:16-33).⁵⁰ He accuses the Corinthians of accepting those who would enslave them, exploit them and take advantage of them. Unlike false leaders who push themselves forwards and slap the Corinthians in the face, Paul is weak, “too weak for that!” (2 Cor. 11:25). Thiselton says that the apostolic title points away from the person of Paul to the crucified and risen Christ.⁵¹ For the Corinthians the apostolic title is assumed to be a claim to legitimacy and authority, but Paul has to explain that the title apostle is, in fact, a renunciation of authority. It demands not only that the bearer speaks on behalf of God but that he or she lives out the way of weakness in a lifestyle which proclaims Christ crucified and risen. For Paul apostle is not a title demanding institutional control of the church. Rather, in Thiselton’s terms, the title points away from the bearer to God. The bearer is a sign of what it is to live out the gospel in a cruciform lifestyle, and is a foundational witness to the resurrection, with a personal stake in the truth of the claims.⁵²

If this analysis is accepted we are left with the question about why Paul claims his title apostle, not once but several times (1 Cor. 1:1, 9:1, 9:2, 15:9 twice, 2 Cor. 1:1 and 12:12).⁵³ For Thiselton, Paul’s reconstructed understanding of apostle stands in contrast to the Corinthian understanding. It highlighted the gulf between the internally divided Corinthians and Paul and his companions. The culture of Corinth valued status and self-reliance as freed slaves and those of lower social classes gained wealth and position. Paul’s rejection of that way, seen in his refusal of money earned from public speaking, was a

⁴⁹ Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM, 1964), 89-93.

⁵⁰ On becoming a scandal see Neil Richardson, *Paul’s Language about God*, JSNTS 99 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 135.

⁵¹ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 673.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 669-70.

⁵³ C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A and C Black, 1971), 30-1.

shocking challenge to the cultural norms of the city and Christian community.⁵⁴ Paul's assertion of the title apostle is not intended to take power, rather to challenge it. Its use demonstrates the need for the Corinthians to rediscover the gospel. In this Paul is not taking sides in their disputes, but questioning the premise upon which their disputes were built. The angry cry of "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle?" (1 Cor. 9:1), demonstrates Paul's frustration that they have neither understood him nor the message. In the Corinthian literature the apostolic claim is made in the context of the separation between Paul and the community. Paul does not use it as a pretext to assert his own authority, but as an attempt to distance himself from power. His desire is for the Corinthians to identify that power is held by the head of the Church, the risen Christ (1 Cor. 11-12).

In Romans the claim to apostleship is sandwiched between Paul's status as a slave of Christ and the submerging of his person to the purpose of the "gospel of God" (Rom. 15:16). He is writing to a community who do not know him. Cranfield comments that "the use of the word 'apostle' here indicates that Paul claims the attention of the Roman church to what follows on the ground not of his own personal worth and wisdom but of the commission he has received from Christ."⁵⁵ In this letter he distils his theological viewpoint, and again the claim to being an apostle is vital to his cause. At least two apostles (Andronicus and Junia) are among the Roman community (16:7), and these two will have set the example of the living and preaching witness that Paul understands as vital to apostolic ministry. While the title is not used to demand authority, especially as he was not the founder of their community,⁵⁶ in its formality it sets up a definition which denies familiarity. He can be trusted because he is an apostle, even though they do not know him. The authority is his connection to Christ, not something which he has claim to himself. The use of the title speaks against the relationship as partnership.

⁵⁴ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 12-7.

⁵⁵ Charles Cranfield, *Romans, A Shorter Commentary* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 3.

⁵⁶ James Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, Word Biblical Commentary 38A (Waco, Texas: Word, 1988), 9.

The question of authority was clearly significant in the use of the apostolic title in the greeting to the Galatian church. The RSV translation of Gal. 1:1a is “Paul an apostle – not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.” However, the NRSV translates the verse: “Paul an apostle – sent neither by human commission nor from human authorities, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father,” and the TNIV similarly: “Paul an apostle – sent not with a human commission nor by human authority, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father.” The motivation for change in both translations is to avoid gender sensitive language, but in the process the translation makes clear what several commentators regard as implicit – Paul is claiming authority. Fung argues that *dia*, “through” is best understood as “commissioned from,”⁵⁷ and Bruce states that the authority of the one who commissions is the authority of the one commissioned.⁵⁸ They both regard Paul as making an early impact by emphasising his apostolic authority. These commentators agree that those who questioned Paul’s credentials were undermining his teaching. Paul is not asserting his authority over other people, but asserting the truth of the message he is bringing. Even though he confronts Cephas, he does not undermine his status as an apostle, and is careful to show respect for the Jerusalem leadership – the “pillars.” The appeal to the Galatians does not rest on authority alone; it also rests on their experience (3:3-4).⁵⁹ For Paul, establishing a direct link to Jesus Christ as the basis of his apostolic authority is a key element in returning the Galatians to a gospel of freedom, far removed from the exercise of authority by those who came “from James,” promoting obedience to law (2:11-13). The Galatians are encouraged to become children of God (3:26-7) not children of Paul and 4:19 is an expression of Paul’s pain that they are still dependent upon him and his desire for Christ to be formed in them. The apostolic claim within the salutation signifies the reality of a failed partnership, until they too are children of Christ.

⁵⁷ Fung, R.Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 37.

⁵⁸ F.F. Bruce, *Epistle to the Galatians* NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 72.

⁵⁹ See, Fung, *Galatians*, 128-33.

The title apostle does appear to be significant to Paul for the validation of the message he carried. In the Corinthian correspondence it was used as a contrast to the claims to personal power desired by the communities, in Romans as an entry card to a community he had not visited; and in Galatians as a reminder of the gospel they had heard from him and abandoned. In each case it is the sign of a failure of partnership, and the hoped for restoration or the forming of a relationship. The title apostle gave Paul the authority to speak, but not to command.

Having looked at key texts where Paul calls himself apostle we now look at those where the title is omitted. The omission in Thessalonians is sometimes accounted for as an indication of no real opposition to Paul in Thessalonica.⁶⁰ Fee posits a different solution by arguing for an early dating for Thessalonians. In the earliest letters Paul opts for a simple greeting, following the standard convention of a three-fold salutation (name of writer, to the addressee, greetings). It is argued that only in later letters does he develop the salutation to include theological points.⁶¹ Fee notes that, following Paul's adaptation of this convention in 1 Corinthians, he always subtly amends every greeting to reflect the context and content of the letter.

The claim to apostleship is also omitted in Philemon. Paul makes his plea for the release of Onesimus, not as a demand from a position of power, but as a friend and fellow worker (v. 1) and as a partner (v. 17). Philemon is encouraged to act on the basis of love (v. 9) spontaneously and without coercion (v. 14). The use of the title of apostle would render such partnership invalid. The omission of the apostolic claim is vital for the correct equal partnership relationship to be established and Philemon to act on his own volition. The call to obedience in v. 21 is not to Paul but to God and Paul leaves open which course is the course of obedience for Philemon.

⁶⁰ R.L. Thomas, "1, 2 Thessalonians," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, ed. F. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 237.

⁶¹ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 27-8. Peter O'Brien, *Philippians*, 44.

It is in this context that the claim can be made that for Paul's relationship with the Philippians, and Philemon, his apostolic title is irrelevant, even unhelpful, and it is consciously omitted. This omission is regarded as significant by most of the major commentators.⁶² For Fee and Bockmuehl it points to (but does not prove) the hypothesis that Philippians is a letter of friendship. They also see in it Paul's desire to connect himself fully with Timothy, who had no such claim to apostleship. This contrasts with 2 Cor. 1:1 and Col. 1:1 where Timothy is associated with Paul, but not included in the same manner.

Such an interpretation challenges O'Brien's argument that the apostolic claim is omitted because it is not under question. Instead of linking the omission to that in Philemon, O'Brien links it with the Thessalonian correspondence, arguing that in Macedonia Paul had no need to use the title because he was accepted as speaking with authority.⁶³ As noted above, O'Brien toys with the idea of a rhetorical structure for Philippians in order to argue for the preservation of the integrity of the epistle and he is, therefore, attracted to the notion of Paul as an authority figure. However, Fee's reconstruction makes more sense of the dating of the writing of the letters which both he and O'Brien share. It makes sense from the literary nature of the text as a friendship letter, and it accords with the understanding of Paul as the apostle of weakness, not one seeking authority.

Reumann sees the omission of the title apostle and its replacement with the title slave as a claim to deeper authority. He argues that as Paul is a slave of the greatest master he therefore has even greater authority than an apostle.⁶⁴ This is an extension of Bruce's argument in Galatians that the representative carries the authority of the master. This might be true if Paul were taking the title as his alone. However, Timothy is included in the slave title, and the life he calls the Philippians to is one of obedience to Christ and an imitation of

⁶² e.g. Fee, *Philippians*, 62. Bockmuehl, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (London: A and C Black, 1997), 49. O'Brien, *Philippians*, 44,45.

⁶³ O'Brien, *Philippians*, 49-50.

⁶⁴ Reumann, *Philippians*, 82.

his servanthood (Phil. 2:5-18). This would not be a case of authority *over*, but authority *with* Timothy and the Philippian community.

It is likely that the omission of the claim to apostleship in Philippians is because Paul was in a partnership with the Philippian community. The relationship he had with the Philippian church was dependent upon authority not being held by either side. Roland Allen points out that “with the appointment of elders the churches were complete. They no longer depended necessarily upon St Paul. If he went away, or if he died, the churches remained They were no longer dependent upon the apostle, but they were independent of him.”⁶⁵ The relationship between Paul and the Philippians is not one of apostle as proto-bishop, with church community under his authority, but as partners with power to influence one another in the task of the gospel. Paul omitted the title apostle because to use it would have been a denial of the relationship of equal status he shared with the Philippian community.

7.2.1.2. Paul the “Father”

There is no internal evidence in Philippians that Paul regarded himself as the founder and father of the community of Christians in Philippi. However, as noted above, many commentators take a positive view of the Lukan account of the founding of the Church in Philippi, and so assume that Paul introduced Christianity to Philippi. From Philippians we do know that Paul did regard himself as “father” to Timothy, and the letter offers some indication of what that meant for him.

Best rejects the link between the claim to apostleship and the claim for authority, but he continues to assert that Paul is in an authoritative relationship with the churches he founded. It is Best’s working assumption, not his conclusion, that Paul does exert authority.⁶⁶ In this context he argues that the title apostle is less significant to Paul’s

⁶⁵ Allen, *Missionary Methods*, 111.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

authority in any given church than his status and role as founder or father.⁶⁷ His argument is based upon an analogy of the Queen's parenting of Prince Charles. His argument is that when Prince Charles was a child the Queen told him to eat his greens because she had the relationship as a mother, not because she commanded him so to do as the Monarch.⁶⁸ Her authority is based upon her relationship to him as mother not from her title as Queen. However, she still holds the power and Best still considers Paul to be authoritarian, even if he concedes that was not Paul's self-assessment.⁶⁹ He identifies Paul's understanding of his authority in his awareness of his position of parent of most of the churches he wrote to. Key to Best's argument is 1 Cor. 4:14-21. The passage begins with Paul's claim to fatherhood and ends with the question of coming with a rod, a symbol of parental discipline. The Corinthians are babies he has been forced to feed milk not solid food (3:1-3).

The image of the successful evangelist as parent is present through much of Paul's letters, notably in Thessalonians, where Paul is both mother and father, and in Galatians (4:19). Paul is the "founding parent," and Best ascribes to him the "well-known sociological phenomenon that those who found organisations tend to control them as long as possible."⁷⁰ Once again this is power legitimised by charismatic authority. Best does not qualify these remarks, and there are two leaps from specific reality to generalisation that require examination. Firstly, that there is "a well known social phenomenon" is a generalisation and Best does not prove, but assumes, that Paul falls into this category. Secondly, even if this phenomenon is replicated in some of the churches Paul founded, it may not be replicated in all.

⁶⁷ Earnest Best, "Paul's Apostolic Authority?" *JSNT* 27 (1986), 3-25.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 3 and 17.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 17.

Support for Best's contention comes from the Elizabeth Castelli. She argues that "the notion of mimesis [imitation] functions in Paul's letters as a strategy of power,"⁷¹ and that when linked to the invocation of the parent/child relationship, especially in 1 Cor. 4:14-21, this becomes particularly authoritarian.⁷² Her argument is that Paul's call for his followers to imitate him is one that has the intention and effect of enforcing a hierarchical relationship giving privileged status to the model, enforcing "sameness" over difference and asserting the authority of the model.⁷³ It is through this lens that she reads the texts of the New Testament, paying no attention to establishing meaning, which she regards as necessarily fictional, but considering the effects.⁷⁴ She argues that Paul's call to *mimesis* is enhanced by the invocation of the parent/child relationship and that "the image of the father must be read in cultural context, that is, in relationship to the nature of the paternal role in Graeco-Roman society-which is a role of possessing total authority over children."⁷⁵ The call to imitate from the "father" figure results in an authoritarian power relationship.

That such relationships exist is not disputed. It is illustrated by the failure of the MRI project recorded in this thesis. Such issues punctuate the history of conflict in the Anglican Church of Tanzania, as recorded by Mtingele.⁷⁶ They are the roots of the issues of dependency identified by Titre in the Congolese context.⁷⁷ They are the problem Allen identifies in the power exerted by external missions over indigenous Chinese Christians of his day, who were told to imitate the church of the West, the parent church.⁷⁸ In each case the effect of these power relationships is seen in the life of a church that is not able to reach maturity. However, Allen asserts that Paul managed to offer an alternative model that allows

⁷¹ Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse on Power* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 15.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 111.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 101.

⁷⁶ Mtingele, "Leadership and Conflict," 209-14. See also, 18-22; 87-90; 106-7; 155-6.

⁷⁷ Titre, "To Teach," 38-9.

⁷⁸ Allen, *Missionary Methods*, 111-25.

growth rather than continual dependency.⁷⁹ The evidence offered is the development and growth of the church after his imprisonment and death. Castelli is looking to a projected “effect” of Paul’s letters, but her failure to obtain data on the reality of the proposed “effect” leaves her open to the accusation that she is holding a mirror up to the text, an accusation she makes of others.

Thiselton responds to Castelli by pointing to the diversity encouraged by Paul in 1 Cor. 12. He distinguishes between unity and diversity. He does not support a “Paul group” and commends other leaders such as Apollos.⁸⁰ Moreover, he points to the path Paul is calling others to imitate as servant of the crucified Christ. The lens that Castelli uses “rules out altruism of any kind.”⁸¹

The key image of the church in the Anglican Communion is the Body of Christ, a core part of Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians. Of that theology, Thiselton comments: “The surprise comes not from the emergence of difficulty and conflict over social diversity (‘because I am not a hand, I do not belong to the body,’ 12:15; ‘The eye cannot say to the hand, ‘I have no need of you’ ’ 12:21); the surprise is, rather, that the transformative power of the gospel could provide a new common status and identity to all believers as ‘one body ... whether Jews or Gentiles, whether slaves or free’ (12:13).”⁸² The consequence of the gospel of Jesus is Lord is the removal of all other distinctions of status.

Castelli is right to point out the potential effect of the appeal to imitate Paul as parent, but the content of the letter is also significant. Fee agrees that the utilisation of the father imagery as a motif as a founder of the church is significant, but the call to imitate him is about encouraging maturity and an escape from the parent/child role.⁸³ The proposed sending of Timothy provides a link between 1 Corinthians and Philippians, and a

⁷⁹ Ibid., 111.

⁸⁰ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 372.

⁸¹ Ibid., 373.

⁸² Ibid., 28.

⁸³ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 185.

consideration of Timothy might offer further understanding of Paul's own understanding of the parental relationship.

Timothy was a well-known and much trusted companion of Paul. The son of a Greek father and a Jewish mother, he had come to faith along with his mother prior to Paul's arrival at Lystra (Acts 16:1), and he was carefully nurtured by Paul and often mentioned in letters. Paul accepted Timothy as part of the party who then moved on to Philippi but he does not seem to have had an important role in evangelism there.⁸⁴ It is not a surprise to see him mentioned in Philippians, but the manner of the joint salutation is unique. Co-workers are mentioned in the salutation of other letters, but apart from 1 Thessalonians,⁸⁵ everywhere else a distinction is made between them and Paul. For example, in 1 Corinthians Paul describes himself as "called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ and by the will of God" (1:1) and only then is the brother Sosthenes mentioned. It is clear who the apostle – Paul is. Sosthenes' role is unclear. He could have been scribe, he could have been carrier, or he could have been nominated to "perform" the reading, but it is clear that he was not the apostle.⁸⁶ In contrast, in Philippians Paul and Timothy are both "slaves of Christ."

This lack of distinction is all the more surprising because the letter is the product of a single author, Paul. He writes in the first person singular (in contrast to Thessalonians) and writes about Timothy in the third person. It has been suggested that Timothy was the scribe and therefore had his name upon the letter, but while this could be the case, it is incidental. Paul acknowledges his use of a scribe to write Romans (Rom. 16:22), but Paul's name still stands alone on the letter. For Hawthorne the answer is this: "The best explanation seems to be that Paul, by such condescension, was most effectively able to teach the Philippians a lesson they needed to learn – 'that relationships in the bosom of the church between collaborators were not those of authority, superiority or inferiority but of humble equality'"

⁸⁴ Bockmuehl, *Philippians*, 48-9.

⁸⁵ We have argued prior to this that 1 Thessalonians was an early form and the salutation was not utilised in the same manner as in the later epistles.

⁸⁶ A full discussion of the role of Sosthenes is in Thiselton *1 Corinthians*, 69-73.

(Collange J-F; *L'épître de saint Paul aux Philippiens*).⁸⁷ Collange and Hawthorne see this as a part of Paul's teaching methodology, but it is possible to argue that the salutation represents the reality of the situation as understood by the Philippians. If this is the case the proposal of "condescension" and a teaching motivation are unnecessary. It is equally possible that Paul wrote like this because all concerned *knew* their relationship to be without "authority, superiority or inferiority but of humble equality."

The relationship between Paul and Timothy is made clearer in Phil. 2:19-23. Paul hopes to send Timothy to them so that he might be cheered by news of them. The nature of human exchange in the model of partnership is considered in section 7.5, but here we need to focus on why Timothy is suitable. The first reason is that Timothy has concern for the Philippians because unlike others he places his own interests below the interests of Jesus Christ (2:21). This is a strongly worded verse and implies condemnation of others within Paul's community, and follows on from his acceptance that others around him preach Christ out of their own interests (1:15-18). Fee believes that Paul's frustration was with a limited few of his community who would otherwise be able to make the trip, not with all the believers in that community.⁸⁸

The second reason is that Timothy has "proved himself," which Hawthorn argues convincingly should read Timothy "is of proven worth."⁸⁹ In other words Timothy has faced tests and these have refined him. Thus he is "of proven character"⁹⁰ and Paul is able to say "that, as a child with his father, he worked like a slave with me in the cause of the gospel" (2:22).⁹¹ The wording of this sentence is important for the distillation of a model of partnership. Hawthorne and O'Brien point out that the Greek becomes very awkward and laboured as Paul struggles to express the relationship he has with Timothy. "As a child with

⁸⁷ Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 3-4.

⁸⁸ Fee, *Philippians*, 267-8.

⁸⁹ Hawthorn, *Philippians*, 107,111.

⁹⁰ Fee, *Philippians*, 268.

⁹¹ O'Brien, *Philippians*, 324. See also Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 107.

his father..." – Timothy is like a child in his relationship with Paul. Elsewhere Paul denotes those he has converted as his children but it does not appear to be the case that Paul converted Timothy (Acts 16:1). Rather Timothy is considered Paul's child because he has learnt at Paul's side as a son learns a trade from his father.⁹² He has served an apprenticeship. It would be easy to read this text as Timothy working for Paul as a son for a father, and thus place Timothy in a junior subordinate role, but Paul writes that Timothy worked as a slave (*edouleusen*) with me (*sun emoi*) in service of their common Lord, rather than as a slave for Paul. Thus the "father" motif is used in a manner that does not imply the power relationship argued by Castelli.

The tests by which Timothy has been proved mean that, while he remains a son, he is one who has matured into an equal partner. This means that if Timothy were to visit the Philippians he would not come as an outsider into the partnership but as an equal. He remains as a son to Paul, but one who has come to maturity through the tests that have shaped him. He is not a servant of Paul, or of anyone else, but only of the God who is Lord of all. A son will learn the trade at the feet of his father, but once he has finished his apprenticeship he can take over the business and will eventually be in sole charge. However, a son will always remain the child of his father, even though he has reached maturity.

Therefore, Paul can include Timothy as an equal as a "Slave of Christ." *Doulos* is sometimes translated as "servant,"⁹³ but our notion of "servant" is not the one Paul intends. He and Timothy are slaves of the Lord who loves them. While the notion of being a slave is usually one that represents bondage, for Paul being a slave of God brings freedom. It does not alter social status, indeed 1 Cor. 7:21 shows that the freedom is one which exists within or without slavery.⁹⁴ Slavery to Christ is freedom from sin, law and death (Rom. 8:1-2), and does not bring slavery to any new human master. This includes Timothy, who is not the

⁹² Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 111, referring to Caird, G.B. *Paul's Letters from Prison*, New Clarendon Bible Series (Oxford: OUP, 1976), no page reference given.

⁹³ For example; NIV, RSV.

⁹⁴ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 553-9.

slave of Paul. This relationship is an example of the effect of Paul's message, which contrasts with the "effect" postulated by Castelli.

The title "Slaves of Jesus Christ" might be used to infer that Paul and Timothy are special servants of Christ and hold a position of authority over others, in particular the Philippians.⁹⁵ However, this would run contrary to the flow of the letter. The Philippians themselves are encouraged to follow the Christ-like example of slavery in chapter 2. Paul uses the Christological hymn to demonstrate that as Jesus took the form of a slave (*doulos*) (2:7) this is an example for the Philippians to follow. Slavery requires obedience and in 2:12 the Philippians are commended for their obedience. If this is obedience to Paul then the relationship cannot properly be understood as one of partnership.

O'Brien argues from Phil. 2:7 that Paul regards obedience to him as obedience to Christ and so maintains inequality.⁹⁶ However, this is refuted by Fee.⁹⁷ According to Fee, while Paul calls for obedience to himself in 2 Thess. 3:15, elsewhere he argues the mark of Christian maturity is obedience to Christ. "For Paul *faith in* Christ is ultimately expressed as *obedience to* Christ, not in the sense of following the rules, but of coming totally under his lordship, of being devoted completely to him."⁹⁸ This corresponds to the way 2:12 continues. The Philippians are encouraged through their obedience to "continue to work out their own salvation." Fee argues this means that they are to find for themselves, and within their relationship with Christ, the right way to live out their faith, not determined by anyone else, even Paul.⁹⁹ Thus O'Brien has missed the point of the development of the Philippian Church from the kind of immaturity of the Corinthians, who demanded authority, to the maturity where Paul can rejoice that the Philippians are able to work out for themselves how they can live out their "salvation."

⁹⁵ E.g. Reumann, *Philippians*, 82.

⁹⁶ O'Brien, *Philippians*, 275-6.

⁹⁷ Fee, *Philippians*, 232-3.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 233. Emphasis his.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 231-7.

The equality of maturity is emphasised in Phil. 3:15 where Paul includes himself, and those to whom he is writing, among the *teleioi*, the “mature,” who should share a common opinion. Hawthorne follows a line of commentators who see the word *teleioi* as ironic, contending that Paul placed it in juxtaposition with *teteleiomai* in verse 12.¹⁰⁰ Both words are from the common root *telos* that can mean perfect in the sense of fulfilling an aim, of being complete.¹⁰¹ In 3:12 Paul says he is not yet perfect, and yet in 3:15 he includes himself among the perfect. Hawthorne follows many commentators in hypothetically constructing an opposition group who claim perfection and who Paul mocks with irony.¹⁰² This interpretation has come under fire recently. While *teteleiomai* and *teleioi* have the same root they can have different meanings in different contexts.¹⁰³ The context of the former is the fulfilment of salvation in full fellowship with the risen Jesus, a perfection not yet attained. The second is a completion of the stage of immaturity for those who are grown up in Christ, a state of being which not only can be obtained, but is desirable for all Christians. Secondly, once we have understood the letter as one of friendship, we see that there is no great heretical group causing division in the Philippian community and no need to postulate the existence of such a group. Indeed that Paul includes himself so unambiguously within those who are *teleioi* means that he is not making clear his opposition to a section of the Philippian community, but his identification with the whole of their church in their common maturity.¹⁰⁴

There is no superiority in Paul’s relationship with the Philippians. 3:15 emphasises the “mutuality” of their friendship.¹⁰⁵ Indeed if they disagree with Paul, he trusts them enough to explore their thoughts before God to come to a mature decision. There is no

¹⁰⁰ Hawthorn, *Philippians*, 155.

¹⁰¹ Fee, *Philippians*, 344.

¹⁰² For a full list see O’Brien *Philippians*, 435, footnote 89.

¹⁰³ This is a classic case of placing diachronic meaning over synchronic: a fallacy identified by Barr in James Barr, *The Semantics Of Biblical Language* (Oxford: OUP, 1961).

¹⁰⁴ O’Brien, *Philippians*, 436. Fee, *Philippians*, 358.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 359.

indication that this will necessarily be the same conclusion as Paul's, and he trusts them to explore with God the right conclusion. It is clear that the notion of being slaves of Christ is one that unites Paul, Timothy and the full Philippian community. There is an equality of status; he has no authority over them.

7.2.1.3. Paul, Power and Authority in Philippians

The status of Paul as apostle and as father offers him the opportunity of legitimising the use of power as a charismatic leader. The effect of the use of such power and authority is understood in significant missiological writings as detrimental in the medium and long term to the independent growth of the church. New Testament scholarship points to a conclusion that Paul used the apostolic title to authenticate a message in the context of either a breakdown in relationship (the Corinthian correspondence and Galatians) or to establish a relationship (Romans). The message itself was one that was designed to challenge a dependency culture, and in each of these texts other apostles were commended, even when there was acknowledged friction (Peter in Galatians), or assumed friction (Apollos in Corinth). The apostolic title was dropped in the letter to Philemon and Philippians in the context of partnership and authority was not demanded.

Similarly, the call to imitation, especially in the context of a parental relationship, is open to abuse. The likely effect is to produce dependency and a lack of diversity. However, the relationship between Paul and Timothy offers an alternative of the move from a parent/child relationship to a parent/adult relationship, where the two are of equal status. The former is a relationship that induces frustration in Paul, the latter an aim potentially achieved in his relationship with the Philippians. Partnership in Christ between Paul and the Philippians is based on parity of status.

7.2.2. Distillation

In 1 Corinthians Paul marks himself as apostle in order to call the divided communities to rediscover the victory of the cross. He redefines authority in weakness and

opposes forms of verbal coercion. In this manner the common relationships of the use of power legitimised by charismatic authority are challenged. As long as the Corinthian communities expect a relationship defined by dependency, partnership is not possible.

Paul recognises the Philippians' maturity, and assumes equality of status in the relationship. He shows a level of respect and mutual equality for the Philippian church that is rarely equalled in the rest of his letters. He, Timothy and the whole church of Philippi, including the overseers and deacons, are of equal status within the partnership. All are slaves of Christ and owe obedience to Christ alone. Power exists and flows in both directions without one side dominating the other.

7.2.3. Abstraction – Partners are of equal status

In a partnership both partners must have equality of status. There must be mutual respect. Partnership cannot work where there are feelings of inferiority or superiority on either side. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: are all ready to forego feelings of superiority? Do all have confidence to know they are as important as those with whom they are in partnership?

7.3. Common Basis of Belief

7.3.1. Analysis

Sampley, drawing on the *Institutes of Gaius*, states that: “A partnership [*societas*] lasts as long as the parties remain of the same mind,” where “‘of the same mind’ is a shorthand way of saying that the aim of the *societas* remains central and functional for the partners.”¹⁰⁶ The focus of partnerships in the Roman world was either money or status. The gospel was something completely different. The gospel was the vital centre of Paul's faith. Assent to the gospel was not just an agreement even in heart and mind, but a state of being, slavery to the Lord Jesus Christ.

¹⁰⁶ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 15.

Paul was concerned that the Corinthians had rejected the gospel they had once embraced. Fee comments that despite appearances, Paul's concern in 1 Cor. 15:1-11 is not to prove the resurrection, but to reassert beliefs once commonly held.¹⁰⁷ He argues that 15:3-5 is commonly regarded as an early creedal statement, a testimony Paul had given to them from the start.¹⁰⁸ The subject of conflict may be the resurrection of the body, but the reassertion of common ground is vital for the debate to be had. That the creedal statement requires further elaboration suggests that doubts were raised about the basis of faith.¹⁰⁹ The strong reassertion of the resurrection leads to a debate on the resurrection of the dead and to the statement: "And if Christ has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith." (15:14). Paul is calling them back to common ground, but he is not certain they continue to share that ground.

The contrast is seen in the use of the Christological hymn in Phil. 2. As with 1 Cor. 15:3-5, the hymn was something both Paul and the Philippians would have known. What makes it different is that there is no hint that the Philippians did not accept the common creedal statement. Paul does not use it to convert them; he does not use it as part of a kerygmatic sermon, but as a basis from which to argue for a style of behaviour and attitude. In dialogue between partners a shared vocabulary of belief is vital for the development of the shared relationship.

It is important to note that in Phil. 2 Paul does not call for theological consistency in the way he does in 1 Cor. 15. From the common statement of faith Paul calls them to live out their salvation in obedience to God. Phil. 2:12-13 recognises that the working out of salvation is contextual. The basis is humility in the service of Christ, but the living out varies from person to person and from place to place. What is interesting is the way Paul accepts the diversity of belief and attitude in those considered partners. While the basis of a shared

¹⁰⁷ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 718. See also Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1184-5.

¹⁰⁸ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 718.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

relationship with God and an agreement on the fundamentals of the gospel are vital, differences of working out the practical implications of that are expected by Paul.

This is emphasised in Phil. 3. In response to those who see a radical discontinuity at 3:2, Fee points out the links between this passage and other parts of the letter. These are the Christocentric nature of the appeal, especially the link between 3:8 and 1:21, the emphasis on participation in Christ's sufferings in 3:10-11 which has parallels in 1:29-30 and 2:17, and the eschatological orientation particularly in 3:11-1 and 20-21, which he sees as a primary theme in the first two chapters, highlighted in 1:6.¹¹⁰ In 4:1-3 the Philippians are encouraged to "stand fast in the Lord" (4:1), Euodia and Syntyche are encouraged to "have the same mindset as the Lord" (4:2), and to remember that they "contended together for the gospel" (4:3). Fee sees a contrast with conclusion to the section and 1:27 and 2:2. The purpose of the warnings against theological deviation is to ensure they are able to fulfil their role in the partnership in unity with one another and with Paul.

The style and content of 3:1-4:1 is in keeping with warnings in other friendship letters.¹¹¹ It is a warning based on the existence of teachers who have influenced other churches, notably in Galatia. While there is no evidence of such a group within the church in Philippi the warning is so vital for the health of the partnership that Paul feels the need to repeat it. If the Philippians succumb to such theology there will be no common ground of belief between them and the partnership cannot exist.

Fee contrasts these people with the group who are said to preach Christ out of selfish ambition (1:15-18).¹¹² There is obvious tension between Paul and this group. They are not under his "authority" and yet he rejoices because it is Christ they preach. From a very flimsy base, Fee constructs a theory that these jealous evangelists are orthodox Jews reaching out to

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 285-7.

¹¹¹ Fee, *Philippians*, 286. See also Stanley Stowers, "Friends and Enemies in the Politics of Heaven: Reading Theology in Philippians," in *Pauline Theology*, vol.1, ed. Jouette M. Bassler (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 113-17.

¹¹² Fee, *Philippians*, 121-4.

other Jews in Rome, but not interfering with gentile responses to Christ. However, there is no evidence that there was significant disagreement between Paul and this group over the kerygma. Rather they seem to lack an attitude of humility. Paul rejoices in the diversity of this group and recognises that they preach the gospel of the Lordship of Christ.

Paul commends his own way to the Philippians, but as we have previously noted, he respects their maturity and allows them the freedom to judge his words for themselves (3:15). As Fee says: “Paul is especially concerned that they follow his example, which happens also to be part of a ‘patron/client’ friendship. But throughout the letter he studiously avoids any hint of this kind of ‘superior to inferior’ expression of friendship between him and them, in fact he goes out of his way to make sure that their friendship is understood in terms of mutuality.”¹¹³ They are free to live out the gospel in different ways and to disagree with him on different points, provided they live out their life in service to the crucified and risen Lord.

7.3.2. Distillation

The Philippians shared Paul’s basic understanding of the gospel. They are at one on the basics fundamental to their task. They share the common ground in assenting to the Christological hymn in Chapter 2. However, there is room for contextual differences in how these fundamentals are worked out in their lives both corporately and individually. There is room for cultural differences.

7.3.3. Abstraction – Partners have a common basis of belief

Absolute theological parity is not a requisite for partnership, but a common basis of belief and a shared theological language within which to discuss our relationship in partnership is of vital importance. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: do all have a basis of shared values and beliefs? Do all have a shared theological language with which to discuss both unity and diversity?

¹¹³ Ibid., 359.

7.4. Unity Within each Community

7.4.1. Analysis

Sampley observes that the failure to agree terminated the *societas*. For the simple one to one partnership model put forward by Sampley, the disunity is between individual partners.¹¹⁴ Paul is painfully aware that, where the partners are themselves communities, disunity within one of them is just as destructive as disunity between them.

In chapter 6 of this thesis Peterlin's argument that Philippians was written to "defuse tensions and restore unity" in a radically disunited church was rejected.¹¹⁵ His position is founded not on internal evidence, but on a primary belief in an overarching theme in each of Paul's letters, and a conviction that, while a friendship letter would be written due to opportunity (rather like a family postcard), a biblical letter would need a greater purpose.¹¹⁶ Against this we have seen that the *context* of the letter was a partnership relationship and the structure of the letter is that of a friendship letter. However the internal evidence indicates some disunity in both the Philippian and Pauline communities. However, the extent of the disunity did not reach the level experienced within the Corinthian church.

1 Corinthians begins with a recognition of disunity and an appeal to unity (1:10), but even so the dominating theme of the letter is not the disunity of the Christians, but what lies behind their strife. The identification of different groups early on in the letter has led many to look for the content of their disagreements in the issues raised by Paul in the whole of the letter, but this is at best difficult, as nothing explicit is said which would enable an analysis of different opinions held by the different parties. The differing groups are not mentioned again after Chapter 4. While four groups claim leaders (Paul, Apollos, Cephas and Christ), there is no evidence that either Apollos or Peter (Cephas) owned or supported the groups named in their honour any more than Paul accepted the group which took his name. A great

¹¹⁴ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 14-5.

¹¹⁵ Davorin Peterlin, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church*, Supplement to NovT vol. LXXIX (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1995), 6.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

deal of work has been done over the years to identify the possible theologies of the four groups, with no less than six possibilities for the Christ group,¹¹⁷ but there is no evidence of specific theological differences between the groups. It is like a group of football fans who agree on the rules of the game, but boast in the abilities of their favourite team. The rivalry is about which team is best, not about how the game is played. It seems that the supporters of each of the groups believed themselves to be better than those of the others, and any posited theological divisions are contrived and influenced by later theological conflicts.

Apollos may have been different in style to Paul,¹¹⁸ but there is no evidence that the group claiming his name was specifically contradicting Paul's theology. Indeed Paul goes out of his way to commend and encourage Apollos (16:12). Paul appears to have been in deepest conflict with other Jewish Christian missionaries who were characterised as forcing circumcision on gentile believers.¹¹⁹ There is no clear evidence that this was the belief of any of the groups. There may have been some differences over accepting financial and practical support, but these were not the fundamental differences between the Corinthian parties. It appears that the groups shared the same fundamental fault lines in their theology, and these led to the divisions. Paul's perspective seems to be that they pride themselves in their wisdom and spiritual abilities, and boast about them. Their view of Paul is that he does not show wisdom or spiritual power, a view backed by his refusal to accept payment for preaching. Therefore, the accusation is made that he is unable, rather than unwilling, to earn a living from his preaching. The rivalry is between groups out-doing one another in wisdom and spiritual gifts, boasting of their prowess and putting down the other as inferior.¹²⁰

The message of Paul is a challenge not to one group over another but to all. The message of the cross is one of weakness, slavery and suffering, and appears as foolishness, neither wise nor powerful. Fee sets this out in his comment on the development of the

¹¹⁷ See Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 123-33.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ James Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 340.

¹²⁰ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 47-52.

argument of 1:10 to 4:21. He argues that for Paul the nature of the gospel, the Corinthians own experience of it, and the style of preaching that he used among them stand in contradiction to their boasting. Paul then moves on to help them to see the contrast between humans and God in his ecclesiology and attacks “wisdom” and boasting. Fee argues that in chapter 4 he uses Christology to commend slavery to Christ.¹²¹ The misinterpretation of the gospel leading to rivalry and division ends all possibility of partnership. Disunity in the church in Corinth denies the possibility of partnership. The situation in Philippi is not perfect and there are divisions, particularly between Euodia and Syntyche (Phil. 4:2). Within Paul’s own community in Rome, some preach Christ out of selfish ambition (1:17) and others look to their own interests (2:21), but the situation is different to that in Corinth. There is a fundamental unity, with some tensions.

Unity is vital to the partnership. We have seen that Paul needs to show that he is fulfilling his end of the bargain in preaching the gospel; he also needs to show that his community is at one. It is a display of honesty to admit that within his community the gospel is preached in the attitude of rivalry. However, it is still the gospel that is preached. Unity must cut across personality clashes, and does not depend upon friendship. Rather, it depends upon common service to Christ. It is vital for Paul to show that the community around him in Rome is in the partnership. Among those who are members of his community there is Timothy, but also those who preach Christ out of rivalry with Paul.

Unity in the community in Philippi is also vital because without it Paul is only in partnership with one group, and will inevitably be dragged into any dispute between them. This is the context in which the Christological hymn is recalled in Phil. 2. As seen in section 7.3., it is not used to call the Philippians to absolute doctrinal purity, but to encourage them into the way of humility in order to enable unity.

¹²¹ Ibid., 50-1.

If any of you have any encouragement from being united with Christ, if any comfort from his love, if any fellowship with the Spirit, if any tenderness and compassion, then make my joy complete by being likeminded, having the same love, being one in spirit and purpose. Do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit, but in humility consider others better than yourselves. Each of you should look not only to your own interests but to the interests of others. Your attitude should be the same as Christ Jesus. Who being in the very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a slave, being made in human likeness. And in being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross. (Phil. 2:1-8)

Paul argues that the virtues associated with salvation – encouragement, comfort, tenderness and compassion – need to be expressed in deeds. They must be like-minded, loving, and have the same spirit and purpose and, in humility, think of others before themselves. Belief is to be lived out, not just believed or recited. As we noted above, a reminder of the fundamental message of the gospel follows the creedal statement in 1 Cor. 15. The creedal statement in Phil. 2 is followed by a call to live out what is believed; specifically it is a call to humility. Humility is required for the partnership to flourish, as well as a sign of salvation. It is not written in the context of any specific conflict, but rather in the context of the reality of the Christian life. Paul’s community is not perfect and he is aware that is also true of the community in Philippi. They constantly need to remind themselves what it means to follow Christ.

Paul is aware of one specific problem between two prominent leaders in the church and writes to assist:

Therefore, my brothers and sisters, you whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, that is how you should stand firm in the Lord, dear friends! I plead with Euodia and I plead with Syntyche to agree with each other in the Lord. Yes, and I ask you, true companion, help these women who have contended at my side in the cause of the gospel, along with Clement and the rest of my co-workers, whose names are written in the book of life. (Phil. 4:1-3)¹²²

Phil. 4:1 draws the reader back to 1:27 where the community is called to “stand firm in one spirit, contending as one person for the faith of the gospel.” Fee points out the

¹²² Translation by Fee, *ibid.*, 122.

extraordinary nature of the naming of Euodia and Syntyche in 4:2.¹²³ Companions are of course named at the beginning and end of letters but they are rarely singled out in this way, especially in a conflict situation. Within biblical scholarship speculation has taken place as to whether further information about these women might exist, but none has come to light. Scholars agree that they are women,¹²⁴ and while Hawthorne believes that one of them might be Lydia,¹²⁵ this is rightly ignored in later commentaries. All modern commentaries agree that these were real people and not pseudonyms for factions within the church.¹²⁶ Our knowledge of them comes only from the text. The only additional knowledge we have is that the Macedonian church was a place where women were respected, with Acts 16 speaking of the woman Lydia in a manner that assumes she was an early leader of the church.¹²⁷

Euodia and Syntyche are not named and shamed either as opponents of Paul, or as being particularly sinful. Their importance is highlighted by the recognition that they contended at Paul's "side in the cause of the gospel" (4:3). The language reflects gladiatorial combat and in context points to them being on a par with Paul. They were not inferior to him, but stood side by side with him. Paul registers his hope that they will continue to be significant when he asserts they are included in the "book of life" (4:3). This is an unusual eschatological reference – Fee calls it unique.¹²⁸ It is generally accepted that the phrase relates not only Clement and the fellow workers who had died,¹²⁹ but also to Euodia and Syntyche because the focus is still on them,¹³⁰ and because there is no cause to limit the phrase to the dead.¹³¹ Indeed the point is that Euodia and Syntyche are both on the same side,

¹²³ Ibid., 389.

¹²⁴ Contra KJV, see Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 179.

¹²⁵ Ibid. With Lydia being not a name but a derivative of 'Lydian', the one from Lydia in Asia Minor.

¹²⁶ Suggested by the Tübingen School and rejected by Hawthorne, Ibid., 179, and others. Reasserted by Peterlin, *Disunity*, 219, and conclusively dismissed by Bockmuehl, *Philippians*, 239.

¹²⁷ W.D. Thomas, "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi," *Expository Times* vol. 83 (1971-72): 117-20. Fee, *Philippians*, 390-1.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 396-7.

¹²⁹ F.W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (London: A and C Black, 1959), 145.

¹³⁰ Fee, *Philippians*, 397.

¹³¹ Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 180.

in the same book living the same life.¹³² The impact of the gospel and the dynamic of the partnership are weakened by their present division. It is not a fundamental division and while it could be about theology, it might be a personal argument. Paul does not come down on one side or the other; he remains strictly neutral. However, the resolution of the matter is very important.

Reconciliation is something which Paul recognises they cannot do on their own. The translation of the first half of 4:2 is complicated by the desire of some commentators to see *Syzygus* as a proper name. This is rarely accepted, as there are no recorded uses of a name *Syzygus* from the era. The singling out of one person to assist in the peace making process has led to a discussion as to whom this person might be. Hawthorne lists the proposed counsellors as (1) Paul's wife, who might be Lydia (2) a husband or brother of one of the women (3) Epaphroditus (4) Timothy (5) Silas (6) Luke (7) the chief Bishop (8) Christ and (9) a man called *Syzygus*. All these Hawthorne dismisses as speculative bordering on the ridiculous.¹³³ His proposal to translate the verse as "I ask you my loyal yoke-fellows" rather than "fellow" suggests the task of reconciliation is the duty of the whole Philippian community. This is opposed by more recent commentators. O'Brien does not identify the person, but he is sure that it is an individual who is aware of his calling and has tact and influence.¹³⁴ Fee follows O'Brien in this and is convinced that the person is a member of Paul's community. Indeed he is convinced that only Luke fits the bill. He argues that Luke was left behind to enable the Philippians to grow in faith and would have had authority in the community. Fee argues that he was with Paul when he wrote earlier letters, and as he is not

¹³² The awareness of the possibility of Paul's death gives the whole letter an eschatological edge. The Philippians are a delight to Paul, and they are his "crown" as they represent his victory in the struggle to make Christ known.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 180-1.

¹³⁴ O'Brien, *Philippians*, 481.

mentioned in this one, he must have been away at the time, possibly in Philippi.¹³⁵ This too is speculation, and the identity of the loyal yoke fellow is lost.

Reconciliation is the duty of the whole community, but that does not rule out mediation by those with gifts for enabling reconciliation. It is likely the “genuine yoke-fellow” of Paul is an individual who would have immediately been obvious to the community. The close bond made clear by the language of true yoke-fellow implies a person so close to Paul that, even if they are part of the Philippian church, they are nevertheless part of Paul’s community. It could be any of those mentioned, or it could be another unknown significant person, either male or female. There is no implication that the task of reconciliation is about forming a judgement over who is right or wrong. The task is not given to the “overseers and deacons” of 1:1. The task of building unity does not involve a process of judging which one is right. It involves enabling these two significant leaders the opportunity to engage with one another.

7.4.2. Distillation

The Philippian church does not show evidence of fundamental division. It does not have the scale of problems of disunity displayed by the Corinthian church, but there are minor divisions. Unity is such a vital point for the continuation of the partnership that Paul sees it necessary to emphasise its value at the heart of the letter. The disunity within his own community is something that he regrets, but again it is not of the order of the proud disunity of the Corinthians. At least he has Timothy. The path to unity is through humility in the footsteps of Jesus and his way of servanthood. Reconciliation is not achieved by judging who is right and wrong, but by the facilitation of dialogue between the divided people.

7.4.3. Abstraction – Partners have a concern for unity in one another’s community

Partnership between two groups depends upon each group being united. Unity is forged by humility. Without unity the partnership will be between parties within one or both

¹³⁵ Fee, *Philippians*, 392-5.

of the groups, and will encourage division. It is the responsibility of each partner to encourage unity in the other, and, when appropriate, to offer services of reconciliation and not judgement. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each partner prepared to seek the way of humility to unity? Are all committed to unity their partner community?

7.5. Eagerness to Communicate and to be with One Another

7.5.1. Analysis

The geographic distance that separates the Philippians from Paul is greater than might be expected for a commercial *societas*. The need for communication is not made explicit in Sampley's model but is vital for the partnership.

There is a consensus among scholars that Paul was in Ephesus when he wrote 1 Corinthians.¹³⁶ Communication between Ephesus and Corinth was easy. Paul received reports on the state of the church in Corinth from "Chloe's people" (1 Cor. 1:11) who appear to have been slaves acting as agents for Chloe, a wealthy Ephesian woman.¹³⁷ There would have been regular contact by boat between these ports. Correspondence was carried on between the parties with references to other letters. Paul would not have found it hard to visit Corinth, but he was reluctant to do so. At the end of 1 Cor. 4 Paul offers two visions of his return. He reminds them that they are his children (4:14-15) and suggests that they have become arrogant, not expecting him to come (4:18). The first vision is a return with a whip, the sign of authority, and the second is a return in love (4:21). His possible return is couched in rhetoric and offers the Corinthians the contrast between what they are calling for, his coming with authority, and what he is offering to them, his coming in love.

A more sober reflection on his travel plans is found at the end of the letter (16:5-9). There is a level of ambivalence about the visit. While in chapter 4 he had threatened to come

¹³⁶ Neither Thiselton nor Fee references any scholar who contests an Ephesian location for the writing of 1 Corinthians. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 32. Fee *1 Corinthians*, 15.

¹³⁷ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 32.

quickly, the actual travel plans place a longer time scale. Given the possibility that he could step on a boat and be in Corinth in a matter of days, he delays to complete work in Ephesus until after Pentecost. Furthermore, the section starts with Paul's assertion that he will first travel via Macedonia, and so follow the route of his second missionary journey (16:5). The path by road is longer, and Paul is emphasising that he is in no hurry to get to them, even if he does expect to stay for some time. He is not afraid to come, but he is scared about the reception Timothy might receive (16:10) and, as Thiselton points out, there is no implication anywhere that Timothy was at all timid.¹³⁸

Timothy has been dispatched by Paul to remind them of how Paul lived in Jesus Christ (4:17), and while the conditional clause in 16:10 might indicate an uncertainty about his coming, it is more likely to be an uncertainty about the timing of the arrival. Paul is also unsure about the reception Timothy will receive. The indication is that Timothy might be intimidated, rejected and impeded, and Paul writes to make sure those things do not happen.

The relationship between the Corinthians and Apollos is also interesting. While some claim to be of his party, Apollos himself seems very reluctant to go. Only after Paul's urging is he prepared to come to them and then only when he has the "opportunity." There is no enthusiasm on Apollos' part for the journey. This is highlighted by the absence of greetings from him in verse 19, despite it seeming likely that he was in Ephesus at the time and part of Paul's community, albeit a more independent player than Timothy and others.

The picture is once again of the failure of partnership and the breakdown of relationships. As we turn to Paul and the Philippians we see quite a different situation. Paul has a huge desire to meet with his friends in Philippi. His situation does not enable him to travel and so he speaks of sending Timothy to them, not so that they will receive instruction, but because Timothy will be able to return with news to cheer Paul (Phil. 2:19). Timothy is to be sent because he has a genuine interest in their welfare.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 1331.

The importance of communication becomes more apparent when we understand that the context of the letter is not only Paul's imprisonment, but also the possibility of his death. The eschatological becomes personal in this letter, and the desire to meet is the only thing stopping Paul from delighting in the possibility of meeting Christ soon in death. According to Fee, *Philippians* has an "eschatological framework."¹³⁹ Eschatology is not a subject of speculation for Paul but a dynamic that shapes life and theology. Fee continues by noting the way "the essential framework finds expression both explicitly and implicitly throughout *Philippians*."¹⁴⁰

Paul's contemplation of his own death takes place in Phil. 1 and is summed up in the words "For me to live is Christ, to die is gain" (1:21). These words begin an aside that is of great importance for the understanding of *Philippians*. Paul wants to die and to be with Christ, but feels he still has work to do, and will therefore carry on living. Although Paul states that he is "convinced" that he will remain he writes on the edge of life and death, and others already taking on his roles, both those preaching the gospel and others such as Timothy and the "loyal yokefellow" (4:3) in a pastoral role. The eschatological perspective of the end of Paul's own life pervades the letter. He is thinking of how he will be able to boast of the *Philippians* (2:16) and that they are his "crown" (4:1). He talks of "becoming like Christ in his death" and about "experiencing the power of the resurrection" (3:10), which is something he has experienced in part (3:12) and will experience fully in the future (3:21).¹⁴¹ The words of 4:8-9 have the ring not only of the closing of the letter, but of final

¹³⁹ Fee, *Philippians*, 50-52. Beker identifies eschatology as the "coherent centre" of Paul's thought. See L. J. Kreitzer, "Eschatology," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid (Leicester: IVP, 1993), 254.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 51. Fee sees Paul's priority is to enable the *Philippians* to understand his and their present suffering in the eschatological context of future glory. The present and the future are under Christ and present suffering is to be met with joy for those whose lives are "being conformed into the likeness of his death" (Phil 3:11). This leads to the imperative to "stand fast" which is repeated here as Paul presents himself as the model of the runner close to the finishing line.

¹⁴¹ The structure of 3:7-11 is comprehensively set out in Fee, *Philippians*, 311-337. Fee sees this section in the "already" and "not yet" context, where the resolution is on the day of Christ. However, Paul in 1:23 sees another place of consummation through his own death and while there will be a full completion on the day of Christ, there will be an experiencing of the resurrection and a being with Christ at that point.

requests, and Paul is sure that he will need no more money from the Philippians (4:18). Paul is excited by the possibility of his death and sees it as a step further in his following of Christ to a new level of knowing and being with him. However, there is one point that makes Paul feel he will not yet die – his desire to be with the Philippians and for them to be with him (1:25-26). The bond of partnership between Paul and the Philippians means that Paul would postpone his full fellowship with Christ for the sake of their joy.

The Philippians have also been eager to have communication with Paul. They have sent messages through Epaphroditus to see if Paul will be able to maintain the partnership, to send him money to enable him to function as a partner, and they want to know if Paul will be able to be with them once again (2:19-30). The journey from Philippi to Rome was a well-worn path and a secure route without exceptional dangers. However, the sending of a gift by a poor community displays not only generosity, but also commitment. The distance from Philippi to Rome is 800 miles and would have been a journey of one month by sea or two to three months by land.¹⁴² For security Epaphroditus would not have travelled alone.¹⁴³ Protecting the money would have required at least one and probably two companions. One might have returned to make the Philippian community aware of his illness. If they had wished to send only a note they may have been able to use a messenger or perhaps someone linked to the army and travelling to Rome. In every possible scenario communication between the partners was important enough to require both commitment and significant expense.

Paul felt some discomfort at the delay in the support they were giving him (4:10). The lack of opportunity for the Philippians to show support emphasises both the importance and difficulty involved in the communication. Perhaps Paul had feared that practical considerations had overridden the desire for communication. The money, energy and time

¹⁴² Jeffery Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians – Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity* JSNT Supplement Series 136 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 409, note 19.

¹⁴³ Fee, *Philippians*, 36-7.

given to sending a messenger and money to Paul could have been spent on the evangelistic enterprise in Philippi. Some might think that more would have been accomplished, but Paul knows the value of partnership and so rejoices in the arrival of Epaphroditus, the money and, most especially, the companionship he brings.

7.5.2. Distillation

Eagerness to send letters and to visit transcend the problems of travel and communication, and are even more important for Paul than an early end to his life which will see him united with Christ (the best thing he can think of). In contrast to 1 Corinthians, he is eager to be with them, and the expected visits are for their joy and for Paul's. Letters are no substitute for personal visits, and even trusted representatives such as Timothy are no substitute for the real thing. Communication, the joyful expectancy of the letters and visits, is an important feature of the relationship between Paul and the Philippians.

7.5.3. Abstraction – Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another

Partners will seek ways to be in communication, using whatever means are available, but never neglecting personal visits. The purpose of the visits is for mutual encouragement and to discover how the partnership is proceeding. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each community able to put in the resources of finance, time, and effort into visiting their partners and welcoming them into their homes and churches? Are all prepared to maintain the links by using all forms of communication available?

7.6. Complementary resources and skills

7.6.1. Analysis

Sampley states that: "Each of the parties to consensual *societas* contributed to the partnership one or more of the following: property, labour, skill, or status."¹⁴⁴ He offers the example of one partner, contributing half ownership of a slave and the other contributing

¹⁴⁴ Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 13-4.

training; in this case the slave was trained to act.¹⁴⁵ Peterman describes the conventions of reciprocity within Greco-Roman society in the following manner: “When a person (or persons) is a recipient of good in the form of a favour or gift, the receiver is obligated to respond to the giver with goodwill and to return a counter-gift or favour in proportion to the good received.”¹⁴⁶ According to Seneca, what is given and received is described as benefits, and the giving and receiving of benefits is the foundation of society which leaves the receiver under obligation, but which makes equal demands on both, through which friendship is established.¹⁴⁷ Each party should aim to out-do the other in giving and “In this friendship the parties seek to render to each other the services they require.”¹⁴⁸ Seneca talks about the exchange of such benefits in the terms of debt. He also talks of this reciprocity as an exchange of good deeds, using the language of accountancy in the context of friendship. Peterman highlights the use of the words debt, exchange and interchange in the context of social reciprocity and friendship.¹⁴⁹

In modern sociological terms the donor in a financial relationship is generally considered to be the holder of power. Hence Weber describes the relationship between a Lord and political vassals in this manner: “He seeks to take the administration into his own hands by having men personally dependent upon him: slaves, household officials, attendants, personal ‘favorites,’ and prebendaries enfeoffed in kind or in money from his magazines.”¹⁵⁰ If the exchange of money inevitably brings about a power inequality then this too questions the partnership relationship.

Paul’s refusal to accept the offers of financial support from the Corinthian Church is frequently commented upon. His economic circumstances were never good. Meggitt draws a

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 11-2.

¹⁴⁶ Peterman, *Paul’s Gift*, 3.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 53-4.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 54.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 53-65. He shows that Epictetus, Aristotle, Plato and Xenophon also use the language of accountancy in reference to friendship. It is made explicit in Philo who sees the bestowal of benefits as selling and buying.

¹⁵⁰ Weber, “Politics,” 82.

picture of Paul as one of the poor,¹⁵¹ living in harsh poverty and sharing fully “in the destitute life of the non-elite in the Roman empire.”¹⁵² Hock argues that the Corinthian Christians were ashamed that Paul had to rely on menial work and was not able to earn a living as a speaker-cum-performer, a professional preacher.¹⁵³

Thiselton believes that despite Paul’s poverty sociological studies explain, with complete adequacy, why Paul would have felt it necessary to refuse financial gifts from the Corinthians. He draws upon the work of Marshall – who has identified the same themes of reciprocity as Peterman in Seneca – to argue that in accepting cash he would have placed himself in debt to wealthy benefactors, compromised the gospel by making himself servant of human beings, and diluted his service to Christ.¹⁵⁴ In addition the fractured state of the Corinthian Church meant that any gift would have been a gift of one faction and placed Paul in debt to one over another. The relationship with Corinth was an essentially negative one.

The relationship with the Philippians was essentially positive.¹⁵⁵ Phil. 4:10-20 has been considered a separate letter (Beare), an embarrassed afterthought (Hawthorne, O’Brien), or a sign of division (Peterlin), but the literary critical model of Alexander has challenged such readings by understanding these verses to be integral to the letter. This is further reinforced by Peterman’s identification of verbal and conceptual parallels between 1:3-11 and 4:10-20.¹⁵⁶ The letter opens with a reference to the support given by the Philippians to Paul. Peterman argues that rather than being translated, “I thank my God every time I remember you,” 1:3 should read, “I thank my God every time you are moved to remember me.”¹⁵⁷ The key point he makes is that the central concern of Paul is the gospel. Thus financial support must be for the gospel, and thanks are given to God, not to the

¹⁵¹ Justin Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 126.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 129.

¹⁵³ Ronald Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 35. See also Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 23-4.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 662-3.

¹⁵⁵ Peterman, *Paul's Gift*, 9.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 91-2.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 93-9. Fee opposes such a translation on grammatical grounds.

Philippians.¹⁵⁸ In addition the financial gift cannot be considered in isolation from other resources shared. The Philippians pray for Paul (1:19), witness with him (1:27-8, 2:15, 4:3), suffered with him (1:30) and take part in his affliction (4:14).¹⁵⁹ Oakes contends that the economic hardship of renouncing conventional reciprocity for Christian partnership would have been real for the Christians in Philippi.¹⁶⁰ Their solidarity in giving comes from their need and not their plenty. The partnership “involves active participation.”¹⁶¹ Peterman does not list what Paul gives to the partnership, but it is clear that the same features are true for him and his community. They pray for the Philippians (1:3, 4:10) and he suffers with them also (4:12) accepting his chains for the sake of the gospel (1:13). He is not a preacher who takes money for eloquence, living a lavish lifestyle and distancing himself from those to whom he brings good news.

Money can be safely received in the context of wider and deeper resource sharing. They genuinely care for one another, seeking to send representatives to encourage each other's communities (2:19-30). Paul makes it clear that the money is not needed (4:11-13) because God will supply all he needs. But the key message of the gift is that the Philippians are prepared to share in his troubles. He is aware that they are not giving money that would have been spent on luxuries. This money would have been spent on food and clothes and they have suffered to give the gift. The debt is not with him however, it is with God (4:17-18) and is a fragrant offering. It is God who will repay and meet all their needs (4:19). It is from the place of imprisonment, poverty and impending death that Paul is confident that God will meet all their needs. This cannot be interpreted as support for any form of prosperity gospel; the needs are not wealth and human success.

When I talk to church groups in the UK and the USA involved in diocesan links, I find they are not used to asking what they will get out of a relationship with a poorer

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 92, 99-103,108.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 100.

¹⁶⁰ Oakes, *Philippians*, 89-96.

¹⁶¹ Peterman, *Paul's Gift*, 101.

community, feeling that such questions are wrong. The experience of rich western multinationals taking from the poor has led them to assume that reversing this inequality is the only way ahead. However, for the rich not to ask what the poor have to offer is to set up inequality and is an insult to the poorer partner. This is not partnership, but aid. There is good reason for aid to be given when the need is desperate, but it cannot be confused with partnership. It is interesting that the financially giving church is also offering prayer and service for Paul. It is not that they are bringing only money to the table; they are giving much more.

7.6.2. Distillation

The sharing of resources is vital to the furtherance of partnership. Money is a significant part of the sharing, but it can only be offered and received in the context of reciprocal exchanges and must not dominate the exchange. The danger of money is that it leaves a debt that needs to be repaid. If it is not given as part of a mutual relationship then the donor can become the master, a contradiction of the Lordship of Jesus and thus of the gospel. Any gifts are for the gospel and given to God. The relationship is fluid and it is not always clear what one side will have to offer the other as the partnership starts out.

7.6.3. Abstraction – Partners share complementary resources and skills

Partners will have complementary gifts and resources to share. Money will often be part of this, but money cannot dominate the relationship. Other gifts are required from both parties. The richer party must be prepared to offer more than money and neither side can take power over the other by the giving of gifts. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: how can money be placed in its correct context? How are the riches of the variety of gifts of all to be shared?

7.7. Willingness to share in One Another's Struggles and Victories

7.7.1. Analysis

The predominant reason for forming a *societas* relationship was to gain a profit. While the terms of the partnership could be negotiated Sampley says “it was not permitted to say that one partner was liable for losses alone but ineligible for profits.”¹⁶² Neither was it permitted for a party to withdraw from partnership prior to the declaration of a great loss.¹⁶³ The commitment was to share in both profit and loss. Such sharing in liability is key in any partnership relationship,¹⁶⁴ and distinguishes partnership from reciprocity as described by Peterman. Reciprocity demands the return of favours, but does not commit one side to the loss of the other.

Members of the Corinthian Church were prepared to reward Paul for his preaching and insulted by his refusal to accept their gifts. Paul's refusal to accept financial support from the Corinthians was a refusal of a reciprocal relationship. There is no evidence within the Corinthian correspondence to suggest that the Corinthian Church was interested in Paul's personal circumstances in Ephesus. Their concerns are for promoting their own interests as factional groups within the church. There is no indication that Paul is invited to share in their victories. He complains of their pride and boasting, and it seems unlikely that those attempting to prove their worth, over and above that of others, would be willing to share their glory with him.

In contrast, the Philippian Church shows its concern for Paul by sending Epaphroditus on a long and arduous journey of 800 miles to hear news and to offer support. As we saw in the previous section, the sharing of resources caused real hardship in a community which Oakes argues had taken on economic suffering by their decision to

¹⁶² Sampley, *Pauline Partnership*, 15.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁶⁴ See Max Warren, *Partnership – The Study of an Idea* (London: SCM, 1956), 13.

commit to the gospel.¹⁶⁵ The offering of the gift is a sign of their commitment to the liability incurred by Paul in the cause of the partnership. They share in the same struggle as and the same liability (Phil. 1:30).

The sharing of liability is only half the story: the partners also share in the joy of success. Any debt incurred by the receiving of a gift from the Philippians is due for repayment not by Paul, but by God (4:19) to whom the gift is offered (4:18). The same theology is seen once again in the Corinthian correspondence. Paul talks of receiving a reward for his work of founding the church (1 Cor. 3:14) and that he runs for a crown that will last forever (9:24-25). Talk of earning salvation through works has been anathema to Protestants following the rejection of such theologies by Martin Luther, but the “New Perspective on Paul,” especially as explained by Tom Wright,¹⁶⁶ has pointed out that such concepts are present in the writing of Paul. The works, however, are not about following the letter of the law but the fulfilling of the gospel in building the Kingdom as Rom. 2:16 is developed in Rom. 8 and 10.¹⁶⁷

These themes are picked up in Philippians. The imagery of the race is taken up in Phil. 2:16 where the Philippians themselves will be evidence that Paul “did not run or labour for nothing” (2:16). The result of their mutual sacrifice is that they should be glad and rejoice together (2:18). The theme of rejoicing runs through the letter, both Paul rejoicing in the Philippians and the Philippians being encouraged to rejoice by Paul. Paul describes the Philippians as “his crown” (4:1). The correspondence between this verse and 1 Thess. 2:19 suggests Paul is saying the Philippians are his “[eschatological] joy and crown [of boasting].”¹⁶⁸ As well as being his present joy they will stand with him in the presence of Christ, as his victor's crown. Their standing fast achieves his eschatological prize. Their

¹⁶⁵ Oakes, *Philippians*, 89-102.

¹⁶⁶ N.T Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005), 108-28.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ Fee, *Philippians*, 388.

participation in his suffering is credited to their account as a sacrifice to God through which their names are written in the book of life (4:18-19).¹⁶⁹

7.7.2. Distillation

The Corinthian church was prepared to pay for services rendered and to engage in reciprocity, paying for Paul's preaching. However, they were not prepared to enter into suffering for him and showed no interest in sharing the credit for their own victories. In contrast, the Philippian Church demonstrated solidarity with Paul through being prepared to face poverty and economic disadvantage, and being prepared to offer sacrificial giving for the sake of the partnership. The acceptance of liability is fundamental to a partnership relationship, but so is the sharing in profit. Neither partner was to profit in terms of wealth or status, the conventional measures of their age. Credit with God is regarded by Paul as a more valuable reward.

7.7.3. Abstraction – Partners share in one another's struggles and victories

Partners will be prepared to share in liability and rejoice in one another's success. Partnership requires commitment that may, at times, lead to suffering in solidarity. It requires the ability to rejoice in the partner's success. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each prepared to share in the suffering of the other? Are all prepared to share delight in victories?

7.8. The Philippian Model

Collecting the abstracts together provides us with a model of partnership. It has been generated by the analysis of the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians at Philippi, but it is freed from being a simple description of their relationship.

¹⁶⁹ See also Romans 15:16.

The Philippian Model

1. Partners have a common purpose

A partnership depends upon a clear, common task in which all partners can be involved. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: what is the purpose of the partnership? Are the parties involved able to play their role in achieving the goal?

2. Partners are of equal status

In a partnership both partners must have equality of status. There must be mutual respect. Partnership cannot work where there are feelings of inferiority or superiority on either side. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: are all ready to forego feelings of superiority? Do all have confidence to know they are as important as those with whom they are in partnership?

3. Partners have a common basis of belief

Absolute theological parity is not a requisite for partnership, but a common basis of belief and a shared theological language within which to discuss our relationship in partnership is of vital importance. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: do all have a basis of shared values and beliefs? Do all have a shared theological language with which to discuss both unity and diversity?

4. Partners have a concern for unity in one another's community

Partnership between two groups depends upon each group being united. Unity is forged by humility. Without unity the partnership will be between parties within one or both of the groups, and will encourage division. It is the responsibility of each partner to encourage unity in the other, and, when appropriate, to offer services of reconciliation and not judgement. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each partner prepared to seek the way of humility to unity? Are all committed to unity within their partner community?

5. Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another

Partners will seek ways to be in communication, using whatever means are available, but never neglecting personal visits. The purpose of the visits is for mutual encouragement and to discover how the partnership is proceeding. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each community able to put in the resources of finance, time, and effort into visiting their partners and welcoming them into their homes and churches? Are all prepared to maintain the links by using all forms of communication available?

6. Partners share complementary resources and skills

Partners will have complementary gifts and resources to share. Money will often be part of this, but money cannot dominate the relationship. Other gifts are required from both parties. The richer party must be prepared to offer more than money and neither side can take power over the other by the giving of gifts. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: how can money be placed in its correct context? How are the riches of the variety of gifts of all to be shared?

7. Partners share in one another's struggles and victories

Partners will be prepared to share in liability and rejoice in one another's success. Partnership requires commitment that may, at times, lead to suffering in solidarity. It requires the ability to rejoice in the partner's success. When entering a partnership the questions must be asked: is each prepared to share in the suffering of the other? Are all prepared to share delight in victories?

Conclusion

The model distilled is no longer an explanatory model. It is now ready to be used as a tool to explore contemporary mission partnership. As such it now becomes an exploratory model. The test of an exploratory model is that it is useful in describing other situations, highlighting the problems, and providing new insights for further action.

The continued relevance of Roland Allen's *Missionary Methods* is because it describes the world of today, not just the past. The test of this model is that it can illuminate the reasons for failures in the partnership experiment in the Anglican Communion, and offer new directions for action. This will develop mission partnership across boundaries of diversity, geography and economics, wider than those imagined by Paul and his community, or by the Christians at Philippi.

CHAPTER EIGHT

8. USING THE PHILIPPIAN MODEL AS AN EXPLORATORY MODEL

Introduction

The need has been established for an exploratory model to guide planning and to evaluate action in order to develop partnership in the Anglican Communion. It was argued that such a model should be developed within the boundaries of the Anglican Way as defined in *The Virginia Report*. In the previous chapter an explanatory model of partnership was distilled from an investigation of the real instance of the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians at Philippi. This model is now referred to as the “Philippian Model.” The task of this chapter is to test the Philippian Model by exploring its fruitfulness as an exploratory model. For a missiological study the search for an explanatory model is in itself insufficient, as the Model has to have practical value as an exploratory model.

The testing of the fruitfulness of the Philippian Model presents a problem for the researcher. The Model has not been adopted, and so it is not possible to definitively test its long-term effectiveness. However, there are ways of testing its potential. The first question to ask is if the Model offers a clear analysis of the present state. This involves a reviewing of the historical record through the lens of the Philippian Model. The Model will be expected to offer insight into the failures identified in the text of “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the body of Christ” in chapter 2, the implementation of MRI in chapter 3, and the responses to crises in the Anglican Communion in chapter 4 of this thesis. The analysis in these chapters demonstrated failure, but not how the aims of those present at the Toronto Congress might have been achieved.

The second test of the Philippian Model is to ask if it aids planning for the future. *The Windsor Report* recommended initiatives such as the Panel of Reference, the Covenant, and a proposed juridical role for the Primates’ Meeting, but it also commended a process of

listening. This was intended as “listening to the experience of homosexual persons,” as proposed in section c of the 1998 Lambeth Conference Resolution I.10. However, the ACC – 13 resolution on the “listening process” crucially included a reference to “mutual listening.”¹ In addition, the 2008 Lambeth Conference abandoned resolutions and focused on a process of mutual listening, entitled “Indaba.” The 2009 Primates’ Meeting also moved away from decision making and focused on mutual listening. ACC –14, although it continued to pass resolutions, attempted to use “Indaba” style discussion to reach consensus on contentious issues. The author of this thesis has had a part to play in all these events (except the 2009 Primates’ Meeting) and has developed a proposal for “Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening,” shaped by the Philippian Model. This chapter will seek to demonstrate how the Model has been significant in developing planning for future action. Further evaluation of the Model will come through future work carried out by other scholars.² In addition the Philippian Model may have further application in developing mission partnerships in other contexts and two will be suggested as demonstrating fruitfulness.

8.1. Applying the Philippian Model to Warren, Bayne, and “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ”

Max Warren provided a language for describing partnership in the emerging Anglican Communion. Warren had a three-fold model of partnership consisting of *mutuality*, *responsibility* and *the acceptance of liability*. By mutuality he meant involvement together by committing to one another in trust. He understood responsibility as “the readiness to serve the purpose of the common enterprise” and the acceptance of liability as “a readiness to pay the price of partnership.”³ Although Warren did not use the Bible to come to his understanding of partnership, there is a good correlation between his simple definition and three elements of the Philippian Model. Partners have an agreed task or common enterprise,

¹ ACC – 13, “Resolution 12: The Listening Process,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc13/resolutions.cfm#s12>.

² Philip Groves, “Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening in the Anglican Communion – A project sponsored by the Most Reverend Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury” (2009).

³ Max Warren, *Partnership - The Study of an Idea* (London: SCM, 1956), 12-3.

they are prepared to invest resources and skills, and they are prepared to share in each other's struggles. His collaboration with Stephen Bayne in preparing the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” added two more elements of the Model. They realised that the new provinces of the Anglican Communion needed to run their own affairs, and MRI was intended to introduce equality of status within the Communion.⁴ Stephen Bayne expressed his awareness of what the younger churches had to offer the older churches of the Communion.⁵ “Mutual Responsibility” also showed awareness of the significance of communication. It called for communication that would enable “deep and deliberate involvement in one another's affairs and life.”⁶ Bayne put effort into the search for a common belief and hoped that this would emerge as the Communion matured. Superficially the only element lacking from the Philippian Model is the commitment to maintaining internal unity through humility, which might have been addressed as partnerships developed. We have to ask, therefore, why the basis did not lead to deeper developments.

Warren and Bayne believed that the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” was the expression of their models, but it failed to communicate their theological understanding to those who came to it afresh. While there is significant resonance between the reconstructed model of Warren and Bayne and the Philippian Model, there is significant dissonance between the Philippian Model and the document. This can be seen by a point by point comparison.

⁴ Stephen Bayne ed., *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ* (London: SPCK, 1965), 6. See Michael Ramsey quoted in the introduction to the same book, vii. See also, Simon Chiwanga, “Chairman’s Address to ACC- 11,” *Anglican Communion News Service ACNS* 1881 (17 September 1999), <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/acnsarchive/acns1800/acns1885.html>.

⁵ Bayne, *Mutual Responsibility*, 65-6. “I know at least one church, whose clergy would be immeasurably helped, humbled, purified, and strengthened by the example and companionship of priests from Asia or Africa, who are not yet caught in the middle-class image of the professional parson.”

⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

Partners have a common purpose.

In “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” there is no articulation of the common task for the partnership.⁷ Rather, the primary aim seems to be the raising of \$15 million and the purpose for which this money is to be raised is unclear.⁸ Thought was given to the unity of purpose of the member provinces of the Anglican Communion: every church was called “to begin at once, a radical study of its own obedience to mission.”⁹ However, no thought was given to how such unity of purpose might be achieved.

Partners are of equal status.

The only clear discernible task of the MRI project is to end the inequality of status measured by the labelling of some churches as “younger” or “receiving” and others “older” or “giving.” However, the immediate task of raising money, even though they avoided calling it an appeal for funds, and the first practical action of setting up a directory of projects reinforced the inequality of status. There was no discernible plan to enable the ending of power inequality in relationships across the Communion.

Partners have a common basis of belief.

Bayne had struggled to find the definition of Anglican identity, and therefore notions of a common basis of belief were vague.¹⁰ In a personal reflection at the end of the book *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ*, Bayne recalls and applies a half remembered quotation from Plato about the “Ideal”: “‘That it is, we know; what it is, we know not; nor do we know the way thereto.’ For I know that the new form of the Anglican Communion does exist somewhere, even though ‘What it is, we know not’.”

⁷ Something Bayne, unlike Warren, did not feature in his writing on partnership.

⁸ Ibid., 3. Peter Whiteley, *Frontier Mission - An Account of the Toronto Congress 1963* (London: SPCK, 1963), 78.

⁹ Ibid., 6.

¹⁰ Bayne, *Mutual Responsibility*, 68.

Bayne continued to worry that there was no agreed concept of what Anglicanism was and to hope that it would emerge in time.¹¹

Partners have a concern for unity in one another's community.

No consideration was given to programs to develop local unity. This was a problem, as it was recognised that divisions between the mission agencies were an issue for the consultations, and this resulted in the demand for the Brisbane conference in 1986.¹² The extent to which the divisions between the British mission agencies were a result of the divisions within the Church of England was not addressed.

Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.

The requirement to keep in touch was emphasised, and a strategy outlined. This was based on the appointment of five regional officers.¹³ However, the plan was impractical and the regional officers were never appointed. The document did not contain any recognition of the significance of relationships, focusing instead on structures.

Partners share complementary resources and skills.

As noted above, warnings were given that an appeal for \$15 million would present the document as an appeal for funds.¹⁴ There is no sense in the document of there being complementary resources to be shared across the Communion. The “giving” churches had money, but the “receiving” churches had nothing.

Partners share in one another's struggles and victories.

No measurable aims were set. These would have allowed for a sense of sharing in success or failure. Without a common purpose the sense of solidarity was impossible to foster.

¹¹ Stephen Bayne, “Report of the Executive Officer, 1963,” in his *An Anglican Turning Point – Documents and Interpretations* (Austin, Texas: Church Historical Society, 1964), 95-7.

¹² *Progress in Partnership, Report of the Mission Agencies Conference 8-13 December 1986, Brisbane, Australia*, (London: ACC, 1986).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 12-3.

¹⁴ Whiteley, *Frontier Mission*, 78.

Although elements of the Philippian Model were superficially present in the underlying model, none were taken up within the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ.” Chapter 3 of this thesis showed that the document did not offer a sustainable model for future partnership, and the dissonance with the Philippian Model offers reasons why. Warren and Bayne came very close to being able to articulate the dynamics of a successful partnership relationship, as suggested by the Philippian Model, but none of the elements were sufficiently present in the document they sponsored. It was this document that was presented to the Anglican Communion, not their speeches, books and articles. A clear path was required for the move from a church in a colonialist mind set to churches in a partnership. Instead what resulted from the Toronto Congress of 1963 was rhetoric, an appeal for funds and the formation of a Directory of Projects. A fuller articulation of the seven elements of the Philippian Model would have presented a different challenge to the churches of the growing Communion. As it was, they were confirmed in their separation; the richer churches were asked for money and the poorer churches were left hoping for a hand-out.

The application of the Philippian Model as an exploratory tool offers insight into why the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” was an insufficient basis for building the relational Communion envisaged by the 1963 Anglican Congress.

8.2. Applying the Philippian Model to the PiM Consultations

The aim of this section is to see if the Philippian Model as a critical tool enables further understanding as to why the PiM consultation process failed to deliver its key aims. How the process failed over its 25-year history was shown in chapter 3 of this thesis. The individual PiM consultations may have proved valuable in setting mission goals in the provinces, but they did not develop partnership. The consultations became a series of

internal reviews for each of the provinces aided by outside consultants who assumed the name “partners” without becoming partners.

Partners have a common purpose.

The process did not provide a common purpose between partners. The Church running the consultation set its purposes, and the two or three representatives of the “external partner” churches may have agreed to the tasks set, but they were not asked to commit themselves or their churches to an ongoing purpose.

Partners are of equal status.

Money decided status within the PiM consultation process, with poor churches almost begging for money, and rich churches dismissive of any external critical evaluation of their ministry. Equality of status was a goal for the process, but the mechanism consolidated the giver/receiver reality.

Partners have a common basis of belief.

Theological agreement or diversity was not considered, and while superficial agreement was acknowledged, real differences were not addressed.

Partners have a concern for unity in one another’s community.

Running the consultations at the level of the province allowed the covering over of internal differences and priorities between dioceses, and, in regional provinces, between national churches. Internal unity and disunity was not addressed.

Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.

Once the consultation was over, any continuing follow up and communication was with the individual “external partners,” not with partner churches.

Partners share complementary resources and skills.

The emphasis of the consultations was on what the province needed, not what it had to share. The majority of the consultations happened in provinces that were poor, and in the process of indigenising their bishops and key appointments. The ending of the era of bishops with links to mission agencies and boards meant that pressure was on to maintain the

infrastructure, which, despite Roland Allen's warnings, were seen as the mark of mission activity.¹⁵ The incoming indigenous bishops needed money, but they were never asked what they had to share. The notion of the sharing of complementary resources and skills was never on the agenda.

Partners share in one another's struggles and victories.

Without a sense of common purpose, and with no commitment to ongoing relationships, the "partners" had no share in one another's struggles and victories.

The PiM consultation process worked in contradiction to all seven elements of the Philippian Model. The process was well-meaning, but could only result in the failure to build partnership.

The Philippian Model can be contrasted with the "Ten Principles of Partnership," the official model for mission partnership. In chapter 3 of this thesis it was argued that because the "Ten Principles" were drawn from a failed project, it is flawed as a critical tool to criticise practice and enable planning. The principles within it are confused and contradictory because it is the product of confusion, not the solution to confusion. In contrast, the Philippian Model offers a biblically based, theologically grounded and systematic approach to partnership that would have challenged the failures of the PiM consultation process and enabled planning. Any process would have focused on assisting partner churches to come understand their common mission goals. The financial power of one province could not have been allowed to define status. Partners would have been forced to face the cultural diversity of the human response to the one gospel.¹⁶ The internal divisions in provinces disfigured the PiM process, and for true partnership to emerge such divisions would need to have been addressed. The consultation process allowed for a small number of people to visit one another's province, but the relationships often ended with the

¹⁵ Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 57-8.

¹⁶ Andrew Walls, *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002), 77.

closing of the consultation. Further programs of visiting were needed to enable the process to reach to the grass roots of the churches. Only a privileged few, mainly men and mainly bishops, or representatives of missionary agencies participated. Only in the context of wider consultation, with more visiting, could there have been a genuine exchange of resources and skills, and only then could struggles and victories been shared. The Philippian Model would have demanded a process completely different to the PiM consultation process.

The Philippian Model is capable of acting as an exploratory model in enabling a critical reappraisal of the PiM processes that emerged from the 1963 document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ.” The historical record demonstrated the failure of the process and the Model offers reasons why the process failed and alternative strategies.

8.3. Applying the Philippian Model to the Search for Anglican Identity

Stephen Bayne predicted the need for a search for Anglican identity and authority but he could find no solution. Aspects of *The Virginia Report* have been taken as a model for the processes that follow, and these aspects were developed in *The Windsor Report*. This study has raised questions over the reliability of this model as an explanatory model. It has pointed to the lack of transparency in the process that led to the formulation of the explanatory model. Chapter 4 offered evidence of a tendency to selectively use proof texts in the formulation of the biblical basis, and the uncritical adoption of non-biblical concepts such as the principle of subsidiarity. In *The Windsor Report* subsidiarity is combined with the concept of *adiaphora*, without consideration of the Christian tradition. *The Virginia Report* is very effective in describing the Anglican Way of discerning the mind of Christ though Scripture, understood by tradition and reason, and in describing the Anglican Communion. However, it does not appear to have been successful in applying its own definitions of the Anglican Way in its own work. *The Windsor Report* continued with the use of proof texts and gave prominence to the concept of *koinonia* in 1 Cor. 1:9. The way the word is used in

the text means it carries the totality of meaning of *koinonia* in the New Testament.¹⁷ This is an example of an “illegitimate totality transfer.”¹⁸ On its own this verse should not have been expected to carry the burden of defining the biblical understanding of communion.

The Windsor Report was a response to the torn fabric of the Communion following the confirmation of the election of Gene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire, the acceptance of official rites of blessing for same sex unions in New Westminster, and the intervention of foreign bishops and primates in dioceses of ECUSA. One proposal for the solution to the issues of identity and authority proposed by *The Windsor Report* is an Anglican Covenant. In chapter 4 of this study we considered the issues relating to the three drafts of the Covenant which are based upon *The Virginia Report* and *The Windsor Report* acting as exploratory models. The task in this chapter is to see if the Philippian Model, used as a critical tool, offers grounds for critical assessment of the Covenant, with emphasis on the Ridley Cambridge Draft (RCD).

The critique of the RCD in chapter 3 of this thesis focussed on the insufficiency of *The Virginia Report* and *The Windsor Report* as explanatory models making them unreliable tools as exploratory models. The task of this section is to see if the Philippian Model offers insight as a critical tool to consider the Covenant in its present form. The initial problem in a critical assessment of the Covenant is that there is no clear consensus as to either its nature or purpose within the Communion. Norman Doe, who was on the Lambeth Commission and acted as a consultant to the Covenant Design Group, points out that the Lambeth Commission did not offer a theological definition of a Covenant and as such it has been understood in different ways. He offers four basic ideas in one sentence that defines the Covenant as a “voluntary relationship responsive to God embodied in an agreement

¹⁷*The Windsor Report (TWR)*, The Lambeth Commission on Communion (London: ACO, 2004), 5.

¹⁸ James Barr, *The Semantics Of Biblical Language* (Oxford: OUP, 1961), 217-8.

involving an exchange of solemn promises which generate commitments.”¹⁹ He describes the purpose of the Covenant as having five dimensions: “unity: reconciliation, recommitment and trust; identity, clarity and understanding; order and stability; and mission.”²⁰ This abstract description of covenant could be applied to the relationship between Paul and his community and the Church in Philippi, indicating that the Model may have value as a critical tool.

8.3.1. The Ridley Cambridge Draft and the Philippian Model

Partners have a common purpose.

The second section of the RCD is an elaboration of common purpose.²¹ Norman Doe recognises the elevation of a description of mission purpose in the St Andrew’s draft as a development from *The Windsor Report*,²² and this is continued in the RCD. Doe recognises the influence of missiologists such as Tim Dakin in the shaping of the Covenant with a missiological emphasis. Section 2 of the RCD begins with the affirmation; “communion as a gift of God given so that God’s people from east and west, north and south, may together declare the glory of the Lord and be both a sign of God’s reign in the Holy Spirit and the first fruits in the world of God’s redemption in Christ.”²³ Churches are asked to commit themselves to mission as defined in the Five Marks of Mission. There is resonance between section 2 of the RCD and the first clause of the Philippian Model.

Partners are of equal status.

The notion of equality is present within the RCD, even if it is not openly addressed. Paragraph 3.1.1 establishes membership of the Church through Baptism and participation in the Eucharist. The constitutional autonomy of each church is affirmed in section 3.2.2.

¹⁹ Norman Doe, *An Anglican Covenant – Theological and Legal Considerations for a Global Debate* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008), 30.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 70.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 53-4.

²³ “An Anglican Covenant - The Third (Ridley Cambridge) Draft” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm>, 2.1.1.

However, this is placed alongside a call to respect the common good in the context of commitment to mutual responsibility and interdependence in the body of Christ. The juxtaposition of autonomy with mutual responsibility and interdependence, with a footnoted appeal to the Toronto Congress, sets up a contrast, which would not have been understood in this way in 1963. The assumption of equality of status blighted the PiM consultation process and the Covenant does not contain a sufficient expression of equality.

The greatest challenge to the notion of equality under the Lordship of Christ, an essential element of the Philippian Model, is in section 4 of the RCD under the heading “Our Covenanted Life Together.” This is by far the most controversial element of the text and at the time of writing has been referred for further study.²⁴ Clause 3.2.6 prepares the way for Section 4. It requires each signatory to commit itself to participate in “mediated conversations” in situations of conflict. Section 4 puts flesh on that commitment and sets out a method for resolving disputes in the Communion. Sections 1-3 of the RCD developed the previous draft of the Covenant, but section 4 was described as being “a completely new section for the Covenant text addressing the matter of joining, participating in and leaving the Covenant, and resolving matters of dispute.”²⁵

It would be wrong, however, to describe section 4 as an innovation. The model for this section is the concept of subsidiarity proposed in *The Virginia Report*, developed in *The Windsor Report* and by commended by the Inter Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission (IATDC). Subsidiarity presupposes the existence of “higher” and “lower” levels of discernment. In order to clarify when decisions should be decided at a higher level, IATDC introduced the criteria of “*intensity, substance and extent*.”²⁶ The successive drafts of the Covenant struggle to find a suitable location for the “higher” levels of discernment.

²⁴ “ACC –14. Resolution 14: 11,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc14/resolutions.cfm#s11>.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Communion, Conflict and Hope – The Kuala Lumpur Report of the third Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission 2007* (London: ACO, 2008), 104.

Section 6 of the Nassau Draft placed the responsibility for deciding on essential matters in the hands of the Primates,²⁷ but this was widely criticised for locating the primates as a centralised authority.²⁸ The Primates themselves felt their role was “overemphasised,” and expressed the need for the inclusion of laity in any decision making process.²⁹ The St Andrew’s Draft removed what had been section 6 from the Covenant text and placed it in a detailed appendix. Responsibility for excluding a province was placed in the hands of the ACC,³⁰ and the responsibility for settling disputes was placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by procedures involving the other Instruments of Communion and potential commissions.³¹ This in turn was criticised heavily at the Lambeth Conference and elsewhere as placing too much responsibility in the hands of the ACC.³² The RCD placed the responsibility for “overseeing the functioning of the Covenant in the life of the Anglican Communion” in the hands of the Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and of the Primates’ Meeting, “or any body that succeeds it.”³³ It is likely that criticisms will arise as to the suitability of the Standing Committee of the Communion to be entrusted with such responsibility.

²⁷ “An Anglican Covenant Draft prepared by the Covenant Design Group, Updated Version April 2007” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/report/draft_text.cfm, 6.4.

²⁸ “An Anglican Covenant - Commentary to the Ridley Cambridge Draft,” (RCD) *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/ridley_cambridge/commentary.cfm.

²⁹ “The Anglican Covenant Proposal (GS 1661), ‘Address by the Most Reverend Drexel Gomez, Archbishop of the West Indies,’” in “the General Synod of the Church of England Report of Proceedings July 2007, day 3, Sunday 8 July, vol. 38, no. 2,” *The Church of England*, <http://www.cofe.anglican.org/about/gensynod/proceedings/july2007/rj073.pdf>.

³⁰ “Framework Procedures for the Resolution of Covenant Disagreements” Appendix to the St Andrews Draft Covenant, *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/st_andrews_documents_2008.pdf, 1.4. and section 8.

³¹ *Ibid.*, sections 3-7.

³² “Commentary to the Ridley Cambridge Draft,” 5-6.

³³ RCD, 4.2.1. The Joint Standing Committee has now been replaced by the Standing Committee of the Communion. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Chair of the ACC jointly chair the Standing Committee of the Communion, with the vice chair of the ACC as an ex-officio member. In addition the primates elect five representatives by region and the ACC elects four members to the Standing Committee to serve for a two-session term at every meeting.

If this thesis is correct and the model of subsidiarity is insufficient both as an explanatory and exploratory model, then the search for a practical way to respond to it is likely to continue, with very little hope of a successful outcome. The confusion over the practical expression of subsidiarity is reminiscent of the struggles to realise the aims of MRI. Without a model to guide planning and access developments the MRI project drifted into failure. There was a consensus that the PiM consultation process was the best method for delivering MRI and the perceived failure was attributed to practical issues of how the process might be more effectively implemented. Section 4 of the RCD represents a valiant attempt to find a practical expression of subsidiarity, but is one that is unlikely to carry long-term support because the model itself is insufficient.

The Archbishop of Canterbury understands that some provinces of the Communion will either be unwilling to sign the Covenant, or will be asked to accept a degree of separation, and has proposed a two-track Communion as a solution to the conundrum.³⁴ The first track will be for those fully signed up to the Covenant, with a second track for the rest. Section 4 of the RCD builds in notions of inequality to the Covenant by establishing “higher” and “lower” levels of discernment, and by introducing the possibility of a two-track Communion.

³⁴ Rowan Williams, “The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion” (27 June 2006), *The Archbishop of Canterbury*, <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/640>. “The idea of a 'covenant' between local Churches (developing alongside the existing work being done on harmonising the church law of different local Churches) is one method that has been suggested, and it seems to me the best way forward. It is necessarily an 'opt-in' matter. Those Churches that were prepared to take this on as an expression of their responsibility to each other would limit their local freedoms for the sake of a wider witness; and some might not be willing to do this. We could arrive at a situation where there were 'constituent' Churches in covenant in the Anglican Communion and other 'churches in association', which were still bound by historic and perhaps personal links, fed from many of the same sources, but not bound in a single and unrestricted sacramental communion, and not sharing the same constitutional structures. The relation would not be unlike that between the Church of England and the Methodist Church, for example. The 'associated' Churches would have no direct part in the decision making of the 'constituent' Churches, though they might well be observers whose views were sought or whose expertise was shared from time to time, and with whom significant areas of co-operation might be possible.” See also, “Communion, Covenant and our Anglican Future” (27 July 2009), *The Archbishop of Canterbury*, <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/2502>.

Partners have a common basis of belief.

The primary emphasis of the RCD is on finding common ground for the member churches of the Anglican Communion. Section 1, “Our Inheritance of Faith” is an establishment of common ground in continuity with the “the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”³⁵ Appeal is made to the Scriptures, the Apostles and Nicene Creeds, Episcopal structures, and the sacraments. The section defines Anglican notions of what it is to be Christian: a broad definition that many non-Anglicans would recognise. These are linked to historic Anglicanism by references to the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. The third section, “Our Unity and Common Life,” develops common ground among Anglicans. Drexel Gomez described it to the ACC in this way: “Section Three therefore sets out what holds us together in Communion - our Baptism and celebration of the Eucharist, our shared ministry, and the four Instruments of Communion. We state that we are committed to relationship.”³⁶ The RCD is very good at setting out common ground.

Partners have a concern for unity in one another’s community.

The report of the Covenant Design Group highlights the need for humility and repentance in a new section 2.1.3,³⁷ which might indicate resonance with this clause in the Philippian Model. However, The emphasis in the RCD is on the failure to recognise Christ in one another. No mention is made of signatories seeking their own internal unity.

Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.

Clause 3.2.3 commits signatories to spending “time with openness and patience in matters of theological debate and reflection, to listen, pray and study with one another in order to discern the will of God.” This commitment to meeting and listening is only in the

³⁵ RCD, 1.1.1.

³⁶ “The Covenant: an Introduction by Archbishop Drexel Gomez.” Address to ACC-14 (May 2009). Available online: “The Covenant: an Introduction by Archbishop Drexel Gomez,” address to ACC-14 (May 2009), <http://www.aco.org/acns/enclosures/Covenant%20Presentation%204%20May%20handout.pdf>.

³⁷ “Commentary to the Ridley Cambridge Draft.”

context of "theological debate." The context gives the impression that communication is required when proposing actions that might "provoke controversy" are being considered. The commitment to communication in the Philippian Model is based in a desire to meet and share.

There are commitments "to support the work of the Instruments of Communion with the spiritual and material resources available to it, receive their work with a readiness to undertake reflection upon their counsels, and to endeavour to accommodate their recommendations."³⁸ However, there are no requirements to attend the Lambeth Conference, Primates' Meeting or ACC.

Partners share complementary resources and skills.

There is a reference in section 2.1.3 of the RCD to the duty of care not to misuse God's gifts. This might relate to the sharing of complementary skills, but the use of the negative does not make it plain what is expected. The section contains a rather curious phrase calling for repentance for "our exploitation one of another."³⁹ While "exploitation" has negative connotations, exploiting one another's gifts is a legitimate aim and calling. With no direct comment on this phrase, it is unclear what is meant. The conclusion is that while there are some indications of intent, there is no clear resonance between this clause and the call to share complementary resources and skills.

Partners Share in One Another's Struggles and Victories.

The RCD does not mention solidarity in suffering, or rejoicing in blessing. Section 3.2 of the RCD is more concerned with settling controversies than constructing partnership.

8.3.2. Resonance and Dissonance

There are two clear points of resonance between the RCD and the Philippian Model. These are a statement of purpose in mission and two statements of common ground. Five elements of the Philippian Model are either absent or not sufficiently present in the RCD.

³⁸ Ibid., 3.2.1.

³⁹ RCD, 2.1.3.

These are a statement of the equality of each province, the responsibility of each church to attend to one another's unity, the commitment to communication, a clear commitment to give and receive, and a commitment to solidarity in suffering and rejoicing in blessing. The omission of these vital relational agreements does not mean that the RCD is wrong, but it may indicate that it is insufficient on its own to restore the bonds of affection. It will play a vital role in defining common ground and common purpose, both of which are essential in the Philippian Model. However, these elements on their own are institutional not relational. It is argued below that the Covenant will only be a framework within which relationships can grow. Current proposals for the reviving of the "bonds of affection" will also be considered.

The Covenant process is continuing and will be the subject of further research as the process develops. It is not possible to know if the Covenant will be accepted across the Communion, and if it is, what effect it will have. The Philippian Model relies on a common purpose and a common basis of belief, both of which are clearly articulated in the RCD. The absence of the five elements from the RCD does not mean that they are absent in the process of restoring the bonds of unity in the Anglican Communion. The Covenant process is not the only official response to the crisis in the Communion recommended in *The Windsor Report*. The Communion has embarked on processes of listening, both through what is sometimes known as "The Listening Process," and through the organisation of the 2008 Lambeth Conference.

8.4. The Philippian Model and the Listening Process, Indaba, and Continuing Indaba

The relational response to *The Windsor Report* has always been a significant part of the "Windsor Process," even if it is often ignored in the press and on Internet discussions. For example, The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke of it in his 2007 "Advent Letter to

Primates” stressing the significance of relationships.⁴⁰ The relational aspects of the Philippian Model have their expression within the processes of listening, within the operation of the ACO, and within the Lambeth Conference. The author of this thesis has had a significant role in the development of processes of listening in his role as Facilitator for the Listening Process on Human Sexuality in the Anglican Communion. This has given an opportunity for the application of the Philippian Model. This section sets out the way the Model has been used in informing planning.

8.4.1. Historical Background

The bishops present at the 1998 Lambeth Conference passed Resolution I.10 on human sexuality. The second clause stated that the Conference: “in view of the teaching of Scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage.”⁴¹ Within the same resolution the bishops also recognised that there are people who experience themselves as having “a homosexual orientation,” and that that they look to the church for “pastoral care, moral direction of the Church, and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of relationships.”⁴² In this context the bishops committed themselves “to listen to the experience of homosexual persons.”⁴³ *The Windsor Report* described this as a “listening process” and called for it to be “taken forward, so that greater common understanding might be obtained on the underlying issue of same gender unions.”⁴⁴ The Primates’ Meeting of 2005 urged the ACC, which met later that year, to appoint a facilitator

⁴⁰ Rowan Williams, “The Archbishop's Advent Letter to Primates” (2007), *The Archbishop of Canterbury*, <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1586>. “Direct contact and open exchange of convictions will be crucial. Whatever happens, we are bound to seek for fruitful ways of carrying forward liaison with provinces whose policies cause scandal or difficulty to others. Whatever happens, certain aspects of our ‘relational’ communion will continue independently of the debates and decisions at the level of canons and hierarchies.”

⁴¹ *The Official Report Of The Lambeth Conference 1998: Transformation And Renewal* (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1998), Resolution I.10.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *TWR*, 135.

to monitor the work being done, share the results and enable further listening.⁴⁵ ACC –13 responded by passing a resolution affirming this request, but also calling for a process of “mutual listening.”⁴⁶ At their meeting in Dar Es Salaam in 2007 the Primates commended the work of the Facilitator and asked for “the preparation of material to assist the bishops at 2008 Lambeth Conference.” This request was fulfilled by the publication of the book *The Anglican Communion and Homosexuality*.⁴⁷

During 2007 and 2008 preparation was underway for the Lambeth Conference, with the focus on equipping bishops for mission.⁴⁸ At the heart of the conference was a concept entitled “Indaba.” The Archbishop of Canterbury described the Zulu word Indaba as a “meeting for purposeful discussion among equals. Its aim is not to negotiate a formula that will keep everyone happy but to go to the heart of an issue and find what the true challenges are before seeking God's way forward.”⁴⁹ He compared it to what “Benedictine monks and Quaker Meetings seek to achieve as they listen quietly together to God, in a community where all are committed to a fellowship of love and attention to each other and to the word of God.”⁵⁰

The Primates’ Meeting of 2009 accepted the Windsor Continuation Group’s recommendation that there be a renewal of the Listening Process.⁵¹ Following the Lambeth Conference the ACO and Lambeth Palace had been working on a proposal for Continuing

⁴⁵ “The Primates’ Meeting February 2005 Communiqué,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/primates/resources/downloads/communique%20_english.pdf, para. 17.

⁴⁶ ACC – 13 *Living Communion, Nottingham 2005*, eds. J. Rosenthal, and S.T. Erdey (Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 2005), 10.

⁴⁷ Philip Groves ed., *The Anglican Communion and Homosexuality – A resource to enable listening and dialogue* (London: SPCK, 2008).

⁴⁸ Ian Douglas, “Equipping for God’s Mission: The Missiological Vision of the 2008 Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* vol. 33, no.1 (January 2009): 3-4.

⁴⁹ Rowan Williams “Archbishop of Canterbury’s Pentecost Letter to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion” (12 May 2008), *The Archbishop of Canterbury*, <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1792>

⁵⁰ Ibid. See also Thabo Makgoba “Essence of Indaba” in *Worship and Indaba Group Resources* (London: Lambeth Conference, 2008), section on Indaba Groups, 1-2.

⁵¹ “The Windsor Continuation Group Report to the Archbishop of Canterbury” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/windsor_continuation/docs/WCG%20Report%20Final%20090105.pdf

Indaba to fulfil this request. This proposal was supported by the ACC in 2009.⁵² The

Continuing Indaba project intends to:

Develop theological resources to inform the process of seeking a common mind by the utilisation of theologians around the world reflecting on Scripture and the traditions of the church in the context of diverse cultures, with an emphasis on non-western cultures and to publish them in culturally appropriate forms. Develop and publish training materials for the convening and facilitation of Anglican Indaba processes.

Run five pilot conversations of typically three dioceses meeting across diversity. The focus will be upon the primary mission issues in each context and will not avoid hard questions – not only related to sexuality, but also to the authority of Scripture, faithfulness to tradition and the respect for the dignity of all. The hope will be that the result of the conversations will be a depth of agreement and the clarification of disagreement resulting in positive missional relationships.

Run theological and process evaluation groups to ensure the process is faithful to the Anglican way, valuable in enabling mutual mission and replicable across the Communion.⁵³

8.4.2 The Lambeth Conference and Indaba

The decision to run a Conference that equipped bishops for mission rather than producing resolutions changed the nature of the 2008 Lambeth Conference. Mission provided common purpose, and the emphasis on Bible study and worship provided the common theological language.⁵⁴ Stephen Lyon emphasises that Indaba was best understood as the whole event, including a programme of hospitality that preceded the Conference.⁵⁵ The hospitality provided direct meeting of visitors to UK dioceses. They met with one another as well as their hosts in a less formal manner. The emphasis on relationships was reinforced by the continuity of Bible study groups. Bishops met in the same group of eight for the duration of the Conference and moved with their group to join with five or six other groups to form a consistent Indaba group.⁵⁶ One indicator of success was consistent

⁵² ACC –14, “Resolution 14.12: The Listening Process,” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc14/resolutions.cfm#s12>.

⁵³ “The Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening Project” (2009), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, http://www.anglicancommunion.org/listening/continuing_indaba/description.cfm.

⁵⁴ Douglas, “Equipping,” 4.

⁵⁵ Stephen Lyon, “Why did Indaba work at the Lambeth Conference?” (2008), internal reflection paper for ACO and Lambeth Palace staff, 1.

⁵⁶ Douglas, “Equipping,” 4.

attendance at the groups, including the last Sunday of what had been a three-week event.⁵⁷ The Lambeth Conference offered an opportunity to meet, and the Indaba groups offered the chance to communicate. In formal interviews conducted by sociologist Paula Nesbitt some bishops expressed their frustration of being limited to 90 minutes for each session in their Indaba group. They commented on how the groups had enabled them to understand different contexts, and understood that this demanded different responses. The Indaba process allowed for face to face communication.⁵⁸

The Indaba concept removed power from those who were familiar with western procedure, and gave equality of status to all bishops. Facilitation allowed for contributions from all, and minority opinions were received and considered. The focus of framing questions gave opportunity for the sharing of responsibility and a sense of attempting to seek unity through humility.

The most controversial subject was human sexuality. Prior to the day set for the discussion of human sexuality the Sudanese bishops had issued a statement reinforcing their support for Lambeth I.10, and the bishops of the United Churches of North and South India, Pakistan and Bangladesh had followed suit.⁵⁹ The statements were published on conservative websites and were intended to disrupt the process. When it came to the session on human sexuality the bishops were asked to consider how the debates and divisions over homosexuality had affected mission in their context. They were then asked to consider what they wanted to ask of their fellow bishops and what they were prepared to do. The framing questions were intended to encourage a commitment to give and receive and to reflect on

⁵⁷ Paula Nesbitt, e-mail message to author, September 7, 2008. "As part of my research, I tried to walk across different parts of campus at various times to see how many bishops were visible rather than participating in scheduled activities. During Bible study, I rarely saw bishops on campus individually. During the indaba group sessions, there were a few more bishops visible, but not many. This also tended to vary each day, suggesting that the thematic emphasis could have had some effect. By contrast, there were significantly more bishops visible during other activities such as the hearings, self-select groups, and worship."

⁵⁸ Pradeep Kumar Samantaroy, e-mail message to author, July 2008,

⁵⁹ "Statement of the Sudanese Bishops to the Lambeth Conference" was initially published on the *Anglican Mainstream* website, but has been removed. It is available on other websites. "A Statement by the Bishops from South Asia," *Anglican Mainstream*, <http://www.anglican-mainstream.net/?p=4581>. Neither statement is available from official sources.

how unity could be achieved through a commitment to consider the other before themselves. This unsolicited response from Bishop Samarantoy suggests that for some the process was successful:

I came to attend the Lambeth Conference with lot of questions in my mind about the issue of human sexuality as I knew this issue has threatened the unity in the Anglican Communion. Coming from a conservative back-ground I was not even prepared to listen to any person who supported the gay and lesbian people. However, the Indaba experience has changed my opinion. After listening to the stories of bishops coming from different cultural contexts I have become aware of the pain and agony people have bear because of our attitude towards each other. Further, I am convinced that despite their different and often opposite positions all are committed to live and grow within the Anglican family. The binding force in a family is love. If we love one another we learn to transcend our differences and don't hesitate to sacrifice our own interests for the sake of the family unity. This is possible only when we are willing to listen to each other. The amount of sacrifices I make is dependent on the depth of my love and intimacy of my relationship.

As for me I have decided not to be hasty in judging the gay and the lesbians. I wish to learn more about their life and problems. I have also decided to regularly pray for them. I wish to encourage the other members of the Anglican Communion to do the same.⁶⁰

Indaba at the Lambeth Conference added the five aspects of the Philippiian Model which are absent from the Covenant process. Ian Douglas is quick to stress that the difficulties and challenges in front of the Communion have not disappeared, but he stresses that any hope for the future of the Communion is based upon the commitment to mutual mission engendered by the Indaba process.⁶¹

8.4.3. The Listening Process and Continuing Indaba

Following the Lambeth Conference I wrote a paper on future possibilities and this was studied by senior staff at the ACO and Lambeth Palace. The paper laid out the potential for further mutual listening in the very near future, and the danger that such an opportunity might not be repeated in the near future.⁶² This was followed by a proposal for mutual listening, and the title of “Continuing Indaba” was suggested. The Philippiian Model, used as an exploratory tool, guided the development of this proposal.

⁶⁰ Pradeep Kumar Samantaroy, e-mail message to author, July 2008. Quoted by Douglas “Equipping,” 6.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Philip Groves, “Mutual Listening - Lambeth and Beyond” (2008), confidential report for the ACO.

Partners have a common purpose.

The Covenant is intended as a framework within which relational links can flourish. The Continuing Indaba project is intended as a method of realising this flourishing. The framing question for the project is: “How do partners within the Anglican Communion at local, diocesan, provincial and global level assist one another in their calling to be agents of the mission of God in proclamation, discipleship, service, justice and environmental protection both in their own locality and throughout the world?”⁶³ The mission focus is very important in providing common purpose to partnership.

Partners are of equal status.

The project relies on developing a model for conversations between partner dioceses across the world. Within the structure it is of vital importance that each partner is regarded as of equal significance. The intention is for bishops to frame the central question in the context of their mission circumstances. No direct reference is made to homosexuality within the framing issue. This was a deliberate policy to avoid power being held by one side in any conversation. While gay and lesbian Christians are part of every church of the Communion, it is recognised that in many provinces other priorities take precedence. For example, the Province of Burundi defines its mission priorities as “peace and reconciliation, repatriation of refugees and displaced people, community development, literacy and education, and HIV and AIDS, Malaria and TB.”⁶⁴ To prefer the mission issues of the Global North over ones as pressing as those identified by churches such as the Province of Burundi would be contrary to the principle of equality. In addition it was recognised that if homosexuality were the framing issue the temptation for those from the Global North to educate those from the Global south would be enormous. The power would then rest in the hands of the Global

⁶³ “Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening in the Anglican Communion Grant Request.” (2009) ACO confidential document. Lines 838-41.

⁶⁴ “Reports from the Provinces - Province of the Anglican Church of Burundi (Province de l’Eglise Anglicane du Burundi)” (2007), *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/listening/reports/burundi.cfm>.

North. Equality is also enhanced by the external funding of the project, with neither group dependent upon the other for their presence at the conversation.

Partners have a common basis of belief.

The process is intended to be biblical in character and to draw upon cultural and theological resources from around the globe. The project depends upon resource hubs established in critical centres guiding the process. The aim of the resource hubs is to “provide culturally appropriate theological and resources to guide the development of further process resources.”⁶⁵ The intention is to give a clear theological and process framework for the conversations so participants will have a common basis for understanding the process. In addition, communal worship and Bible study will form a significant part of the life of the groups engaged in conversations, creating common ground.

Partners have a concern for unity in one another’s community.

Commitment to unity is a crucial factor in the selection of the participating dioceses in the pilot conversations. Unity will not mean uniformity and the discernment process will involve seeking dioceses which are committed to common mission, and where real difference is exhibited in healthy internal dialogue. The absence of unity in any one participating diocese will threaten the stability of emerging partnership.

Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.

The conversations are intended to be a step on the road of existing and future partnership.⁶⁶ One potential conversation might be between the Diocese of Massachusetts and its partner diocese of Tanga in Tanzania. This is an existing link and the bishops of both dioceses are keen to see it develop from a donor/receiver relationship to become more creative. They spoke of this desire in a broadcast to the Lambeth Conference.⁶⁷ The

⁶⁵ “Resource Hubs,” (2009), internal Continuing Indaba document.

⁶⁶ “Criteria for Pilot Conversations,” (2009) internal Continuing Indaba document.

⁶⁷ *The Lambeth Conference 2008*, DVD, (New York: Trinity Church, 2008).

maintenance of communication is not only about the frequency of visits, but also the ability to talk truthfully about issues of genuine concern for one another.

Partners share complementary resources and skills.

The eagerness of each group to give and to receive will be a vital ingredient for the conversations. Traditionally links have been focused on the sending of money from the North to the South, but pilot conversations will include conversations for partnership between, for example, a diocese in TEC and a diocese in the Church of England, with one in Africa. The aim is to challenge the delineation of dioceses as either “giving” or “receiving” inherent in previous models. The sociologists evaluating the pilot conversations will be looking for evidence of the strengthening of local mission in every participating diocese. This is the key test for the success of the project.

Partners share in one another’s struggles and victories.

One potential conversation that is presently being explored is between a Californian diocese and one from the persecuted churches of either North or South India. In 2008 the Bishop of Los Angeles apologised to Hindus for proselytising and evangelism.⁶⁸ In India violence has been used against Christian communities accused of proselytisation.⁶⁹ It is hoped that engagement between the diocese of Los Angeles and persecuted Christian minorities in India will result in the recognition of suffering and the desire to work in solidarity together. The aim of the developing of all the relationships is to foster solidarity in suffering, and rejoicing in Christ.

The Philippian Model informs the Continuing Indaba process, and the Model itself has proved vital in planning, offering clarity. Evidence of initial success is that the project has attracted a funding of \$1,430,000. In order to obtain funding it was subjected to scrutiny by a funding panel appointed by the Satcher Health Leadership Institute at the Morehouse

⁶⁸ “Christian's apology to the Hindus in US” (February 12, 2008), *Hindu Janajagruti Samiti*, <http://www.hindujagruti.org/news/4042.html>.

⁶⁹ See, for example, “Indian Minister in Orissa Visit,” *BBC*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/7166297.stm

School of Medicine in Atlanta, Georgia. It has received the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the endorsement of the ACC.⁷⁰ The project is underway, but it is too early to give a final judgement. However, early indications are that the Model has offered clarity, enabling planning and offering a road map through the process.

8.5. Further Applications of the Philippian Model

Three examples are offered of the application of the Philippian Model to mission partnership contexts. The Model is the basis of my *Global Partnerships for Local Mission* published by Grove Books in 2006.⁷¹ It was the core of the Churches Together in Leicestershire 2003 Lent study course entitled *Partners in the Gospel*.⁷² In addition it has been used as a critical tool by the officer for the “Shaped by God” program in the Diocese of Leicester.

The Mission and Evangelism director for the Anglican Communion requested copies of the Grove booklet *Global Partnerships for Local Mission* to distribute to bishops at the 2008 Lambeth Conference. The response has been favourable with no critical responses. I have been asked to assist the newly appointed World Mission Policy Adviser for the Mission and Public Affairs Division of the Archbishops' Council of the Church of England in her work. She has expressed a keen interest in the Philippian Model.

The 2003 Lent Study Course was used to shape the response to the link between Churches Together in Leicestershire and the Diocese of Trichy-Tanjore of the ecumenical Church of South India. In the town of Melton Mowbray,⁷³ which has not taken up an active role in the link, the use for the study led to the development of monthly ecumenical worship and the development of joint mission projects. The success of the study was in allowing the experience of the church in one place to challenge the life of the church in another.

⁷⁰ ACC – 14 “Resolution 14.12.”

⁷¹ Philip Groves, *Global Partnerships for Local Mission*, Grove P106 (Cambridge: Grove, 2006).

⁷² Philip Groves, *Partners in the Gospel* Churches Together in Leicestershire Lent Study Course 2003.

⁷³ I was a team vicar in the Melton Team, but I had no involvement in the use for the course in the town and no role in the developments.

The “Shaped by God” project began with a report to the Diocese of Leicester in 2005. It is a programme of enabling the development of mission partnerships. These are focussed on the delivery of “Nine Marks of a Healthy Church,” as described within the report.⁷⁴ The diocese has devoted significant resources to the implementation of “Shaped by God” including the appointment of a member of staff to oversee the programme. “Shaped by God” has seen significant developments and faced many difficulties. I was able to present a paper on partnership to the research group of the diocese including the staff member responsible for “Shaped by God.” The Philippian Model enabled him to understand why some relationships were developing and flourishing while others were failing. Successful partnerships were following the blueprint of the Philippian Model, unsuccessful “partnerships” were not. I have recently received a request for further consultancy.⁷⁵

There are indications that the Philippian Model provides a basis for the critical assessment and planning mission of mission partnerships in local situations and across geographic, economic and cultural divides. Further study is required.

Conclusion

In this chapter the Philippian Model is applied as an exploratory model to seek clarity on issues and problems that have arisen, and to offer planning for future processes within the Anglican Communion. The Model offers clarity in understanding why “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” was not able to sustain a move towards partnership; why the PiM consultations failed; and is of value for an assessment of the RCD of the Anglican Covenant. It offers insight in identifying elements missing from the Covenant process that may be developed in different processes. It has been used in the development of planning for the Continuing Indaba project and gives a coherent structure for ongoing work of the project. Further tests of the viability of the Model as an exploratory tool

⁷⁴ “Shaped by God - Partnerships for Mission in Leicester and Leicestershire,” *The Diocese of Leicester*, <http://www.leicester.anglican.org/shaped/index.htm>, 14-20

⁷⁵ Barry Hill, e-mail message to author, September 2009.

will be provided but the evaluations of the Continuing Indaba project, which will begin in 2009 and report in 2012. In addition to the work in the Anglican Communion, the Philippian Model has been used to define a partnership relationship and to develop understanding of the mission partnerships within the diocese of Leicester.

The task of this chapter was to test the Philippian Model as an exploratory model. The model has enabled an understanding of why the Anglican Communion failed to deliver the aims of MRI and clarified issues relating to the responses to the crises in the Communion. The potential and limitations of the Covenant process is highlighted. The Model has been fruitful in enabling planning for the restoration of the bonds of affection through the Continuing Indaba project. Indications are that the Philippian Model is a significant exploratory tool.

CHAPTER NINE

9. CONCLUSION

Introduction

The aim of this thesis has been to formulate a model of partnership for mission in the Anglican Communion which can be used as a critical tool in order to understand the failures of the past and enable planning for the future. The understanding of models set out in the introduction has been applied throughout the thesis.

In chapter 2 of the thesis it was shown that the models guiding the formation of the document “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ” at the Third Anglican Congress of 1963 were not sufficiently communicated. As such, the Anglican Communion lacked an exploratory model to enable planning towards the ending of the donor/receiver culture. In chapter 3 this was proved to be the case through a study of the practical implementation of programs intended to implement MRI and to end the giver/receiver culture of the Communion. The documented failure of the PiM consultation process led to the questioning of the value of the “Ten Principles of Partnership” as an exploratory model. It was shown that they are insufficient because they were drawn from the experience of a failed process. Chapter 4 offered an account of the commissions established in order to develop models of communion in response to crises within the Anglican Communion. The focus was on *The Virginia Report*, *The Windsor Report*, subsequent work of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission, and the three drafts of the Anglican Covenant. The thesis was critical of the reports, identifying a lack of transparency in the formulation of the models presented to the Communion. In particular the handling of the biblical material appeared to rely on proof texts, and the concept of subsidiarity appears to have been uncritically embraced. This led to problems in the content of the RCD of the Covenant. Chapter 5 considered the potential of the biblical concept of *koinonia* as a source of a model for partnership in the Anglican Communion, but found the methodological

objections to such an approach too difficult to overcome. In chapter 6 the failure of missiological studies to use New Testament scholarship, and the difficulties associated with the interaction between the two disciplines were addressed. Proposed solutions were applied to the study of Philippians as a potential source of a model of partnership for mission across boundaries of geography and economics. Seven potential aspects of partnership were identified in the text of Philippians. This chapter laid the ground for the distillation of an explanatory model of partnership in chapter 7. Here the relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi was abstracted into a seven-point model, entitled the Philippian Model. The seven points of the Model are:

1. Partners have a common purpose.
2. Partners are of equal status.
3. Partners have a common basis of belief.
4. Partners have a concern for unity in one another's community.
5. Partners are eager to communicate and to be with one another.
6. Partners share complementary resources and skills.
7. Partners share in one another's struggles and victories.

In chapter 8 the Philippian Model was assessed as an exploratory model. It was found to be fruitful in enabling a further critical assessment of the failures to promote and implement MRI, and gave answers as to why good intentions were not realised. It was useful in understanding the limitations of the Covenant process and in proposing a process of mutual listening to stand alongside the Covenant.

The study has shown the significance of models, and specifically the importance of paying careful attention to the formulation of explanatory models. It has highlighted the disconnection between missiology and New Testament studies and has proposed solutions. The study offers a model for mission partnerships across barriers of geography, economics

and culture. The Philippian Model offers a tool to criticise present action and to enable planning for the future. The Philippian Model is a mechanism for the “Ephesian Moment.”

9.1. Recommendations Arising from the Thesis

9.1.1. Models

The application of the specific theory of models set out in the introduction of this thesis has proved useful throughout. All of us use models, but the delineation of models as *explanatory* and *exploratory* enables clarity of thinking to enable effective application. The commissions of the Anglican Communion have presented their reports as finished products without such delineation. This practice has not enabled planning. The intentional use of modelling methodology would greatly assist in the development of programmes for common mission, and it is hoped this is a contribution to the field.

9.1.2. Missiology and the Bible

Since the publication of *Transforming Mission* there has been a growing realisation within missiology of the need to engage seriously with a variety of academic disciplines. Missiology is interdisciplinary in its nature, but has often failed to interact with specialists. In particular chapter 6 of this thesis has highlighted the problem of the relationship between missiology and New Testament scholarship. Recent studies have identified the need for further interaction,¹ and it is hoped the methodological work in chapter 6 of this thesis is a contribution to the ongoing debate. Future missiological studies will need to develop further serious interaction with scholarship in a diversity of disciplines because missiological study cannot afford to ignore the wealth of scholarship available.

Missiology since Rolland Allen has used models. For example, in chapter 2 we noted how Max Warren used models developed from economics, sociology and politics. The clear delineation of explanatory models makes demands on the missiologist to study real objects

¹ Kent L. Yinger, “Paul and Evangelism – A Missiological Challenge from New Testament Specialists.” *Missiology: An International Review* vol. XXXVII, no. 3, (July 2009): 385-396.

and instances in a manner recognisable to specialists such as biblical scholars and sociologists.²

9.1.3. New Testament Scholarship and Missiology

If missiologists are to take New Testament scholarship seriously, they are likely to ask questions of the New Testament scholar. Replicability was identified as the key question asked by missiologists of New Testament scholarship. If the New Testament has any relevance to the life of the Church, then the missiologist must assert the possibility, even the desirability, of identifying the common ground between the context then and now. The Anglican Communion has embarked on a project entitled “The Bible in the Life of the Church.”³ The initial objective of the project is to understand the methods of biblical interpretation used by Anglicans from around the world. The case study proposed is to consider how the Bible is applied to the fifth mark of mission, “To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.” This project provides an opportunity to consider the missiological perspective in biblical scholarship.

9.1.4. The Application of the Philippian Model in the Anglican Communion

The Philippian Model is being used as basis for planning in the development of the Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening Project. The Model has made a significant contribution to planning. The monitoring and evaluation of the project will be vital in establishing the significance of the model. Monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken by three groups: a process evaluation will be undertaken by two sociologists of religion who will be looking for evidence of change and benefit from the project. A theological evaluation will seek evidence of theological depth, especially as theological resource hubs develop the theological base. An independent team of ecumenical observers will prepare a report on

² Kirsten Kim, “Mission Studies in Britain and Ireland: Introduction to a World-Wide Web,” *British Journal of Theological Education* 11.1, (2000): 72-86.

³ ACC –14 “Resolution 14.06: ‘The Bible in the Life of the Church,’” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc14/resolutions.cfm#s6>

process for the donor body. The further application of the model will be dependent upon the results of these evaluations.

9.1.5. The Application of the Philippian Model for Partnership in Mission

The publication of *Global Partnerships for Local Mission* has made the Philippian model available to those seeking to develop mission partnerships. The Church of England is developing a strategy for World Mission, and the Philippian Model is to be presented to inform the developing policy. It is hoped that opportunities will emerge for further use of the model in a variety of situations.

Summary

Andrew Walls identified this era of the church as an “Ephesian Moment,” a point in time when cultural interpretations of the gospel present a challenge that offer three choices. The first choice is to demand that one culture dominate over another. The second is to recognise that the differences are so great that one cannot live with the other, and so the two (or three or four) must part and go their own ways. In response, Walls follows the writer of Ephesians in offering a third way. If Jesus is truly Lord of all and the head of the body that is the Church, then “the Church must be diverse because humanity is diverse; it must be one because Christ is one.”⁴ Within missiology, Walls’ understanding has been received positively, but it can be asked if there is evidence that Pauline theological direction won the day. Evidence would seem to point to the victory of the gentile grouping and the isolation of Jewish Christianity, resulting in their non-existence. The present reality may indeed be an “Ephesian Moment,” but the Anglican Communion may choose one of the first two options, or a mixture of both.

The relationship between Paul and his community and the community of Christians in Philippi offers a model of crossing otherwise divisive barriers for the sake of the gospel. If

⁴Andrew Walls, “The Ephesian Moment – At a Crossroads in Christian History,” in his *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002), 77.

there is hope for a future for the Anglican Communion that declares Jesus as Lord, accepts human diversity and divine unity, then a model for enacting the “Ephesian Moment” is required. The history of the Anglican Communion following the 1963 Congress and the adoption of “Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ,” shows that without a model partnership it is impossible to develop a successful programme, even when all are enthusiastic about its potential. The Philippian Model offers a genuinely Anglican resource to enable mission partnerships.

Bibliography

- Abrahamsen, V. "Women at Philippi: The Pagan and Christian Evidence." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 3 (1987): 46-56.
- Aichele, G. ed. *The Postmodern Bible*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Akiri, Mwita R. "The Growth of Christianity in Ugogo and Ukaguru (Central Tanzania): A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Role of Indigenous Agents 1876-1933." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999.
- Alexander, Loveday. "Hellenistic Letter-Forms and the Structure of Philippians." *JSNT* 37 (1989): 87-101.
- Allen, Roland. *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Anderson, W.B. *The Church in East Africa 1840-1974*. Dodoma: Central Tanganyika Press, 1977.
- Bailey, K. "Women in the New Testament: A Middle Eastern Cultural View." *Anvil* 11, no. 1 (1994): 7-24.
- Banks, R. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Historical Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Barker, Glen.W. "1,2,3 John." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 12, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 293-377. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Barnes, E. "Women in Ministry: A Matter of Discipleship." *Faith and Mission* 4 (1987): 63-69.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics Of Biblical Language*. Oxford: OUP, 1961.
- Barrett, Charles K. *The Gospel According to John*. London: SPCK, 1955.
- _____. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A and C Black, 1971.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A and C Black, 1973.
- Barton, John. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- Bauckham, Richard J. ed. *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting - The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- _____. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15: 13-21)." in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington III, 165-9. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.
- _____. *Scripture and Authority Today*. B12. Cambridge: Grove, 1999.
- Baur, J. *2000 Years of Christianity in Africa*. Nairobi: Paulines Press, 1994.

- Bayne, L.C. *Stephen Bayne – A Bibliography*. Independently Published. New York: 1978.
- Bayne, Stephen F. *An Anglican Turning Point – Documents and Interpretations*. Austin, Texas: Church Historical Society, 1964.
- _____. ed. *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ*. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Beare, F.W. *The Epistle to the Philippians*. London: A and C Black, 1959.
- Beetge, D. “The future of the Anglican Communion.” in *Christianity and Homosexuality – A Resource Booklet for Discussion*, 14-18. London: St Martin-in-the-Fields, 2005.
- Best, Earnest. “Bishops and Deacons: Philippians 1:1.” *Studia Evangelica* (1968): 371-76.
- _____. “Paul’s Apostolic Authority?” *JSNT* 27 (1986): 3-25.
- Best, T. and G. Gassmann eds. *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia – Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1993.
- Bloomquist, L.G. *The Function of Suffering in Philippians*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* London: A and C Black, 1997.
- Boice, J. “Galatians.” In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 12, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 407-508. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Booty, J. *An American Apostle: The Life of Stephen Fielding Bayne Jr.* Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Bosch, David .J. *Transforming Mission*. New York: Orbis, 1991.
- Bowers, Paul. “Church and Mission in Paul.” *JSNT* vol. 14, no. 44 (1991): 89-111.
- Brown, C. ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971.
- Bruce, F.F. *Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. *Philippians*. NIBC. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1989.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text With Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- _____. *Paul, Apostle of the Heart Set Free*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Brunner, Emil. *The Word and the World*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1931.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. 2nd ed. 1984 reprint. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1958.
- Buchanan, Colin O. “Epaphroditus’ Sickness and the Letter to the Philippians.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 36 (1964): 157-66.

- Burridge, Richard.A. *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. SNTSMS 70. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.
- _____. *Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive approach to New Testament Ethics*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans: 2007.
- Caird, G.B. *Paul's Letters from Prison*. New Clarendon Bible Series. Oxford: OUP, 1976.
- Cairns, I. *Deuteronomy - Word and Presence*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Calvin, J. *1 Corinthians*, trans. J.W. Fraser. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries 9, edited by D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Cambell, J.Y. *Three New Testament Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Cameron, E. *The European Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Cameron, J.K. "The Conciliarism of John Mair." In *The Church and Sovereignty c.590-1918*, edited by D. Wood, 429-35. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Capper, Brian J. "Paul's Dispute with Philippi: Understanding Paul's Argument in Phil 1-2 from his Thanks in 4.10-20." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 49 (1993): 193-214.
- _____. "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods." In *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting - The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, vol. 4, edited by R.J. Bauckham, 323-57. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- _____. "Reciprocity And The Ethic Of Acts." In *Witness to the Gospel – The Theology of Acts*, edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 499-518. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: IVP, 1991.
- _____, D.J. Moo and L. Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Leicester: IVP, 1992.
- Castelli, E.A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse on Power*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Reformation – Pelican History of the Church*, vol. 3. London: Pelican, 1964.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Craddock, F.B. *Philippians*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. *Romans, A Shorter Commentary*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1985.
- Creswell, J. *Re-encountering the Resurrection*. Lagos, Nigeria: Transfiguration, 2005.
- Culpepper, R.A. "Co-Workers in Suffering. Philippians 2:19-30." *Review and Expositor* 77 (1980): 349-58.

- DeSilva, D.A. *Introducing the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1964, revised 1967.
- _____. *Reformation Studies*. London: Hambledon Press, 1982.
- Dillistone, F.W. *Into All The World – A Biography of Max Warren*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1980.
- Dodd, Charles H. *The Johannine Epistles*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- _____. "The Mind of Paul; II." In *New Testament Studies*, edited by C.H. Dodd, 118-26. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.
- Doe, Norman. *An Anglican Covenant – Theological and Legal Considerations for a Global Debate*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008.
- Douglas, Ian T. ed. *Waging Reconciliation God's Mission in a Time of Globalization and Crisis*. New York: Church Publishing, 2002.
- _____. and Paul F.M. Zahl. *Understanding the Windsor Report – Two Leaders in the American Church Speak Across the Divide*. (New York: Church Publishing, 2005).
- _____. "Equipping for God's Mission: The Missiological Vision of the 2008 Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 33, no.1 (January 2009): 3-6.
- Dulles, Avery C. *Models of the Church*. (Expanded edition). New York: Doubleday, 2002.
- _____. *Models of Revelation*. New York: Orbis, 1983.
- Dunn, James D. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38A. Waco: Word, 1988.
- _____. "Historical Text as Historical Text." In *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*. JSOT Supplement 195, edited by J. Davies, G. Harvey and W.G.E. Watson, 340-59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Duraisingh, Christopher. "Encountering Difference in a Plural World: A Pentecost Paradigm for Mission." In *Waging Reconciliation God's Mission in a Time of Globalization and Crisis*, edited by Ian T. Douglas, 171-212. New York: Church Publishing, 2002.
- Etzioni, A. *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1961.
- Ezell, D. "The Sufficiency of Christ. Philippians 4." *Review and Expositor* 77 (1980): 373-81

- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- _____. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. *To Advance the Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Fowl, Stephen E. *Philippians*. Two Horizons New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Fung, R.Y.K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- George, A.R. *Communion with God*. London: Epworth, 1953.
- Gill, D.W. and C. Gempf, eds. *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting - Vol. 2 Graeco-Roman Setting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Gillman, F.M. "Early Christian Women at Philippi." *Journal of Gender in World Religions* (1990): 59-79.
- Goddard, Andrew. *God, Gentiles and Gay Christians – Acts 15 and Change in the Church*. E121. Cambridge: Grove, 2001.
- Gomez, Drexel and Maurice Sinclair, eds. *To Mend the Net: Anglican Faith and Order for Renewed Mission*. Carlton, Texas: Ekklesia, 2001.
- Gooder, Paula. *Searching for Meaning – An Introduction for Interpreting the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 2008.
- Greer, Rowan. *Anglican Approaches to Scripture*. New York: Crossroad, 2006.
- Groves, Philip. "The Least in the Community of Jesus as Examples for Leadership Today." *Anvil* vol. 15, no. 1 (1988): 13-21.
- _____. *Global Partnerships for Local Mission*. P106. Cambridge: Grove, 2006.
- _____. ed. *The Anglican Communion and Homosexuality – A resource to enable listening and dialogue*. London: SPCK, 2008.
- Hargreaves, J. *A Guide to Philippians*. London: SPCK, 1983.
- Hassett, Miranda K. *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism*. Princetown, NJ: Princetown University Press, 2007.
- Hawthorne, G.F. *Philippians*. Word Biblical Commentary 43. Waco: Word, 1983.
- _____. , R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Leicester: IVP, 1993.
- Hildebrandt, J. *History of the Church in Africa*. Accra, Ghana: African Christian Press, 1990.
- Hock, R.F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Holmberg, H. *Paul and Power*. Lund: Gleerup, 1978.

- Hooker, M. "Philippians." In *The Cambridge Companion to Paul*, edited by James Dunn, 105-15. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.
- Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement - Studies of the New Testament and Its World*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1996.
- _____. ed. *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1999.
- Jackson, Bob. *Hope for the Church*. London: CHP, 2003.
- Jewett, R. "Conflicting Movements in the Early Church as Reflected in Philippians." *NovT* 12 (1970): 362-90.
- Johnson, E. and J. Clark. *Anglicans in Mission: A Transforming Journey*. London: SPCK, 2000.
- Kahane, Adam. *Solving Tough Problems – An Open Way of Talking, Listening, and Creating New Realities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SCM, 1964.
- Kaye, Bruce. *Conflict and the Practice of Christian Faith – The Anglican Experiment*. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2009.
- Kent, H.A. "Philippians." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 93-160. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- Kidd, R. *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A Bourgeois Form of Early Christianity?* SBLDS 122. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1990.
- Kim, Kirsten. "Mission Studies in Britain and Ireland: Introduction to a World-Wide Web." *British Journal of Theological Education* 11.1 (2000): 72-86.
- Kindred, Michael. *Once Upon A Group*. Southwell, Nottinghamshire: Southwell Diocesan Education Committee, 1987 reprint.
- Kings, Graham. *Christianity Connected*. Zoetermeer, The Netherlands: Boekencentrum, 2002.
- Knappert, J. *The A-Z of African Proverbs*. London: Karnak House, 1989.
- Knox, Elizabeth. *Signal on the Mountain*. Canberra: Acorn Press, 1991.
- Kraftchick, S.J. "A Necessary Detour: Paul's Metaphorical Understanding of the Philippian Hymn." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* vol. 15 (1993): 1-37.
- Kurz, W.S. "Kenotic Imitation of Paul and of Christ in Philippians 2 and 3." In *Discipleship in the New Testament*, edited by F.F. Segovia, 103-26. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Ladd, G.E. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Revised and edited by D.A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

- LeMarquand, Grant and Joseph Galgalo, eds. *Theological Education in Contemporary Africa*. Eldoret, Kenya: Zapf, 2004.
- _____. “And the rulers of the nations shall bring their treasures into it’ a review of biblical exegesis in Africa.” *The ANITEPAM Journal* (November 2006): 75-87.
- Lieu, J. *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
- Loh, I.-J. and E.A. Nida. *A Translator’s Handbook on Paul’s letter to the Philippians*. Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1977.
- Longenecker, R.N. “Acts.” In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 9, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 205-573. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- _____. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Waco: Word, 1990.
- Longman, T. *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*. Leicester: Apollos, 1987.
- Makgoba Thabo. “Essence of Indaba.” In *Worship and Indaba Group Resources*, 1-2. London: Lambeth Conference, 2008.
- Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. London: SCM Press, 1983.
- Malinowski, F.X. “The Brave Women of Philippi.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, vol. 15 (1985): 60-64
- Maranz, D. *African Friends and Money Matters – Observations from Africa*. Dallas: SIL International, 2001.
- Mare, W.H. “1 Corinthians.” In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 10, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 173-297. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Epistles of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- _____. ed. *New Testament Interpretation*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1979.
- _____. *Acts*. Leicester: IVP, 1980.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Philippians*. London: Epworth, 1992.
- _____. and K.P. Donfried. *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.
- _____. and D. Peterson eds. *Witness to the Gospel – The Theology of Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Martin, Dale. B. *Sex and the Single Saviour – Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Martin, Ralph P. *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians*. London: Tyndale, 1959.
- _____. *Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Mbiti, John. *New Testament Eschatology in an African Background - A Study of the Encounter Between New Testament Theology and African Traditional Concepts*. Oxford: OUP, 1971.

- Macmillan, Harold. "Wind of Change - Speech made to the South Africa Parliament on 3 February 1960." *African History*.
http://africanhistory.about.com/od/eraindependence/p/wind_of_change2.htm
- McConville, J.G. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. JSOT Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- _____. *Deuteronomy*. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- McDermott, M. "The Biblical Doctrine of *koinonia*." *Biblishe Zeitschrift* 19 (1975): 219-33.
- Meggitt, J.J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1998.
- Meeks, W.A. *The First Urban Christians – The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Morris, Jeremy. "The Church and Change." In *An Acceptable Sacrifice? Homosexuality and the Church*, edited by Duncan Dormor and Jeremy Morris, 49-61. London: SPCK, 2007.
- Morris, Leon. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Motyer, J.A. *The Message of Philippians*. Leicester: IVP, 1984.
- Minear, P.S. "Singing and Suffering in Philippi." In *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John in Honor of Louis Martyn*, edited by R.T. Fortna, and B.T. Gaventa, 202-19. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
- Mtingele, Mkunga H.P. "Leadership and Conflict in an African Church: An Enquiry into the Context Nature, Causes and Consequences of Conflict and Conflict Management in the Anglican Church of Tanzania during the period of Indigenous Leadership Circa 1960 – Circa 2000." PhD diss., The Open University, 2004.
- Neill, Stephen. *Christian Partnership*. London: SCM, 1952.
- _____. *Anglicanism*. London: Pelican, 1958.
- Nesbitt, Paula. "Camp Allen to Canterbury: A Future for Lambeth in the 21st Century." Paper presented to the TEC House of Bishops, March, 2008.
- Newbigin, Lesslie. *Unfinished Agenda – an Autobiography*. Geneva: WCC, 1985.
- Nyringe, Zach D. "To Proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom (ii)." In *Mission in the 21st Century*, edited by Andrew Walls and Cathy Ross, 11-24. London: DLT, 2008.
- Oakes, Peter. *Philippians- From people to letter*. SNTS 110. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *The Epistle to the Philippians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

- _____. *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1995.
- O'Donovan, Joan Lockwood. "Subsidiarity and Political Authority in Theological Perspective." In *Bonds of Imperfection – Christian Politics Past and Present*. Edited by Oliver O'Donovan, and Joan Lockwood O'Donovan, 225-45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- O'Donovan Oliver. *On the Thirty Nine Articles – A conversation with Tudor Christianity*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1986.
- _____. *Resurrection and Moral Order*. Leicester: Apollos, 1986.
- _____. "Good News for Gay Christians." *Fulcrum*. <http://www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/news/2007/20070108odonovan7.cfm?doc=179>
- Okorochoa, C.C. ed. *The Cutting Edge of Mission*. London: ACC, 1996.
- Oxbrow, Mark and E. Garrowed. *Emerging Mission – Reporting on a consultation, Bangalore, India-November 2004*. London: CMS, 2005.
- Panikulam, G. *Koinonia in the New Testament - A Dynamic Expression of the Christian Life*. Analecta Biblica 85. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.
- Peterlin, Davorin. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church*. Supplement to NovT, vol. LXXIX. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1995.
- Peterman, G.W. *Paul's Gift From Philippi – Conventions of Gift Exchange and Christian Giving*. SNTS 92. Cambridge: CUP, 1997.
- Plummer, Robert L. *Paul's Understanding of the Church's Mission: Did the Apostle Paul Expect the Early Christian Communities to Evangelize?* Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Podmore, Colin. *Aspects of Anglican Identity*. London: CHP, 2005.
- Presler, Titus. "The Impact of the Sexuality Controversy on Mission: The Case of the Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 33, no. 1 (January 2009): 11-16
- Rapske, B. *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting - Vol. 3 Paul in Roman Custody*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians – Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. JSNT Supplement Series 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Reumann John. "Koinonia in Scripture: Survey of Biblical Texts." Faith and Order Paper no. 166 in *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, edited by T. F. Best and G. Gassmann, 36-68. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994.
- _____. *Philippians – A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008.

- Richardson, N. *Paul's Language about God*. JSNTS 99. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Rosenthal, James. *The Essential Guide to the Anglican Communion*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 1998.
- Russell, Bertrand. *Power – A New Social Analysis*. 6th Impression. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1948.
- Sampley, J.Paul. *Pauline Partnership in Christ*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Saunders, E.P. *Paul*. Oxford: OUP, 1991.
- Schutz, J.H. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. SNTS 26. Cambridge: CUP, 1975.
- Shenk, W. "Venn, Henry, 1796 to 1873." *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 1, issue 2 (1977): 16-19.
- Shorter, A. *The Church in the African City*. New York: Orbis, 1991.
- Singer, A.W. "How a Downturn Put One Rust Belt Company's Principles to the Test" *ETHIKOS and Corporate Conduct Quarterly*.
<http://www.singerpubs.com/ethikos/html/lincolnelectric.html>
- Skinner, J.E. "Ideology, Authority, and Faith." In *Authority in the Communion: Essays presented to John Howe*, edited by Stephen Sykes, 27-46. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1987.
- Smalley, S.S. *1, 2, 3 John*. Word Biblical Commentary 51. Waco: Word, 1984.
- Squires, J.T. "The Plan of God." In *Witness to the Gospel – The Theology of Acts*, edited by I Howard Marshall and D. Peterson, 19-39. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Stott, John. *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. London: Falcon, 1975.
- _____. *Understanding the Bible*. 3rd ed. London: SU, 1988.
- _____ ed. *The Anglican Communion and Scripture*. Carlisle: Regnum, 1996.
- Stowers, S.K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.
- _____. "Friends and Enemies in the Politics of Heaven: Reading Theology in Philippians." In *Pauline Theology*, vol. 1, edited by Jouette M. Bassler, 113-17. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. *Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World*. London: SPCK, 1991.
- Swift, R.C. "The Theme and Structure of Philippians." *Biblio Sacra* 141 (1984): 234-54.
- Sykes, Stephen W., ed. *Authority in the Anglican Communion – Essays Presented to John Howe*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1987.
- _____. and J. Booty eds. *The Study of Anglicanism*. London: SPCK, 1988.

- Taylor, John V. *The Go-between God*. London: SCM, 1972.
- Theissen, G. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity, Essays on Corinth*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1982.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." In *New Testament Interpretation*, edited by I. Howard Marshall, 75-104. Exeter: Paternoster, 1979.
- _____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thomas, Philip. "How can Western Christians Learn for Partners in the World Church?" *International Review of Mission* vol. XCII/366 (July 2003): 382-92.
- _____. "Commissioning Commissions: a context for the work of the ABCC and IATDC." (2004). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/documents/commissioning.pdf>
- Thomas, R.L. "1, 2 Thessalonians." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 11, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 227-337. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
- Thomas, W.D. "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi." *Expository Times* vol. 83 (1971-72): 117-120
- Tippett, Alan R. *Introduction to Missiology*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1987.
- Titre, Ande. "To Teach, Baptise and Nurture New Believers (ii)." In *Mission in the 21st Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, edited by Andrew Walls and Cathy Ross, 37-45. London: DLT, 2008.
- Turner, P. and F. Sugeno, eds. *Crossroads are for Meeting – Essays on the Mission and Common Life of the Church in a Global Society*. Sewanee, TN: SPCK USA, 1986.
- Tutu, Desmond *No Future Without Forgiveness*. London: Rider, 1999.
- Walker, Philip. *Mission Accompaniment*. Ev 69. Cambridge: Grove, 2005.
- Walls, Andrew F. *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002.
- _____. and Cathy Ross, eds. *Mission in the 21st Century*. London: DLT, 2008.
- Wanamaker, C.A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Warren, Max. *Partnership - The Study of an Idea*. London: SCM, 1956.
- _____. "The Uniqueness of Christ." *The Modern Churchman* 18 (1974): 55-66
- _____. *The Sevenfold Secret*. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Watson, D.F. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and its implication for the Unity Question." *NovT* 30 (1988): 57-88.

- Weber, Max. "Politics as a Vocation." In *Max Weber, Essays in Sociology*, edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77-128. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Whiteley, P. *Frontier Mission - An Account of the Toronto Congress 1963*. London: SPCK, 1963.
- Williams, Rowan. "The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion." (27 June 2006). *The Archbishop of Canterbury*.
<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/640>.
- _____. "The Archbishop's Advent Letter to Primates." (2007). *The Archbishop of Canterbury*. <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1586>
- _____. "Archbishop of Canterbury's Pentecost Letter to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion." (12 May 2008). *The Archbishop of Canterbury*.
<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1792>.
- _____. "Communion, Covenant and our Anglican Future." (27 July 2009). *The Archbishop of Canterbury*. <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/2502>.
- Wingate, Andrew, Kevin Ward, Carrie Pemberton and Wilson Sitshebo, eds. *Anglicanism: A Global Communion*. London: Mowbray, 1998.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Friendship and Finances in Philippi*. Pennsylvania: Trinity, 1994.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles – A Social-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Wright, N.T. "New Perspectives on Paul." Paper presented at the 10th Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference, 2003. *NT Wrightpage.Com*,
http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_New_Perspectives.htm.
- _____. *Paul: Fresh Perspectives*. London: SPCK, 2005.
- Yinger, Kent L. "Paul and Evangelism – A Missiological Challenge from New Testament Specialists." *Missiology: An International Review*, vol. XXXVII, no. 3 (July 2009): 385-396.
- Youngblood, R.F. "1, 2 Samuel." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 13, edited by F.E. Gaebelin, 553-1104. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Reports and Documents

Anglican Communion

ACC –1 *The Time is Now*, Limuru, 1971.

ACC –2 *Partners in Mission*, Dublin, 1973.

ACC –3 *Trinidad, Report of the Third Meeting*, 1976.

ACC –4, *Report of the Fourth Meeting*, Huron College, London, Ontario, 1979.

ACC –5 *Report of the Fifth Meeting*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1981.

ACC –6 *Bonds of Affection, Proceedings of ACC –6, Badagry, Nigeria*, 1984.

ACC –7 *Many Gifts One Spirit, Report of ACC –7: Singapore 198*. London: CHP, 1987.

ACC –8 *Mission in a Broken World – Report of ACC-8 Wales 1990*, edited by R. Coleman. London: CHP, 1990.

ACC –9 *A Transforming Vision – Suffering and Glory in God's World, Cape Town 1993*, edited by L. McGearry and J. Rosenthal. London: CHP, 1993.

ACC –10 *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium, Panama 1996*, edited by N. Curie and J. Rosenthal. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1996.

ACC –11 *The Communion We Share, Scotland 1999*, edited by J. Rosenthal and M. Rogers. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1999.

ACC –12 *For the Life of the World, Hong Kong 2002*, edited by J. Rosenthal. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 2003.

ACC –13 *Living Communion, Nottingham 2005*, edited by J. Rosenthal and S.T. Erdey. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 2005.

ACC –14 The Anglican Communion Official Website.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc14/index.cfm>.

Giving Mission Its Proper Place MISAG I. London: ACO, 1984.

Progress in Partnership, Report of the Mission Agencies Conference 8-13 December 1986, Brisbane, Australia. London: ACC, 1986.

Renew Our Vision in Mission. MISAG II Interim Report. London: ACO, 1989.

Towards Dynamic Mission – Renewing the Church for Mission. MISAG II Report. London: ACO, 1993.

Women in the Anglican Episcopate: theology, guidelines and practice. The Eames Commission and the Monitoring Group Reports. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1998.

The Virginia Report in ACC –10 Being Anglican in the Third Millennium, Panama 1996, edited by N. Curie and J. Rosenthal, 223-85. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1996. Also published in: *The Official Report of The Lambeth Conference 1998*. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1998.

The Windsor Report, The Lambeth Commission on Communion. London: ACO, 2004.

- “The Primates’ Meeting February 2005 Communiqué.” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/primates/resources/downloads/communique%20_english.pdf
- “‘Towards an Anglican Covenant.’ A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report.” (2005). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/consultation/index.cfm>
- Communion in Mission and Travelling Together in God’s Mission*. Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Mission and Evangelism 2001-2005. London: ACO, 2006.
- “Theological Resources for Anglican ‘Communion’ Issues.” IATDC (2006). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/iatdc/docs/2006resources.cfm>
- “An Anglican Covenant Draft prepared by the Covenant Design Group.” (2007). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/report/draft_text.cfm
- “The Communiqué of the Primates’ Meeting in Dar es Salaam 19th February 2007.” *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/primates/resources/downloads/communique2007_english.pdf
- “Theological Education – Signposts. The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey.” (2007). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/signposts/english.cfm>
- “An Anglican Covenant - St Andrew's Draft Text.” (2008). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/st_andrews/draft_text.cfm.
- Communion, Conflict and Hope – The Kuala Lumpur Report of the third Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission 2007*. London: ACO, 2008.
- “A Lambeth Commentary on the Saint Andrew’s Draft for an Anglican Covenant.” (2008). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/ridley_cambridge_draft_090402.pdf.
- “An Anglican Covenant - The Third (Ridley Cambridge) Draft.” (2009). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm>.

“An Anglican Covenant - Commentary to the Ridley Cambridge Draft - The Ridley Cambridge Report of the Covenant Design Group.” (2009). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/ridley_cambridge/commentary.cfm.

“The Windsor Continuation Group Report to the Archbishop of Canterbury.” (2009). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/windsor_continuation/docs/WCG%20Report%20Final%20090105.pdf

“The Covenant: an Introduction by Archbishop Drexel Gomez.” (2009). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
<http://www.aco.org/acns/enclosures/Covenant%20Presentation%204%20May%20handout.pdf>.

“The Continuing Indaba and Mutual Listening Project.” (2009). *The Anglican Communion Official Website*.
http://www.anglicancommunion.org/listening/continuing_indaba/description.cfm.

Church of England

To a Rebellious House – Report of the Church of England’s Partners in Mission Consultation 1981 General Synod Of the Church Of England. London: Church Information Office, 1981.

All Are Called: Towards a Theology of the Laity. London: CHP, 1985.

From Power to Partnership: Britain in the Commonwealth – The Church of England in the Anglican Communion. Board of Social Responsibility. London: CHP, 1991.

A Growing Partnership: The Church of England and World Mission. GS Misc 439. London: Church of England, 1994.

Partners in Mission (PIM) – Report of the Church of England delegates to the Fifth Partners in Mission consultation of the Church of the Province of West Africa. GS Misc. 510. London: Church of England, 1997.

Some Issues in Human Sexuality. London: CHP, 2003.

Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church. London: CHP, 2003.

Mission-Shaped Church. London: CHP, 2004.

Diocese of Leicester

“Shaped by God - Partnerships for Mission in Leicester and Leicestershire.” *The Diocese of Leicester*. <http://www.leicester.anglican.org/shaped/index.htm>

The Episcopal Church (USA)

Partners in Mission – the Louisville Consultation – 1977 – One Mission– Many Missioners. Edited by J.W.Kennedy. Cincinnati: Forward Movement, 1977.

Partners in Mission USA II: A Popular Report. Edited by R.B. Horine. Ohio: Forward Movement, 1993.

Companions in Transformation – The Episcopal Church’s World Mission in a New Century, The Standing Committee on World Mission. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 2004.

To Set Our Hope on Christ – A Response to the Invitation of Windsor Report para 13. New York: TEC, 2005.

The Lambeth Conference

The Lambeth Conference 1968 - Resolutions and Reports. London: SPCK, 1968.

The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978. London: CIO, 1978.

The Truth Shall Make You Free - The Lambeth Conference 1988 - The Reports, Resolutions and Pastoral Letters from the Bishops. London: CHP, 1988.

The Official Report Of The Lambeth Conference 1998. Pennsylvania: Morehouse, 1998.

The Vatican

“Rerum Novarum.” (1891). *The Vatican*.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html.

“Quadragesimo Anno.” (1931). *The Vatican*.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html.

“Pacem en Terris.” (1962). *The Vatican*.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html.

“Centesimus Annus.” (1991). *The Vatican*.
http://www.vatican.va/edocs/eng0214/_index.htm.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

“Common Statement of the Tenth Round of the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue.” *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*.
<http://www.usccb.org/seia/koinonia.shtml>.

World Council of Churches

Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM). Faith and Order paper no. 111. Geneva: WCC, 1982.

Sharing Life - The Report of the WCC World Consultation on Koinonia. Edited by H. van Beek. Geneva: WCC, 1989.