I welcome the invitation to be present at this Conference, though sadly I will not be able to stay for the whole of your discussion, though I am glad that Bishop David Hamid as my suffragan bishop will be with you for the whole time. I have been particularly asked to say something about Anglicanism in Europe today, as part of the context in which to set the reflections of this Conference on Ecclesiology and Mission. I want to do this by first of all remembering the context of the Bonn Agreement of 1931, then recalling an important paper ‘An Assessment of the Bonn Agreement’, by Archbishop Robert Runcie delivered in 1981 to mark 50 years of the Bonn Agreement in 1981,1 and finally commenting on the present situation of Anglicanism in Europe from the particular perspective of the Church of England Diocese in Europe of which I have been bishop for ten years since my commissioning by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Archbishop George Carey) in St Margaret’s, Westminster, on St Luke’s Day, 2001 and my enthronement in Gibraltar Cathedral on All Saints’ Day that year.

The Bonn Agreement of 1931 had as its remote ancestor the Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875 in which Old Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans met together under the presidency of Dr Döllinger. Amongst the English representatives was Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester, who had for many years been a staunch member of the Anglo-Continental Society founded by Frederick and James Meyrick in 1853, which had as one of its primary aims that of drawing together all episcopal non-Roman Churches.2 As Bishop Browne’s biographer notes, in words that still have a degree of truth in them, that ‘the sympathies of the average Englishman are not easily excited on behalf of foreign churches or distant efforts for a reform in religious faith and usage…we find it very hard to overcome the barrier of our insularity.’3 Browne was therefore unusual in his commitment to the ideals of the Society, and even more unusual in a proposal that he made in 1856 to the Lower House of

1 Text in Gordon Huelin (ed.), Old Catholics and Anglicans 1931-1981 : To commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Intercommunion, Oxford University Press, 1983, pp.1-9. It is worth noting that this 50th anniversary volume is described as commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of intercommunion, indicating something that falls short of ‘full, visible unity.’
3 Ibid., p.229
Convocation, that an ‘Anglican missionary bishop should be placed at Constantinople who might befriend and instruct the bishops of the Armenian and other Christian churches lying under the dominion of the Turk.’\textsuperscript{4} Browne saw the Anglican Church as a model of reformed Episcopal National Churches across Europe and beyond.\textsuperscript{5} He established a firm friendship with Döllinger and, describing himself as ‘an old-fashioned English High Churchman’, said that he found more from which he would want to distance himself in the ‘three extreme parties of the Church of England’ than from anything he had heard of amongst the Old Catholics.\textsuperscript{6} He sent warm greetings when Bishop Herzog was consecrated as the first Bishop of the ‘Swiss Christian Catholic Church’, and later welcomed him, together with Bishop Reinkens to Farnham Castle and an informal conference was held. Archbishop Maclagan of York summed up Browne’s vision as influencing religious life abroad, and trying to bring Churches nearer to each other, and to get them on one platform of evangelic zeal and truth and of a common apostolic order\textsuperscript{7} – not far from the theme of this Conference on Ecclesiology and Mission.

The devastating effects of the First World War had marked consequences for the life of the churches in Europe, not least for the Anglican presence. English congregations had existed continuously in places like Antwerp since before the Reformation, and in 1633 the bishop of London was given jurisdiction by order of the Privy Council over all English congregations outside England – a natural choice as the bishop of the great port city looking towards congregations often concentrated in the port cities and neighbouring places in northern Europe (the English congregation in Hamburg celebrates its 400\textsuperscript{th} anniversary next year). In 1842 the southern part of Europe was formed into an extra-provincial diocese as the Diocese of Gibraltar, the Bishop of London retaining oversight of congregations in north and central Europe. The effect of the First World War and the Russian revolution had meant that many previously flourishing congregations had ceased to exist and church buildings had disappeared. But this was just one small aspect of the consequences of war and revolution. Before the First World War the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910 had given an impetus to world evangelization and also to ecumenical relations. This was picked up in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, with its Appeal to All Christian People. Cosmo Gordon Lang, then Archbishop of York, was Chair of the Reunion Committee, and was initially

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p.183
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p.231
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p.410
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., p.418
despondent about any positive outcome, telling his mother that ‘it seems humanly impossible to get a crowd of Bishops representing every possible point of view, and already disclosing great cleavages of principle to unite in any proposals short of mere platitudes.’ Yet it was Lang who tried to lift the Conference to a greater vision, believing that it was ‘useless to consider projects and proposals in different parts of the world until we had agreed upon the ideal of unity that we must seek.’ It was an appeal to overcome the sin of disunity, and the Encyclical Letter which prefaced the Appeal, spoke of the Reunion of Christendom ‘not as a laudable ambition or a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity.’ The goal was a reunited Catholic Church, ‘within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ.’ In words taking up the Lambeth Quadrilateral such unity rested upon a ‘whole-hearted acceptance’ of the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, and a Ministry with Apostolic authority. The Episcopate was seen as providing ‘the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church.’ It was Lang, both at York and at Canterbury, who took a leading role in taking forward the ecumenical enterprise, not least in endorsing the Bonn Agreement in 1931. The context of the Appeal to all Christian People also included closer relations between Anglicans and the Orthodox Churches not least in the recognition of Anglican orders, led by the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1922 with its official declaration that ‘as before the Orthodox Church, the Ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of Bishops, priest and deacons, possess the same validity as the those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the ‘Charisma’ of the priesthood, derived from the Apostolic Succession.’

The Lambeth Conference of 1930 was the first to be attended by an Old Catholic delegation (the Archbishop of Utrecht and the bishops of Haarlem and Deventer, who were described - somewhat condescendingly - as ‘very humble-looking little gentlemen in their frock-coats, in contrast with the resplendent Orthodox’). A. C. Headlam, the Bishop of

---

9 Ibid., p.268
10 Ibid., p.269
11 Ibid., p.283. The declaration was subsequently affirmed by the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria, the Church of Cyprus, and by Romania in 1936. Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece were on the way to according a similar recognition, when the outbreak of the Second World War, interrupted the process.
12 Lockart, op.cit., p.346
Gloucester, chaired the sub-committee on relations with Episcopal Churches. The Conference of Old Catholic bishops had, following Dutch acceptance of Anglican orders in 1925, ratified that decision on behalf of all Old Catholic churches. There was a proposal for a Joint Commission on Doctrine, the Archbishop of Utrecht hoping that both Anglican and Orthodox Churches would come to discuss the question of reunion at the International Old Catholic Congress in Vienna in 1831, and hoping that the Joint Commission on Doctrine could meet before then. It did so meet in Bonn (in recognition of the earlier meetings in 1874 and 1875). The Bishop of Fulham (the Bishop of London’s suffragan for his jurisdiction of North and Central Europe), was the other Anglican episcopal member. Not only is the Bonn Agreement remarkable for its brevity, the meeting which led to it was even briefer, lasting only one day (July 2nd) – and it was said, by C. B. Moss, another Anglican delegate, that it could have been done in only half an hour were it not for some Evangelical difficulties.

The Evangelical member of the Anglican delegation, the Revd G. F. Graham-Brown, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford (and shortly afterwards consecrated as Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem), wrote the first draft of the formula, which originally contained five sections. Bishop Küry for the Old Catholics thought only the first two sections were necessary, and did not wish any new confession of faith to be drawn up. Finally after an evening’s consideration the text as we have it was finally agreed, the third clause about intercommunion being largely taken from Graham-Brown’s first draft, reflecting his Evangelical concern not to be required to accept every aspect of doctrine, sacramental devotion and liturgical practice of the Old Catholic churches. Endorsed by the Episcopal Synod of the Old Catholic Churches at Vienna on September 7th, 1931, Headlam presented it to the Bishops of the Convocation of Canterbury in January 1932. It was a short debate, Headlam commenting, ‘I think that was partly due to the excellence of the tactics I adopted. I read a very long speech which sent their Lordships into a comfortable sleep, and they were in such an excellent temper in consequence that they were prepared to accept the motion almost without discussion!’ Moss comments

14 Ibid., p.215; C.B.Moss, op. cit., p.342
15 Moss, pp. 346-7
16 Jasper, op.cit., p.218
that in the debate in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, a bishop said that what was proposed was intercommunion not union, to which the Bishop of Lincoln replied that ‘intercommunion was union, the only sort of union that they wanted, the only sort of union that was possible.’ Moss goes on to comment that the Bonn Agreement is based on three principles, Dogmatic Unity; Mutual Recognition; and Independent Co-operation – which clearly leaves a number of questions unanswered in relation to ecclesiology, mission and full, visible unity.

When Archbishop Robert Runcie made his assessment of the Bonn Agreement for its fiftieth anniversary in 1981 he responded in part to the Swiss theologian, Lukas Vischer, who had commented that he wished to defend ‘the ecclesiology implicit in the agreement’ as ‘perhaps the soundest basis for real progress in the ecumenical movement.’ Archibishop Runcie said that this was high praise from a former Director of the Faith and Order Secretariat of the World Council of Churches, but went on to comment, ‘most Anglicans will not be aware that there is an implicit ecclesiology in the Bonn Agreement.’ This was in large part due he argued because of an ecclesiological deficit in Anglican thinking.

A coherent and systematic Anglican approach to ecclesiology is urgently needed, both for Anglican self-definition and for the development of our relationship with other Churches. When we look at Anglican appeals for ‘intercommunion’ with Rome and the Orthodox, or at the way in which decisions have been taken about the ordination of women, we look almost in vain for an Anglican exposition of a theology of the church local and universal…. It is not easy to get contemporary Anglicans to realize that any theology of the church is important. It is a cinderalla subject amongst us.

Yet, Archbishop Runcie went on, that had not always been the case, citing Richard Hooker with his concern to defend Anglican ecclesial polity against both Papists and Puritans (and he could have added others such as John Bramhall. Archbishop of Armagh, who had had to consider Anglican ecclesiology when an exile in Paris during the Commonwealth period – Hooker’s ecclesiology did not work so well in a Parisian ghetto with Anglican episcopal order abolished in England). John Keble, William Palmer, and the so-called ‘branch theory’

17 Moss, op.cit., p.347
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among the Tractarians, was certainly about ecclesiology – and there have been others that have thought seriously about Anglican ecclesiology. Recent events in the Anglican Communion since Robert Runcie’s archiepiscopate have forced ecclesiology higher up the agenda – the consecration of women bishops in America, Canada and New Zealand, the fall-out from the consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson, a divorced man in an open same-sex partnership, questions relating to authority and primacy within the Anglican Communion, the local and the universal. An important article by Dr Colin Podmore, ‘A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of The Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared’\textsuperscript{21} has underlined the significant ecclesiological differences between The Episcopal Church (USA) and the Church of England (and the rest of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion) in relation to the authority of bishops, dioceses and the General Convention in America, and bishops in Synod in the Church of England.

Archbishop Runcie goes on to point out that one of the most remarkable development in ecumenical theology at the time when he was writing has been ‘an almost unnoticed convergence in ecclesiology: the church as a Eucharistic communion of local churches.’\textsuperscript{22} Even though that is the case it remains true, as Archbishop Runcie notes, that ‘unconscious differences in the understanding of the church make agreement on other issues impossible.’\textsuperscript{23} Runcie honestly admits that ‘if the implicit ecclesiological insight of the Bonn Agreement is profound, the actual impact of the Agreement has been frankly disappointing.’ Some of this is the consequence of geographical and cultural separation, but Runcie notes Lukas Vischer’s comment that ‘the agreement establishes not communion but intercommunion’\textsuperscript{24} – a point we have already noted as being made at the time when the Agreement was accepted by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury.

Archbishop Runcie went on to cite his predecessor, Michael Ramsey’s, call to explore ‘the implications of full communion in the Church of God’ in the context of what was then called the Wider Episcopal Fellowship. What are the implications for Anglicans of communion with the United Churches of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, and now with the churches who have entered into the Porvoo Agreement. There are questions to be asked there,

\textsuperscript{22} Huelin, op.cit., p.3
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p.4
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
as well as between Anglicans and Old Catholics. What is the appropriate instrumentality for this - an instrumentality that does not overload ecclesial structures that are often already overstretched in terms of both human and financial resources? Local Ecumenical Partnerships which the Church of England has entered into in England have often foundered by an overload of bureaucracy, as I remember when I was Bishop of Basingstoke in the Diocese of Winchester, from a good priest who served in one of these listing all the additional meetings he had to attend because it was an LEP – his own district church council, the team ministry council (Anglican), the local partner church’s meetings, and the meeting of ecumenical oversight set up by the respective partner churches. I was not surprised that he had almost come to the conclusion that this plethora of meetings hampered rather than enabled the mission of the church.

What then of mission in Europe and our joint responsibility as churches in communion? The Diocese in Europe, brought into being in 1980, by the coming together of the Bishop of London’s Jurisdiction in North and Central Europe and the Diocese of Gibraltar, has now had over thirty years of common life. It has grown, and grown in part because of the movement into Europe of UK citizens, not all Anglicans certainly, but English-speaking, many of whom wishing to worship look for English language congregations, and who are willing, as a recent Diocesan survey showed, to travel far further than in England to be part of a familiar church fellowship. Likewise many non-Anglicans who are English speaking find their home within what is an Anglican structure. On a recent visit to one of our chaplaincies in the Netherlands I found that only the chaplain and myself as the visiting diocesan bishop were Anglican. This hospitality can be valuable, but can also create tensions. But besides those from the UK, who may form the majority of the congregations in Spain or South-West France, there are those from America, Australia and many parts of Africa. There are significant Nigerian congregations in Padova and Macciarata in Italy, and many other congregations in which Nigerians, Ghanaians or Kenyans form a significant part of the membership. Ordinands of the diocese come now from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds. Likewise, without being a proselytising church, we find significant numbers of those from local national backgrounds wishing to join with us, attracted perhaps by a tradition of Christianity which is pastoral, liturgical and sacramental. We should also note the question of overlapping jurisdictions between Anglicans in Europe – the Convocation of American Churches of some ten chaplaincies, there for historical reasons in France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Italy; the two very small Iberian churches whose
origins are not dissimilar from those former Roman Catholics who became Old Catholics after Vatican I – the Lusitanian Church in Portugal, with congregations in Lisbon, Porto and Nova de Gaia, served by some nine clergy; and the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church (IERE) with again a relatively small number of clergy and congregations worshipping largely in Spanish. These were recognised as churches in 1980, the same year as the Diocese in Europe in its present form came into being, and for that reason the ecclesiological relationship between those churches and the Diocese in Europe was never fully set out, though in the past we have had a priest of the Lusitanian Church serve as an archdeacon in the Diocese, and Bishop Fernando of that church was part of the triumvirate (with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London) who made my appointment (which is not a Crown Appointment and does not go through the Prime Minister’s Office – a unique episcopal appointment in the Church of England).

All in all there are some three hundred congregations across Europe and beyond, served by some 150 clergy, stipendiary, part-stipendiary and non-stipendiary, according to the ability of local congregations to pay. Ecumenical relations are important and always have been to the Diocese. In many places in France and Spain we use Roman Catholic churches with the blessing of the local bishop. In other places in France we can worship in a church of the Eglise Reformée. In Finland the Porvoo Agreement has meant that two priests from the Church of Finland have been able to share in ministry to the Anglican congregation. In Finland also there is a community of refugees from the Southern Sudan who are ministered to by a priest from the Sudan and with support from the Finnish Church. In this context the local agreements we have with the Old Catholics for the seafarers ministry in Vlissingen, and the airport ministry at Schipol Airport are valuable as expressions of joint ministry. So too there is the covenant agreement with the Old Catholic church in the Czech Republic, which was necessary both as a means of legal recognition from the secular authorities, and as an expression and outworking of being churches in communion.

As we seek to work out new steps in giving further substance to our being churches in communion, who are called to mission, I believe that we build best by local projects and agreements, and by thinking through the ecclesiological implications of both culture and diaspora. There is a tension between what I need to do as bishop of a dispersed diocese in seeking to counteract the centrifugal and congregationalist pressures that are always present, in order to build up a real sense of unity and identity, and the many different local ecumenical
agreements which we honour. The Diocese in Europe is a growing diocese. The number of congregations has doubled since its inception. It is a Diocese of the Church of England and serves to remind a somewhat parochial Church of England of a wider European dimension, not least in the context of ecumenical relations.

When I became Bishop in Europe in 2001 I knew about the Old Catholic churches because I was a church historian. I had never met an Old Catholic, except I think for a brief encounter with one or two Old Catholic bishops at episcopal consecrations. If that is the case for someone such as myself with a long commitment to ecumenism, and with a strong sense of the history of the church, it is inevitably going to be even more so with almost all of my colleagues as bishops and clergy, let alone lay people. That is part of the reality with which we have to live, and ten years on from my becoming Bishop in Europe I can truly say that it is good to have had these years of encounter with Old Catholics, and that I believe we can look for still more opportunities in which we can work together in mission in a Europe that is increasingly secular, though secular in different countries and in different ways. I also believe that in any projects we seek to do together we need to be aware of the need to carry congregations with us – bishops cannot simply deliver by the signing of agreements – and we need to be aware of the history that has brought us to this point, which is why I have started where I did, so that we can be reminded of the history that has shaped our relationships as well as the challenges to us as to how that history is taken forward.

+ Geoffrey Rowell