**An Introduction to Anglicanism**
**St Ursula's Church, Bern**
27 April 2021

*David Marshall*

One of the most distinctive features of Anglicanism is the variety of approaches within it to worship, to theology, and to the Christian life in general. It's often said that the Church of England is a 'broad church'. In other words, to the question of what it means to be the Church, what the Church should look like in the world, Anglicans offer a very wide range of answers – perhaps a wider range than in any other Christian denomination. This can be confusing, especially to Christians of other traditions, who can be puzzled to discover what can seem like rather extreme forms of both Protestantism and of Catholicism under the one umbrella 'Anglicanism' or 'Church of England'. And Anglicans themselves may also find this hard to understand, and to live with, especially if they have only really experienced one style of Anglicanism.

In a while we'll take a look at the history that has given rise to this 'broad church' character of Anglicanism, but first let me illustrate this point a little more concretely by taking you on an imaginative trip to England, the home of Anglicanism, and to a medium-sized town with three parish churches of quite distinct types. Imagine that on three Sundays you go to worship consecutively at each of these three churches. The first identifies as evangelical; the second as Anglo-catholic; and the third might describe itself as liberal or progressive in its outlook.

So, on the first Sunday you worship at the evangelical parish church, which is named Christ Church (rather than being named after a particular saint, like Mary, Peter, or Ursula), because the founders of this church did not share in the typically Catholic enthusiasm for saints but wanted to stress the centrality of Christ. This church is broadly in the traditions of the Reformation that happened in Europe in the 16th century (more on that later), with a strong emphasis on the Bible and on preaching. Sermons here can last up to thirty minutes, and generally stick close to the text of Scripture. The main Sunday morning service might be Holy Communion, but it might not. Though it is a respected part of this church's worship, Holy Communion is not generally seen as the heart of Christian worship. The vicar here prefers to speak of himself as a minister rather than a priest, and in recent years has followed a wider evangelical trend in the Church of England by no longer wearing robes for Sunday worship. Leading of the worship is often delegated to lay people. Some parts of the liturgy are followed, but there may be informal, spontaneous prayer. The music tends to be contemporary in style. This church acknowledges the influence of Charismatic renewal and emphasizes the need for openness to the presence of the Holy Spirit today. Its wider programmes focus on sharing the faith with those beyond the church and hoping to see others come to Christ.

The following Sunday, you attend St Mary Magdalene's, a very different style of Anglican parish church, firmly in the Anglo-catholic (or 'high church') tradition of the Church of England. Here, in contrast, the role of the priest, who is always referred to as *Father* Michael, is emphasized. In colourful vestments, he conducts the liturgy, assisted by robed acolytes, who process with him, swing incense, hold the Gospel book, and serve at the altar. A robed choir sings traditional choral music. The clear focus of the service is the Eucharist or 'Mass', complete with incense and ringing of bells. The liturgy is followed closely, with no impromptu prayers

added. The sermon rarely lasts more than ten minutes. In the notices at the end of the service, Fr Michael emphasizes that in the coming week there will be a major saint's day and all are encouraged to attend celebration of the Mass that evening.

The following Sunday you attend the third parish church in the same town, a church which identifies with the liberal or progressive tradition within Anglicanism. What distinguishes this church is not so much the style of worship as a general aspiration to be open to the wider world and up to date with contemporary thinking, with a clear tendency towards left-wing sympathies and progressive causes. There is a strong concern here, visible in posters and church notices, that the church exists to serve the wider world and stand in solidarity with people suffering injustice and oppression, people in any kind of need. The notice board outside church declares that this is an 'Inclusive Church': all are welcome here. Whereas in the other two churches you might have quite a sense of the difference between church and world, here there is more of a sense of a church *in* the world and *for* the world, engaged with the world. What's the sermon like here? There is certainly some mention of the Bible, but the driving question is how to connect our faith with contemporary realities. You go on your way challenged to consider how God is calling the Church to understand and live out the message of Jesus in today's world.

In reality, churches, like individual Christians, tend to be shaped by a mix of different influences and different traditions, and they are not usually quite so clearly categorized as I've suggested with that somewhat caricature sketch of three different churches. In fact many, perhaps most, Church of England parishes might resist such categorization and say they are 'middle of the road' or of a 'central tradition', seeking to draw eclectically on the best of the different strands. Nevertheless, the three Anglican tendencies or styles which I've described are the main reference points which historically have characterized the Anglican tradition: the Evangelical or Reformed tradition; the Catholic or Anglo-Catholic tradition; and the Liberal tradition. An Anglican statement from the 1920s says: "Anglicans are heirs of the Reformation as well as of Catholic tradition and they hold together in a single fellowship of worship and witness those whose chief attachment is to each of these, and also, thirdly, those whose attitude . . . is most deeply affected by the tradition of a free and liberal culture." An evangelical tradition, a catholic tradition, and a liberal tradition, coexisting, "holding together" in the same Church.

One way in which that same ideal, that same aspiration to "hold together", is often expressed, is to speak of balance. Anglicanism is a tradition that seeks to maintain balance. Among recently published introductions to Anglicanism, one that I would commend is entitled *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition* (by Allan Bartlett). Another recent publication is entitled: *A Point of Balance: The Weight and Measure of Anglicanism*.

And, of course, who can object to this call for balance? Yes, we all need balance, within our individual Christian lives, within our congregation, within our wider church. And, that would apply among Methodists, among Baptists, among Catholics, among all Christian traditions. But the need for balance does seem to be a distinctively Anglican emphasis and perhaps also a distinctively Anglican challenge. It is as if Anglicanism—for historical reasons which we'll think about in a moment—has set itself the challenge of holding together an especially wide spectrum of Christian outlooks. So, let's turn now to a brief look at history to consider how this distinctive Anglican character developed.

The word "Anglican" comes from the Latin "Anglia," meaning England, and it is especially the upheavals in 16th century England at the time of the Reformation in Europe that we must understand to grasp the origins of the Anglican tradition. We start with King Henry VIII,

who ruled from 1509 to 1547. When he came to the throne as a young man, Henry was a devout Roman Catholic, and the Church in England was a loyal part of the wider Roman Catholic Church under the authority of the Pope in Rome. But only twenty-five years later, in 1534, Henry pushed through Parliament the Act of Supremacy, which rejected the authority of the Pope and the Catholic Church in England and established the monarch as the supreme head or governor of the Church in England. That was a dramatic change, which the devoutly Catholic Henry would have been appalled even to consider in 1509. So, what had changed? Why did this break with the authority of the Catholic Church and the Pope come about in England?

It's important to note that this was not because Henry had become a convinced Protestant. Certainly, it was during the first half of his reign that the ideas of Luther and other reformers began to spread in Europe and to penetrate England. New attitudes to the Bible and a desire to see it widely available in English were becoming significant in certain circles in England. But during the first half of his reign, Henry opposed these Protestant ideas stoutly and Protestants were often harshly persecuted, sometimes executed – notably William Tyndale, the famous Bible-translator. So England's break away from the authority of Rome under Henry VIII did not happen because he had become a convinced Protestant. Rather, it was because he became persuaded that the King of England should be the supreme governor of the Church in England, and that the Pope should have no jurisdiction over the Church in England. This is a complex matter, but at the heart of it was a very personal issue for Henry: he wanted permission from the Pope to divorce his first wife, Catherine of Aragon.

The story of Henry and his divorce is complex. For now, just the basics. Catherine of Aragon had only had one child who survived infancy: a daughter, Mary. Henry was desperate to have a male successor, but it seemed clear that Catherine would not bear him a son. Henry also became convinced that he should never have married Catherine, because she had previously been married to his elder brother, who had died young. Meanwhile, Henry had fallen for a younger woman, Anne Boleyn. So Henry petitioned the Pope for a divorce, but, for political as well as other reasons, the Pope would not grant it. That in the end prompted Henry and his advisors to reject the authority of the Pope over the Church in England.

Again, it's important to note that at this point in 1534, when the Act of Supremacy was passed, although the Church in England had broken away from the authority of Rome it was still basically catholic in its beliefs and practices. Henry was not a Protestant and was never persuaded of Protestant doctrines. But what the divorce and the break with the authority of Rome brought about was *a situation which allowed Protestant influence to grow in England*. It has been said that without the divorce, there would have been no Reformation, which is not at all the same thing as to say that there was nothing to the Reformation but the divorce.

Now we come to a very intense and complex period in English history in which supporters of Protestantism and Catholicism were struggling for their respective causes. It helps first to state very simply the sequence of the reigns of Henry's three children, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, after his death in 1547.

Henry was succeeded by his son Edward VI. Edward's reign from 1547-1553 was a time of growing Protestant influence.

Edward died young and was succeeded by his elder sister, Mary, who restored the authority of the Roman Catholic Church in England.

But Mary only reigned five years. When she died without an heir in 1558, the throne passed to her younger sister, Elizabeth. During Elizabeth's long reign to 1603, Protestantism became firmly established, but in a distinctive form.

Edward, Protestant; Mary, Catholic; Elizabeth, Protestant. These reigns of Henry's three children were a traumatic period of great religious tension in England. A very significant and formative period for Christianity in England. Let's look at it again in a bit more detail.

When Edward became king in 1547, he was only nine years old, and he reigned just six years. His advisors were all Protestants. Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had also been Archbishop under Henry; but under Henry Cranmer had been limited in what he could do as a Protestant sympathizer. Under Edward, Cranmer was now able to pursue Protestant Reformation, and two new prayer books radically changed the liturgy and the sacramental practice of the Church of England in a Reformed direction.

But Edward died young and was succeeded by Mary, a devout Catholic, who brought about a Catholic restoration in England. During her reign some of the Protestant bishops who had been prominent under Edward, including Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, were publicly executed. Mary achieved notoriety as "Bloody Mary," because of the number of executions of Protestants under Mary, leaving a strong anti-Catholic sentiment among the English for a very long time.

But Mary died without a child in 1558, to be succeeded by her younger sister Elizabeth, during whose reign the Protestant cause became established, but in a distinctive, balanced form, known as "the Elizabethan Settlement." Elizabeth was not a hard-line Protestant, and she clearly favoured a moderate form of Protestant Reformation in England. She supported the retention of certain aspects of Catholic practice, including a requirement that clergy should wear robes. This caused controversy as the more Protestant clergy of the Church of England were keen to have a more thorough Calvinistic or Puritan Reformation of the Church; to hard-line Protestants, having bishops, wearing robes, observing saint's days and such matters seemed like remnants of Catholic practice of which the Church of England should be cleansed. But Elizabeth pursued something of a middle way, or *via media*. She didn't want to impose a hard-line Protestantism that would alienate those with somewhat more catholic sensibilities. She was looking for balance, one could say…

So, going back to my earlier point about the desire to achieve balance, which seems to be one of the defining features of the Anglican tradition, in many ways this was given classic expression by Elizabeth. During her reign, the theological architect of the Anglican tradition was Richard Hooker, who wrote a defense of the Church of England over against both the Roman Catholic Church and against extreme Protestantism, defending a middle way.

One nice illustration of this middle way comes from the words for the administration of the bread and wine at Holy Communion, which were defined during the reign of Elizabeth and are still present in the Book of Common Prayer Communion service. The words prescribed for the priest to say as he gives the bread to worshippers are a long and carefully balanced statement. The first part implies a catholic view of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament and the second part implies a more Protestant view of the sacrament, in which the bread and wine are received as a *memorial* of the death of Christ rather than as his real presence. So the priest says first: "*The body of our Lord, Jesus Christ*, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." That language at least leaves open a catholic view of the sacrament. But the priest goes on to say to the same person, in much more Protestant terms, "Take and eat this *in remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart, by faith, with thanksgiving." So, that's a classic expression in the Elizabethan Settlement of Anglican balance, applied here to a central Christian practice, Holy Communion.

During Elizabeth's long reign, the Elizabethan Settlement took root. This nuanced form of Protestantism that became established in England was unlike what took hold elsewhere in

Europe. The Church of England established a form of Protestantism which retained a considerable amount of Catholic order, the authority of bishops, and aspects of Catholic sacramentalism. That is not to say, however, that thereafter in the Church of England this balance between Catholic and Protestant theology and practice was always taken for granted. The history of the Church of England over the following four centuries to the present has, in many ways, involved an uneasy relationship between these different tendencies.

Much more briefly, I'll now mention some of the main historical phases in the further development of the Church of England.

In the seventeenth century, Elizabeth's immediate successor, James I, to a large extent maintained the balance that she had established. In the middle of the seventeenth century, however, we could say that this balance was lost during another traumatic phase of English history, the Civil War. Part of the background to the Civil War was the way King Charles I and his Archbishop, William Laud, tried to impose on the Church of England a high church, catholic-leaning style of Anglicanism, which antagonized the more Protestant, or Puritan, parts of the church. There were other reasons for the Civil War, but when Charles finally fell from power and was executed in 1649, this led to a period of Protestant domination. The Puritans finally had their day, and for about a decade the Church of England as it had developed was pushed to one side, replaced by hardline Protestantism.

In 1660, with the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II, this brief season of Puritan domination was replaced by the reestablishment of broad church Anglicanism. But in the following centuries we continue to see this see-sawing tendency in the Church of England, with variously Protestant and Catholic instincts coming to the fore. For example, in the eighteenth century, there were some very significant evangelical movements within the Church of England, associated with the Wesleys and George Whitfield. Such movements were not always contained within the Church of England – for example, Methodism emerged out of it – but they had a strong influence within it.

In the nineteenth century, the most influential movement in the Church of England was the Anglo-Catholic Revival, led by figures like Newman, who eventually became a Roman Catholic, but also others who stayed in the Church of England, such as Pusey and Keble. This brought a renewed emphasis on the sacraments, a restoration of the religious orders (which had been closed under Henry VIII with the Dissolution of the Monasteries), and the restoration within the Church of England of a much stronger catholic identity. Continuing the same story into the twentieth century, there are periods in which the catholic tendency comes to dominate and then periods when the evangelical tendency came to the fore.

We get a nice illustration of the continuing balancing act within the Church of England between these two tendencies in its life if one looks at the last six Archbishops of Canterbury, from the 1960s through to the present. It is a striking illustration of Anglican identity that they have alternated Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical. Michael Ramsey in the 1960s, Anglo-Catholic; Donald Coggan, Evangelical; following him, Robert Runcie, Anglo-Catholic; and then George Carey, Evangelical; then, Rowan Williams, an Anglo-Catholic; followed by the present Archbishop, Justin Welby, formed in the Evangelical tradition of the Church of England. There is certainly no formal understanding that Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals will alternate in this way, but it is telling that this is what has actually happened.

…..

In that brief survey of the history of the Church of England I've tried to show how two fundamental tendencies, Catholic and Protestant, have been held together, sometimes with considerable tension and conflict. So Anglicanism is sometimes described as a tradition of reformed Catholicism, a tradition that is both Catholic and Reformed. But an important question might occur to you now. I began by describing *three* types of Anglican church: Evangelical, Catholic and Liberal. What about that Liberal strand – have I forgotten about it? From the historical survey we can see how the Evangelical tradition ultimately comes from the Protestant Reformation, but that it has always co-existed with a Catholic strand of Anglican identity that goes back to the pre-Reformation history of the Church in England, and has continued in the Church of England even after it broke with Rome. (That, incidentally, explains why Anglicans do not call themselves *Roman* Catholic but can and do see themselves as part of a Catholic tradition of which the Roman Catholic Church does not have a monopoly. In Anglican terms, you can be Catholic without being *Roman* Catholic. Anglicans who especially emphasize this Catholic part of their identity typically call themselves *Anglo*-catholic.) So we can see the historic roots of the Protestant and Catholic strands within Anglicanism, but what about that 'Liberal' Anglican church I described? Where does the Liberal Anglican tradition come from?

That's a good question, and it requires a different kind of answer. The Liberal strand within Anglicanism does not have the same kind of *historical* origin that we can point to for the Evangelical and Catholic strands. It sits differently within the complex reality of Anglicanism. Here I should mention a well-known illustration which compares Anglicanism with a three-fold cord; the three strands of that cord are scripture, tradition and *reason*. The cord only has its full strength if all three strands are present. Anglicanism is also sometimes compared with a three-legged stool. If any of the three legs, scripture, tradition or reason, are absent, the stool falls over.

Scripture; tradition; reason. Within the Anglican spectrum it has typically been Evangelicals, looking back to the Protestant Reformation and its appeal to the authority of the Bible, who have emphasized *scripture*. And it has been Catholic Anglicans, or Anglo-Catholics, who have tended to emphasize *tradition*, the divinely guided teachings and practices of the church as these have unfolded over the centuries. But these images of a three-fold cord or three-legged stool insist that Anglicans do not just draw on scripture and tradition; they also draw on a third source, reason. God has given us minds to explore the nature of the cosmos, this planet, and our own complex human reality. Christians should gratefully learn not just from scripture and tradition but also from our use of reason, our experience of our own intelligence, and indeed the intelligence of all human beings, Christian or not, in exploring the reality created by God.

This emphasis on reason as one of the sources for Anglican belief and practice has been present all along. It doesn't come from any particular moment in the history of the Church; it's a recurrent style of thinking about Christianity that is confident in our capacity to use human reason and experience, scientific and philosophical exploration, as key sources for understanding God, the universe and our place within it. So Liberal Anglicans have typically stressed the need for a *reasonable* faith. And because the definition of what is reasonable is constantly being revised and updated, that often also means a faith open to cutting-edge contemporary thinking about the world around us and what it is to be a human being. Liberal Anglicans stress the importance of being open to what new truths God is showing us today, hoping to serve as the avant-garde of the church, in encounter with various new kinds of scientific knowledge, or thinking about human society or identity, and what these tell us about God as creator, and about our lives. Liberal thinking in the Church, responding to developments in the wider world, has over the years prompted many debates. Anglicans have often disagreed sharply as they have

variously emphasized and interpreted scripture, tradition and reason, over matters such as: evolution; how far we can take the Bible as a historical source; the possibility of believing in miracles, including the resurrection of Jesus; the role of women in the Church; the nature of marriage. Anglicans have always debated and disagreed, from the start through to today.

I'll move now to a few concluding general points about Anglicanism. Firstly, implicit in all that I've said is that the mainstream of the Church of England has thought of itself as a broad church and has regarded this as something positive to be affirmed and maintained as far as possible. Involved in its foundational story, emerging out of traumatic experience, is the recognition that there is more than one authentic way of being Christian, and that it's good to try to keep those different ways of being Christian in constructive relationship (or creative tension) with each other. Critics of the Church of England can find plenty of ammunition to use in arguing that by seeking to be a broad church the Church of England all too often becomes a church of the lowest common denominator, a church without decisive convictions. Such critics would probably add that because of its role as established or state church, the Church of England all too often goes along uncritically with wider society and loses its distinctive Christian edge. But while recognizing that Anglicanism comes with its besetting temptations and its characteristic weaknesses, its broad church vocation is still worth affirming.

In his book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* Michael Ramsey gives a very rich account of the Anglican Church as one that holds together Reformed and Catholic understandings of what Christianity is. In a famous passage Ramsey writes about this vocation of the Church of England, where he also makes a powerful point about the messiness this brings with it. He writes, "For while the Anglican Church is vindicated by its place in history, with a strikingly balanced witness to Gospel and Church and sound learning, its greater vindication lies in its pointing through its own history to something of which it is a fragment. Its credentials are its incompleteness, with the tension and the travail in its soul. It is clumsy and untidy, it baffles neatness and logic. For it is sent not to commend itself as 'the best type of Christianity', but rather by its very brokenness to point to the universal Church wherein all have died."

That is a much quoted expression of what Anglicanism is called to be. It points us to something else that should characterize Anglicanism: modesty. Anglicanism, Ramsey says, does not present itself as "the best type of Christianity". Rather, it sees itself, in its very imperfections and brokenness, as having a contribution to make to the wider, universal Church of which it is a part. Every priest of the Church of England being authorized by a bishop to exercise ministry makes the prescribed 'Declaration of Assent', before which a Preface is read, beginning: "The Church of England is *part of* the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church." There is a suitable modesty there. The Church of England has never made the claim about itself that it is the one true Church. It believes, confidently, that it is *part of* the one true Church, but it is only part of it. It recognizes that alongside its own attempts to be authentically Christian, there are many other, equally valid, ways of being authentically Christian beyond its borders.

Another concluding point concerns the importance of liturgy, Anglican worship, as a clue to Anglican identity. It's often said that Anglicanism has not produced much notable systematic theology. When Christians from other churches ask: "What is your theology as Anglicans? Who are your systematic theologians who can help us understand what Anglicanism is all about?", the tendency has been to say, "Read our prayer book." Cranmer, whom I mentioned briefly earlier, the Archbishop under Henry VIII and Edward VI, burnt at the stake in Oxford under Queen Mary, is not generally seen as a great theologian. But he is seen as a genius liturgist, and the Book of Common Prayer, which evolved through various stages, but of which he was the

primary architect, is the foundational Anglican document. So it is often said that if you want to know what Anglicans believe, come and pray with us. You will find, in our liturgy, the best clue to what our faith means.

It's also worth mentioning something about the *artistic* heritage in the Anglican tradition. For example, poetry has been an important part of the Anglican tradition. From the seventeenth century, John Donne and George Herbert are perhaps the two greatest Anglican priest-poets. Let me mention two poems by Herbert. Arguably the greatest poem in the English language is his "Love (III)", which begins, "Love bade me welcome but my soul drew back." If all else fails, that's something to be proud of in our Anglican tradition. But let me catch myself in that moment of Anglican smugness and mention an awful but very interesting poem by Herbert called "The British Church". It's interesting because of how it expresses that sense I mentioned earlier of Anglicanism finding a middle way between Catholicism and extreme Protestantism. But it's awful because of the smug triumphalism with which it portrays Anglicanism as the perfect form of Christianity – exactly what Michel Ramsey warns us not to think. Coming to Anglican poets in more modern times, there's T. S. Eliot, who joined the Church of England as an adult, and the Welsh priest-poet R. S. Thomas. And some of you may recognize the name Malcolm Guite, whose poems Helen regularly includes in her weekly emails to the people of St Ursula's. He's an old friend of ours, so we are biased, but I think he is a truly great poet and a gem of the Anglican Church. C. S. Lewis should also be mentioned here. As a layman, Lewis did not have formal theological training, but, apart from Cranmer (via the Prayer Book), he is surely the most widely read Anglican in history. And, at least as much as Lewis' books and essays on the Christian faith, it's his stories, especially the Narnia stories, which have made such an impact. Though not in any obvious sense Anglican, these stories are permeated by the Christian faith. That they were written by a man whose faith was formed in the Church of England is another good reason to be un-smugly proud of our tradition – or, better, to be grateful for it to God. So that instinct to communicate and commend the faith through poetry and fiction is an important part of the tradition. One could of course also speak about the musical traditions of Anglicanism, the importance of church architecture and so forth.

Finally, a brief word about the Anglican Communion. In everything I've been saying I have emphasized the Church of England. For much of the history of Anglicanism, it simply was the Church of England. But over the last two centuries it has developed from an English Church into the worldwide Anglican Communion. Essentially, the Communion grew as the British Empire spread and members of the Church of England established churches which eventually led to dioceses and in due course brought us to where we are now, with about 40 provinces of the global Anglican Communion. The Communion naturally took root particularly in parts of the world where the British extended their empire, such as Nigeria, Ghana, Sudan, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, South Africa, Hong Kong, India, Sri Lanka, Australia, New Zealand, Canada.

There is a continuing role played by the Archbishop of Canterbury as a focus of unity for all the world's Anglicans, but within Anglicanism there is nothing like the centralized authority of the Pope in the Roman Catholic Church. As a result, authority is much more dispersed, much looser, in the Anglican Communion, and the individual provinces of the Communion are much freer to pursue their own course of action, their own developments. In recent decades, there has been a slow-burning crisis in the Communion. Disagreements, especially around marriage and sexual morality, have led to significant splits and the formation of groups of provinces critical of the wider Communion; the unity of the Communion is now more strained, more complex than it used to be.

A key point about modern Anglicanism has been that over the last few decades while church attendance has declined dramatically in England, in the mother Church of Anglicanism, and also in the western Church more generally, this has been a period of phenomenal growth among Anglicans elsewhere, notably in Africa. The leaders of some Anglican provinces increasingly say that the Church of England and the focusing, convening role of the Archbishop of Canterbury do not have to be essential parts of Anglican identity in the future. The Anglican tradition could be unhooked from its historical origins and developed in new ways. That view can be expressed quite polemically, but it can also reflect simply a growing self-confidence and local identity. This opens up the prospect of a continuing diversification of forms of Anglican Christianity emerging in many parts of the world, with significant tensions between some of these. These tensions are not really the same as those I described earlier in the founding history of Anglicanism. The current disagreements are not mainly between Catholic and Evangelical forms of Anglicanism but more obviously between broadly Liberal forms of Anglicanism shaped in interaction with the values of the modern western world and forms of Anglicanism, mainly Evangelical, that are dominant elsewhere in the world. The big question is whether in the face of these challenges Anglicanism will find "clumsy and untidy" ways to hold together. That remains to be seen.