

# Towards the Acceptance of Diversity: A Brief History of the Mixed Economy of Church and Continental European Adaptations<sup>1</sup>

SABRINA MÜLLER

Theological Director of the Center for Church Development, Theological Faculty,  
University of Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland  
sabrina.mueller@theol.uzh.ch

## ABSTRACT

DURING THE PAST FIFTEEN years, the self-understanding of the Church of England, a traditional state church with its parish structure has changed. The mother church of the Anglican World Communion claims since 2004 to be a mixed economy church; one that supports and recognises innovative ecclesial spaces (fresh expressions of Church) as church, as well as parish churches. It is the goal to have an innovative diversity of churches in a pluralistic

1. This article originally appeared in German as “Eine kurze Geschichte der Mixed Economy of Church” in *Pastoraltheologie: Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Praxis in Kirche und Gesellschaft* 109.1 (2020) 5–18. It has been translated into English, peer reviewed, and edited from the original. The journal editors are grateful to all those who contributed to creating the English version.

society. At the same time these churches should be recognisable and contextual. It is the concept of the mixed economy that manages a fair cooperation between parochial and fresh expressions of Church. In the meantime, the concept of mixed economy is not only received in the UK, but rather in different national and free churches in continental Europe. As of late the concept is taken up by the CPCE (Community of Protestant Churches in Europe).

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

For centuries the Church of England was characterized by liturgy, episcopacy and parochial structure. (“The Lambeth Quadrilateral” contains four articles adopted by the Lambeth Conference in 1888. These contain: Scripture, Creeds, the two Sacraments and the historic episcopate. See Booty et al. 1998, 502.) In the last twenty years, however, it has undergone major changes in its ecclesiastical self-image. Not only has the religious diversity within parishes and services increased but also more than two thousand new churches outside established parishes, so-called *fresh expressions of churches*, were begun (see Müller 2016; Lings 2016). Of the fresh expressions of church, some claim church status and others already have church status. In the Church of England the term *mixed economy of Church* is used for this coexistence and sometimes also confusion of churches. (It can be observed that some prefer the term mixed ecology, “which has a more organic ring” [Moynagh 2012, 432].)

The following article discusses the *historical* development of the mixed economy and its confirmation by the Church of England and gives some insights into its reception in continental Europe. In addition, the opportunities presented by this programmatic approach are discussed and the challenging question of how unity in a diverse church should be thought and understood is reflected upon. The aim of discussing the mixed economy as a concept for a sustainable church is that it can lead to a change in attitude, especially at the level of church leadership. Through the horizon of thought of the mixed economy, a generous understanding of

ecclesiology can be promoted, in which the church is recognized as diverse and can thus also be promoted. It also allows new local and missional forms of ecclesial community to reflect and find their place in a larger whole.

A large part of the data referred to in this article comes from my PhD project: *Ekklesiologische Beobachtungen und Interpretationen einer neuen kirchlichen Bewegung*. The monograph was published in 2016. I spent six months in England during 2010–2014 for the project, conducting numerous participant observations and expert interviews with Archbishop Rowan Williams, Bishop Steven Croft, Bishop Graham Cray, Dr. George Lings, Mike Moynagh, and many others.

## **ORIGIN AND RECEPTION OF THE MIXED ECONOMY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

### Unity in Diversity

For more than one hundred years, and perhaps even since its inception, the Church of England has been concerned with the question of how *unity in diversity* should be thought of (see Lings 2012). Therefore, the emergence of a way of thinking and programmatic approach like that of the *mixed economy* of Church must be regarded in a longer temporal horizon and as historically grown.

Since 1910, the Church of England has been repeatedly affected by various movements that have questioned its self-image and ultimately changed it. Thus the idea of *unity in diversity*, which is now made fruitful also in the face of today's plural ecclesiastical situation, goes back to the *ecumenical movement* and *liturgical innovation* (see Müller 2016, 71ff). The *ecumenical movement* dates back to the *World Missionary Conference* in Edinburgh in 1910. The first *World Conference on Faith and Order* was held in Lausanne in 1927 (see Butler 1998, 47). Through the ecumenical movement the awareness arose within the Church of England that unity in diversity is possible within a church: "In recognizing other ways to do and be church, we could no longer think there was only

one way. Here was a harbinger of unity yet acceptable diversity” (Lings 2012, 162).

Another movement in which the idea of *unity in diversity* played a central role was the *liturgical revision* of the 1960s. In 1958 the *Lambeth Conference* recognized that the *Book of Common Prayer* could no longer be the sole basis for church unity (see Chapman 2006, 126). This led to the development and introduction of alternative liturgies and worship services by the *Anglican Congress in 1963*. These changes increased the flexibility of individual parishes and better integrated contextual and pastoral needs. In addition, the language of worship became more understandable (see Hatchett 1998, 141ff). Such *liturgical revision* led to a great variety of liturgical forms and approaches in the Church of England. The unity expressed before the *liturgical revision* by the common, uniform liturgy is now, according to Bishop Steven Croft, determined above all by common values: “It is, I believe, in the articulation and shaping of common Anglican values that we will find, preserve and deepen our unity as the Church of England” (Croft 2006a, 180).

In the Church of England, the awareness of *unity in diversity* has grown historically. For a long time, however, it was mainly interpreted in terms of different religious traditions and was without any theological or structural implications. In the Anglican Church, three or four theological traditions are distinguished, whereby each tradition again exhibits a great diversity in itself. This becomes clear in the different designations: The first tradition is called evangelical or reformed, the second Anglican catholic or traditionalist and the third liberal, broad church, central or non-party. The position of Anglican charismatics is often not referred to as a tradition in its own right, as it has affected and influenced all other currents. It has brought them greater spontaneity in worship, renewal of spirituality and trust in the Holy Spirit (see Avis 2000, 15). However, the role of religious traditions in creating the context for diversity in the last fifty years of the twentieth century should not be underestimated. It may be correct to say this did not

have structural implications at the time, but it did have theological implications concerning unity in diversity.

### From “Unity in Diversity” to the Mixed Economy of Church

With the emergence of the *Church Planting Movement* and later the *fresh expressions of Church*, the principle of *unity in diversity* was expanded, theologically reaffirmed in the doctrine of the Trinity and described at the ecclesiological and structural level with the term mixed economy. At the end of the 1970s and in the 1980s there were disagreements in the Church of England. For, inspired by the American Church Planting Movement, new *Church Plants* also emerged in the Church of England, which began to cross parochial borders. As a result, a commission was set up to observe, analyse and recommend how to deal with these new churches. The results of the analysis were presented in the *Breaking New Ground* report, published in 1994 (see Harris et al. 1994). Two conclusions contributed to the emergence of the *mixed economy*. First, it was recommended that *Church Planting* be understood as a complementary strategy to the parochial system. Through *Church Plants* local congregations should be supported and supplemented. At the same time, it was suggested that social changes such as mobility and relational networking require the parochial system to be supported and supplemented. Secondly, strong cultural and sociological changes have been observed in British society. For example, it was found that the municipal boundary is often no longer identical with the people’s relationship environment. Recommendations for church action were derived from this. Through the distinction between geographical borders, *neighborhood* and networks of relationships and interests, it was established as a consequence that a people’s church needs complementary, new structures (see Harris et al. 1994; Müller 2016, 75ff).

The new *Church Plants* grew rapidly and became more diverse, so that in 2002 the Church of England considered it advisable to re-establish a working group to revise the *Breaking New Ground* report and review developments for change and progress.

The relevant report *Mission-shaped Church* came from this working group. The report published in 2004 became an influential and remarkably widely read document in the Church of England. The newly elected Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, gave additional meaning to the report in his guiding foreword:

If “church” is what happens when people encounter the Risen Jesus and commit themselves to sustaining and deepening that encounter in their encounter with each other, there is plenty of theological room for diversity of rhythm and style, so long as we have ways of identifying the same living Christ at the heart of every expression of Christian life in common. (Cray et al. 2004, vii)

## The Mixed Economy of Church

Already in the preface of *Mission-shaped Church* unity in diversity was emphasized. The introduction to the report was then more explicitly related to the parochial principle, in which the changes of the last ten years were also presented:

Breaking New Ground saw church planting as “a supplementary strategy that enhances the essential thrust of the parish principle.” Perhaps the most significant recommendation of this current report is that this is no longer adequate. The nature of community has so changed (and was changing long before 1994) that no one strategy will be adequate to fulfil the Anglican incarnational principle in Britain today. Communities are now multi-layered, comprising neighborhoods, usually with permeable boundaries, and a wide variety of networks, ranging from the relatively local to the global. Increased mobility and electronic communications technology have changed the nature of community. It is clear to us that the parochial system remains an essential and central part of the national Church’s strategy to deliver incarnational mission. But the existing parochial system alone is no longer able fully to deliver its underlying mission purpose. We need to recognize that a variety of integrated

missionary approaches is required. A mixed economy of parish churches and network churches will be necessary, in an active partnership across a wider area, perhaps a deanery. (Cray et al. 2004, x)

In addition to *Mission-shaped Church*, the *A Measure for Measures* report published in the same year concluded that the parochial system and with it the principle of “one-size-fits-all” as the only model in a plural society no longer meets the requirements (see Toney 2004). Both reports point out that the parochial system is no longer sufficiently capable of fulfilling the incarnational mission of the Church. It needs to be supplemented and this is seen through a mixed economy of church, consisting of local congregations, contextual expressions of church, network congregations, house churches, church plants, etc. . . . Only in this way could a people’s church still do justice to its actual task of being in dialogue with the people of the country about God and of turning invitingly to them. The naturalness with which the term mixed economy is used in the reports is therefore surprising because the term was introduced only two years earlier. The term “mixed economy” was first used by Rowan Williams, the former Archbishop of Canterbury, to refer to the *Church of England*. During his term as Archbishop of Wales he used this term in the report “Good News in Wales”: “We may discern signs of hope. . . . These may be found particularly in the development of a *mixed economy of Church life*. . . . There are ways of being church alongside the inherited parochial pattern” (Smith et al. 2012, 7). Michael Moynagh gave the programmatic approach an additional impetus, and his definition is often referred to: “The phrase ‘mixed economy’ . . . refers to fresh expressions and ‘inherited’ churches existing alongside each other, within the same denomination, in relationships of mutual respect and support” (Herbst 2018, 24:159).

## Mixed Economy—The Theological and Ecclesiological Programme

According to Bishop Graham Cray, who led the Fresh Expressions movement from 2008 to 2014, the term *economy* is not understood as an economic metaphor, but is located in the biblical context. Thus *economy* is linked back to the Greek original word οἰκονομία (administration, budget, and plan for salvation; see Bauer et al. 1988, 1134–35). Reference is made to Ephesians 1–3 and God’s plan of salvation in and through Christ described therein. Cray calls the church, which shares the responsibility for God’s plan of salvation, “God’s household.” In this way the mixed economy is defined as a theological programme that challenges and changes ecclesial self-conception (see Müller 2016, 176). The theological *leitmotif* of the program is, besides the idea of God’s household and plan of salvation, the concept of the Trinity. The Trinity is used, among other things, as a symbol of “unity in diversity” and thus also for the mixed economy of Church. In addition, reference is made to the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and Ephesians 4. The biblical references show that the principle of “unity in diversity” and thus also the mixed economy are already biblical and that unity cannot be equated with uniformity. While unity appears as a desirable goal leading to consistency in the body of Christ, uniformity is seen as narrowing.

The fresh expressions of Church are attributed with the function of having extended ecclesiology in the sense that church can be diverse, multiform and structurally variable as Bishop Steven Croft points out:

FxC helps us to lose our arrogance about “there is only one way of being church.” But we regain a sense of mission, of humility, of being church for others, service. . . . And that is producing a helpful learning and shift back to seeing church in a more diverse and generous way. Which I think is very helpful for our overall mission, but it is profoundly an ecclesiological shift that is taking place. (Müller 2016, 171–73)



It has to be noted that the mixed economy in the Church of England is not only and not first of all an organization-logical programmatic approach, but a theological and ecclesiological one, which should then be reflected in the structures. (The deep philosophical and financial commitment to resource church has reshaped this narrative somewhat since “Renewal and Reform” but further research might be worthwhile. See Church of England 2016.)

## Structural Dimensions of the Mixed Economy

Over the last fifteen years, the mixed economy has become part of the Church of England’s implicit ecclesiological self-image: both traditional parochial congregations and *fresh expressions of Church* are to be promoted (cf. Croft 2006b, 178). The aim is to create relationships based on partnership and not competition within the church. For this reason, the *mixed economy* was structurally anchored at the national level of the *Church of England* by a Synodical decision. The dioceses are encouraged to implement this equivalent ecclesial partnership. Bishop Graham Cray remarked:

What Archbishop Rowan has called the mixed economy, the positive partnership of an on-going inherited ministry in the parishes and the planting of fxC is the official policy of the Church of England as agreed by its Synod. So we have the “this is what we do.” Yes, we have some people who haven’t quite realised yet, that’s what we do, and yes, we have people who are waiting for those in fxC to come to what they call “real church,” but we have committed ourselves to this, we have approved it through our national Synod three times, we’ve had a formal <faith and order> report written on it, jointly with the Methodists, and the General Synod, and the National Conference of the Methodist church have both unanimously approved it, so it’s our policy. (Müller 2016, 176–77)

With the mixed economy, ecclesial diversity is to be further promoted and it has been ensured that *fresh expressions of Church* do not form a parallel structure within the *Church of England*, but are

given a legitimate place in it. (Given that just under 15 percent of the churches in the Church of England are fresh expressions of Church and that these account for 10 percent of the total number of participants, the preemptive synodical decisions on mixed economy were strategically important decisions to avoid divisions and promote a sense of unity. cf. Lings 2016, 53ff.)

In the structural dimension of a mixed economy church the bishop—whether female or male—plays a key role. An important structural change since Mission-shaped Church has taken place in the Church of England at the national level. It concerns the Bishops Mission Order (BMO). The Bishops Mission Order was approved by the General Synod in February 2008 and came into force immediately. The Bishops Mission Order is intended as a flexible tool to support the development of the mixed economy in contexts where broad and well-supported recognition of non-parochial churches is necessary and helpful. The Bishops Mission Order can be issued by the bishop of the diocese and gives an fxC legal, authorized recognition and the status of an Anglican church, which in turn means some financial security (see Church of England 2019). The bishop is the point or focus of unity under which a mixed economy is realized. A parish can also have a mixed economy within it, but the core is the idea that there should be churches which are not geographically fixed churches working alongside parishes. Therefore, in the Church of England the diocesan level is decisive for the programme and also the regional deanery areas are of importance.

The task and function of the ordained office is also changing. Only 54.8 percent of the *fresh expressions of Church* are directed by ordained persons (Lings 2016, 62). This means that in a mixed economy a close partnership between pastors and volunteers is necessary and responsibility must be shared. In this situation a real implementation of the priesthood of all believers becomes necessary and the pastors assume a maieutic function in the promotion of the theological productivity of volunteers (see Müller 2019, 66–88).

Liverpool is a successful example of a diocese in which the mixed economy is consistently promoted and lived.<sup>2</sup> For many years, the Diocese of Liverpool has relied on diversity and creativity as part of its identity (see Diocese of Liverpool n.d.). In Liverpool, cooperation between traditional and new forms of church expression is standard, and hence this diversity is also visible in the Anglican *Liverpool Cathedral*, for example. Thus the life of the church in the cathedral is consistently contextual (see Liverpool Cathedral n.d.). Since this basic attitude has long been cultivated in the diocese, 68.2 percent of the churches are local congregations and 31.5 percent are new non-parochial congregations (cf. Lings 2016, 53).

### **MIXED ECONOMY OF CHURCH—A CHALLENGING CONCEPT WITH POTENTIAL**

Not everywhere is the mixed economy as harmonious as in the diocese of Liverpool. Statistically it is clear which dioceses promote a mixed economy and thus also non-parochial communities and where this is considered superfluous. In the following statistics, the differences in the implementation of the mixed economy and the promotion of *fresh expressions of Church* are clearly visible (Lings 2016, 53ff):

2. The diocese of Liverpool works with the idea of the mixed economy but uses for the communication of this the metaphor of the lake and river.

Diocese name	No. of fxC	Diocese no. of churches	fxC/dioc churches
Liverpool	78	248	31.5%
Canterbury	72	328	22.0%
Leicester	52	313	16.6%
Derby	46	329	14.0%
Chelmsford	50	595	8.4%
Norwich	63	640	9.8%
Ripon & Leeds	39	251	15.5%
Blackburn	64	276	23.2%
Bristol	33	205	16.1%
Portsmouth	21	173	12.1%
Gloucester	23	386	6.0%
Totals	541	3744	
Averages			<b>14.4%</b>

Diocese name	No. of fxC	Diocese no. of churches	fxC/dioc churches
Exeter	69	614	11.2%
Ely	52	334	15.6%
Southwark	47	364	12.9%
Guildford	77	216	35.6%
Carlisle	47	339	13.9%
London	86	489	17.6%
Birmingham	28	189	14.8%
Sheffield	56	208	26.9%
York	57	593	9.6%
Manchester	49	322	15.2%
Totals	568	3668	
Averages			<b>15.5%</b>

During the last nine years of my research in the Church of England on fresh expressions of Church and the mixed economy I have been confronted with the struggle for a good and fair *mixed economy*. The question of the status of non-parochial congregations and local congregations, the different distribution of financial resources, but also mutual accusations of traditionalism and ignorance of mission and context make the *mixed economy* a challenging concept. There are still dioceses which adopt a critical

attitude towards a mixed economy and only grant the status of “church” to the traditional local congregations. *Fresh expressions of Church* and its leaders are struggling with recognition, support and finances in these dioceses.

The different dioceses show that a mixed economy can be prescribed structurally, but that this does not guarantee successful implementation. A functioning mixed economy depends on people and their beliefs. Like many theological and ecclesiological programmes, that of the mixed economy also describes an ideal that can be aspired to, but the basis for a successful implementation is mutual goodwill and a generous and broad understanding of ecclesiology.

Structurally, there is a need for people who see themselves as a hub and thus take on a mediating position, people who care about very different expressions of church, such as the former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams, the current Archbishop of Canterbury Justin Welby, Steven Croft, Bishop of Oxford, or Paul Bayes, Bishop of Liverpool.

## **RECEPTION OF THE MIXED ECONOMY IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE**

The programme of the mixed economy quickly spread beyond the Church of England and attracted great interest in many denominations and in various countries. In continental Europe there are meanwhile different receptions of the mixed economy. The Community of Protestant Churches in Europe (CPCE), together with some researchers from Germany, England, Denmark, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, and Norway, has taken up the topic in its Plenary Assembly 2018. Resolution 6 under point 3.2, “Social Ethics of the 8th Assembly 2018,” reads as follows:

The Assembly welcomes the research groups on “mixed economy” and “church in rural areas” which emerged from the document “ecclesia semper reformanda.” She recommends that these groups be continued and that the Council continue to provide material to the groups,

collect results and send them to the regional groups. (cf. CPCE 2018, 7.6)

In addition, within the framework of the formulation of objectives 2018–2024, the CPCE General Assembly pointed out the importance of church renewal processes under Objective 2, Measure 6:

The CPCE will recognize new forms of church, such as Fresh Expressions. Through appropriate instruments such as consultations and study processes, it will reflect upon their ecclesiological meaning and ask how they contribute to the renewal of the church. The CPCE will seek conversation with these churches, movements, and communities.

What was decided by the CPCE in 2018 has been prepared by an international research group since 2016. In April 2016, as part of its “Reform and Renewal” process, the CPCE invited various researchers to discuss current ecclesiological challenges in Europe. Some researchers saw the mixed economy as an ecclesiological concept that could serve the churches in Europe and that should be further explored. At this first meeting in Frankfurt am Main some overlaps could be identified between the programmatic approach of the mixed economy and the CPCE reform paper “*Ecclesia semper reformanda*,” which in turn spoke in favour of further deepening the topic. On the one hand, “*Ecclesia semper reformanda*” refers to the necessity of structural diversity and contextuality. Secondly, the concluding recommendations state: “It is the fundamental conviction of Protestant churches that the gospel does not prescribe the form of the church. The Church is continually called to transform herself in response to the Gospel” (Protestantse Kerk 2017).

The mixed economy should therefore be examined more closely as a possible practice of “*Ecclesia semper reformanda*” (this Latin expression was born in the Protestant tradition, it clearly dates from the Reformation. In this way we note the lack of a greater sense of the Catholic Church’s ecclesiology that still courses through the veins of the Church of England in Continental

Protestant churches). A further meeting was then organised in Durham UK in September 2017, where an extended group of researchers met to discuss the issue. European researchers from different denominations discussed the programme and its practice in various European countries (Germany, Denmark, England, the Netherlands, Switzerland) and sent the CPCE a final report. The report made clear that the mixed economy is received in the various member churches and is regarded as an important topic for church development. However, the mixed economy is already becoming and must be viewed in its ecclesiastical and cultural horizon. The transfer possibilities must in themselves be contextual and culturally sensitive. An example of this transfer becomes visible when using the terminology for the programme. In the Netherlands, for example, the mixed economy is translated with the term *Pioneering Places* (Protestantse Kerk 2017), in Germany both mixed economy and *regional church development* (Herbst and Pompe 2017) are used as terminology, and in Switzerland the programmatic approach is described with the metaphor of *ecclesial biodiversity* (Müller 2015). The example of the adapted names in the different countries alone shows that the reception and practical implications vary. As different as the names for the mixed economy are, as diverse is their history in each country. However, it is clear that the mixed economy is not a concept that can be adopted one-to-one at a structural level. Rather, it is exemplarily demonstrated in the different names and approaches that the mixed economy is a term that describes an ecclesial attitude which in turn must be contextually located and adapted. The mixed economy is a helpful frame of thought precisely because it can be thought of contextually and adapted. But at the same time, this framework helps in the search for answers to how to deal with new, contextual forms of expression of church. In the example countries mentioned it is evident that new forms of expression of church are increasing and that the mixed economy is a theoretical framework with which the chance of a peaceful coexistence can be shown. In addition, the mixed economy is increasingly bringing the ecumenical perspective into focus. While at the beginning the programmatic

approach described above all “unity in diversity” within a single denomination, more recent developments set ecumenical accents. Given many experiences in Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands, North America, and South Africa, the issue of an ecumenical horizon is extremely important and would be worth further research and certainly another article.

The topic is increasingly being taken up by universities. This not only in articles and research reports, but also, for example, in a joint seminar on church theory between Practical Theology in Göttingen, Greifswald, and Zurich.

## **REFLECTION**

The beginning of the mixed economy as a programmatic approach can already be seen in the work of Preul. He sees a characteristic of *Volkskirche* (people’s church) precisely in the fact that it is not necessary for the true unity of the church that everywhere the same human traditions or rites or ceremonies established by human beings are found. This gives room for new experiments and ideas, but also makes it possible to hold on to traditions that have become dear (Preul 1997, 191; cf. Melancthon 1530, art. 5). In this sense, mixed-economy thinking is not radically new or different, but for the first time it found a more or less consistent implementation in the Church of England.

Although the situation in the various churches in Europe varies (for example, with regard to the financial situation and the relationship between church and state) through historical developments and contextual circumstances, they are all fundamentally challenged by demographic change, religious diversification and pluralisation. This refers to both its institutional form and concrete manifestation of ecclesiastical life and its role as church in society (cf. Schlag 2012, 11ff).

Institutional hierarchies, church ordinances and law or staff employed full-time by the church will no longer be in a position to determine the future shape of the church alone in its present form or function. In order to pursue the vision of a living, plural,



and open church, which deals with its tradition in such a way that it at the same time deals courageously and constructively with the challenges of the present (see Hauschildt and Pohl-Patalong 2013, 438), it is obvious that new and complementary forms of church life are necessary. This explains the interest for and the dynamics around the mixed economy, since it makes visible changes in traditional (national) churches in theory and practice (see Herbst 2018, 24:158–68).

However, it is necessary, both in practical theological research and in church practice, to analyze and interpret changes related to this programmatic approach in detail so that conclusions can be drawn about future church-theoretical processes and the formation of church staff and so that new church initiatives can be promoted.

Although the implementation of the *mixed economy* is tantamount to a balancing act, it is a helpful idea with which the prosperity of different ecclesiastical communities can be promoted and people's church offers and traditional structures are also preserved. With its "one as well as the other principle," the mixed economy is not a radical concept, but one that seeks to strike a balance between tradition and innovation, between local communities and new ecclesial communities. Whether this programme is sufficiently radical to bring about real changes in traditional state and national churches remains to be seen, but it is meant to preserve old things and to create new things.

In a church that tries to live the idea of a mixed economy, the question arises where the *unitas ecclesiae* becomes recognizable. The challenging programming of the mixed economy in particular can provide at least some answers to the question of the *una ecclesia*. For at both regional and national levels, a mixed economy strengthens the sense of togetherness, since within the framework of a mixed economy local congregations, new ecclesial communities and the various dioceses can no longer see themselves as individual entities. The entire programme aims at network-like cooperation across parochial and diocesan borders. It is precisely here that the *una ecclesia* becomes apparent, because ecclesiastical

identity is no longer determined by the place, but by belonging to an ecclesial whole.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avis, Paul. 2000. *The Anglican Understanding of the Church—An Introduction*. London: SPCK.
- Bauer, Walter, et al. 1988. *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Booty, John, et al, eds. 1998. *The Study of Anglicanism*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK.
- Butler, Perry. 1998. “From the Early Eighteenth Century to the Present Day.” In *The Study of Anglicanism*, edited by John Booty et al., 30–51. 2nd ed. London: SPCK.
- Chapman, Mark. 2006. *Anglicanism*. Very Short Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Church of England. 2019. “Bishops’ Mission Orders.” Online. <https://www.churchofengland.org/more/parish-reorganisation-and-closed-church-buildings/bishops-mission-orders>.
- . 2016. “A Vision for Renewal and Reform.” Online. [https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/gs\\_2038\\_-\\_a\\_vision\\_for\\_renewal\\_and\\_reform.pdf](https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/gs_2038_-_a_vision_for_renewal_and_reform.pdf)
- Cray, Graham, et al. 2004. *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context*. London: Church House.
- Croft, Steven. 2006a. “Conclusion.” In *The Future of the Parish System: Shaping the Church of England in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Steven Croft, 178–82. 2nd ed. London: Church House.
- Croft, Steven, ed. 2006b. *The Future of the Parish System: Shaping the Church of England in the Twenty-First Century*. 2nd ed. London: Church House.
- Diocese of Liverpool. n.d. “Diocesan Profile.” Online. <http://www.liverpool.anglican.org/Diocesan-Profile>.
- Community of Protestant Churches in Europe (CPCE). 2018. “8. Vollversammlung der Gemeinschaft Evangelischer Kirchen in Europa (GEKE) in Basel, Schweiz, 13–18 September 2018.” Online. <https://cpce-assembly.eu/dokumente>.
- Harris, Patrick, et al. 1994. *Breaking New Ground: Church Planting in the Church of England: A Report Commissioned by the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England*. London: Church House.
- Hatchett, Marion. 1998. “Prayer Books.” In *The Study of Anglicanism*, edited by John Booty et al., 131–43. 2nd ed. London: SPCK.
- Hauschildt, Eberhard, and Uta Pohl-Patalong. 2013. *Kirche*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlags-Haus.

- Herbst, Michael. 2018. *Aufbruch Im Umbruch: Beiträge Zu Aktuellen Fragen Der Kirchentheorie*. Beiträge Zu Evangelisation Und Gemeindeentwicklung 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Herbst, Michael, and Hans-Hermann Pompe. 2017. *Regiolokale Kirchenentwicklung: Wie Gemeinden Vom Nebeneinander Zum Miteinander Kommen Können*. Dortmund: ZMiR:klartext.
- Lings, George. 2016. *The Day of Small Things: An Analysis of Fresh Expressions of Church in Twenty-One Dioceses of the Church of England*. Sheffield: Church Army. Online. <https://www.churcharmy.org/Publisher/File.aspx?ID=204265>.
- . 2012. "A History of Fresh Expressions and Church Planting in the Church of England." In *Church Growth in Britain: 1980 to the Present*, edited by David Goodhew, 161–78. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Liverpool Cathedral. n.d. "Worship Here." Online. <http://www.liverpoolcathedral.org.uk/home/worship-here.aspx>.
- Melanchthon, Philip. 1530. "Das Augsburgische Bekenntnis." Online. <https://www.velkd.de/theologie/augsburger-bekenntnis.php>.
- Moynagh, Michael. 2012. *Church for Every Context: An Introduction to Theology and Practice*. London: SCM.
- Müller, Sabrina. 2016. *Fresh Expressions of Church—Beobachtungen und Interpretationen Einer Neuen Kirchlichen Bewegung*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- . 2019. *Gelebte Theologie—Impulse Für Eine Pastoraltheologie Des Empowerments*. Theologische Studien. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- . 2015. "Mixed Economy of Church: Chancen und Risiken kirchlicher Biodiversität." In *Volkskirche und Kirchenvolk: Ein Zwischenhalt*, edited by Matthias Krieg and Claudia Kohli Reichenbach, 99–107. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Preul, Reiner. 1997. *Kirchentheorie*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Protestantse Kerk. 2017. *Fingers Crossed: Developments, Lessons Learnt, and Challenges After Eight Years of Pioneering*. Utrecht: Dienstencentrum Protestantse Kerk. Online. <https://www.lerenpionieren.nl/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Fingers-Crossed-fresh-expressions-in-the-Netherlands.pdf>.
- Schlag, Thomas. 2012. *Öffentliche Kirche: Grunddimensionen einer praktisch-theologischen Kirchentheorie*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Smith, Alan, et al. 2012. *Fresh Expressions in the Mission of the Church: Report of an Anglican-Methodist Working Party*. London: Church House.
- Toney, Peter. 2004. *A Measure for Measures: In Mission and Ministry: Report of the Review of the Dioceses, Pastoral, and Related Measures*. London: Church House.