

22

AGREEMENT ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY

The 1973 Anglican/Roman Catholic Statement
on Ministry and Ordination (with Historical Appendix)

with

Theological Commentary and 'Notes on Apostolic Succession'

by

JULIAN W. CHARLEY

Member of the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	3
Section 1 (Official Text):	
Preface by the co-chairmen	4
The Statement	5
Appendix by the Rev. Colin Davey	10
Section 2 by Julian W. Charley:	
Theological Commentary	16
Appendix: 'Notes on Apostolic Succession'	25

The Status of the Document

The document published here is the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. As the two Co-Chairmen point out in their Preface, it is at present no more than a joint statement of the Commission. The Commission is reporting to the authorities who appointed it on one of the items in its programme of work. These authorities have allowed the Statement to be published so that it may be discussed by other theologians. It is not a declaration by the Roman Catholic Church or by the Anglican Communion. It does not authorize any change in existing ecclesiastical discipline.

The Commission will be glad to receive observations and criticisms made in a constructive and fraternal spirit. Its work is done in the service of the Church. It will give responsible attention to every serious comment which is likely to help in improving or completing the result so far achieved. This wider collaboration will make its work to a greater degree work in common, and by God's grace will lead us to the goal set at the beginning of Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue: 'that unity in truth for which Christ prayed' (Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 1966).

Comments on the Statement or requests for further information on the work of the Commission may be sent to its Secretaries:

The Reverend Colin Davey, Archbishop of Canterbury's Counsellors on Foreign Relations, Palace Court, 222 Lambeth Road, London SE1 7LB (01-928 4880).

The Rt. Reverend Mgr. William Purdy, Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Vatican City, 00193, Rome, Italy (Rome 698-4533).

Official Text Copyright the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission

Theological Commentary and Appendix Copyright Julian W. Charley 1973

The Official Text is also published as a separate booklet by the S.P.C.K.
London @ 12p

First Impression December 1973

SBN 901710 42 3

INTRODUCTION

After the 1971 agreement on the doctrine of the eucharist, it may now seem somewhat less breathtaking that the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission has reached an agreement on the doctrine of the ministry and ordination. This does not mean that members of the Commission itself had any less demanding a task to face as they discussed the matter and sought to clear away misunderstandings. At no time until the meeting at Canterbury in September 1973 could the members have been wholly confident that agreement would in fact be reached. It is therefore with both gratitude, relief, and keen anticipation of the public discussion which must now follow, that I offer this Commentary along with various parts of the official text.

It is fitting here to add a word of appreciation for the work of my good friend, the Roman Catholic theologian, Fr. Jean Tillard. Just as in my earlier Commentary on the eucharistic agreement¹ I noted his contribution in a journal article, so now I must mention his very learned and far-reaching paper submitted to the Commission under the title *Le Qualité 'Sacerdotale' du Ministère*.² His treatment of priesthood has marked a notable advance in ecumenical understanding.

I have laid out the official materials first: the agreement and the officially commissioned historical appendix by Colin Davey (which I warmly commend).³ I have followed these with my own commentary on the text, and added after it a paper I submitted myself to the Commission. This latter antedates the agreement and therefore does not refer to it, but it gives an example of the approach to some of the theological problems at issue, which I hope will prove useful. As I have reproduced it exactly as I originally submitted it, I have appended to it a few notes where I wish now to expand or correct some small points in the document.

In my commentary I have deliberately avoided quoting authorities from elsewhere, but have provided solely my own exposition unadorned. I have done this in order to concentrate attention upon Scripture and upon the text of the Statement itself. The further paper, 'Notes on Apostolic Succession', provides sources and authorities for much of the material, and Jean Tillard's booklet provides more.

Finally, I would thank all the members of the Commission, from whom I have learned a great deal, for their kindness and fellowship in Christ. While this Statement goes out, the Commission turns now to tackle questions of authority.

Julian W. Charley,
28 November 1973

¹ *The Anglican/Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist* by Julian W. Charley (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship No. 1) pp. 7-8.

² Published in English as *What Priesthood has the Ministry?* (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship No. 13).

³ There is also in the official booklet a note on 'The Status of the Document', attached later at the request of the Roman Catholic authorities. Solely for reasons of space this is here put on the 'contents' page facing this.

SECTION 1 (OFFICIAL TEXT)

MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

A Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry Agreed by the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission, Canterbury 1973

PREFACE

At Windsor, in 1971, the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission was able to achieve an Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine. In accordance with the programme adopted at Venice in 1970, we have now, at our meeting in Canterbury in 1973, turned our attention to the doctrine of Ministry, specifically to our understanding of the Ordained Ministry and its place in the life of the Church. The present document is the result of the work of this officially appointed Commission and is offered to our authorities for their consideration. At this stage it remains an agreed statement of the Commission and no more.

We acknowledge with gratitude our debt to the many studies and discussions which have treated the same material. While respecting the different forms that Ministry has taken in other traditions, we hope that the clarification of our understanding expressed in the statement will be of service to them also.

We have submitted the statement, therefore, to our authorities and, with their authorisation, we publish it as a document of the Commission with a view to its discussion. Even though there may be differences of emphasis within our two traditions, yet we believe that in what we have said here both Anglican and Roman Catholic will recognise their own faith.

H. R. McAdoo, Bishop of Ossory }
Alan C. Clark, Bishop of Elmham } *Co-Chairmen*

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

ANGLICAN DELEGATES

The Rt Reverend H. R. McAdoo, Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin (Co-Chairman); The Most Reverend F. R. Arnott, Archbishop of Brisbane; The Rt Reverend J. R. H. Moorman, Bishop of Ripon; The Rt Reverend E. G. Knapp-Fisher, Bishop of Pretoria; The Rt Reverend A. A. Vogel, Bishop of West Missouri; The Very Reverend Henry Chadwick, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; The Reverend J. W. Charley, Vice-Principal, St. John's College, Nottingham; The Reverend Dr. Eugene Fairweather, Kettle Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, University of Toronto; The Reverend Canon H. E. Root, Professor of Theology, University of Southampton.

Consultant

The Reverend Dr. R. J. Halliburton, Vice-Principal, St. Stephen's House, Oxford.

Secretary

The Reverend Colin Davey, Assistant Chaplain, Archbishop of Canterbury's Counsellors on Foreign Relations.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DELEGATES

The Rt Reverend Alan C. Clark, Auxiliary Bishop of Northampton (Co-Chairman); The Rt Reverend Christopher Butler, OSB, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster; The Reverend Fr Barnabas Ahern, CP, Professor of Sacred Scripture, Rome; The Reverend Fr P. Duprey, WF, Under Secretary, Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity; The Reverend Fr Herbert Ryan, SJ, Professor of Historical Theology, Pontifical Faculty of Theology, Woodstock College, New York; Professor J. J. Scarisbrick, Professor of History, University of Warwick; The Reverend Fr George Tvard, AA, Professor of Theology, Methodist Theological School, Delaware, Ohio; The Reverend Fr Jean M. Tillard, OP, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Dominican Faculty of Theology (Ottawa) and in Brussels; The Reverend Fr E. J. Yarnold, SJ, Senior Tutor, Campion Hall, Oxford.

Secretary

The Rt Reverend Mgr. W. A. Purdy, Staff Member, Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OBSERVER

The Reverend Dr Gunther Gassmann, Research Professor, Centre d'Etudes Oecumeniques, Strasbourg.

THE STATEMENT

INTRODUCTION

1. Our intention has been to seek a deeper understanding of Ministry which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the traditions of our common inheritance, and to express in this document the consensus we have reached.¹ This statement is not designed to be an exhaustive treatment of Ministry. It seeks to express our basic agreement in the doctrinal areas that have been the source of controversy between us, in the wider context of our common convictions about the ministry.

2. Within the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion there exists a diversity of forms of ministerial service. Of more specific ways of service, while some are undertaken without particular initiative from official authority, others may receive a mandate from ecclesiastical authorities. The ordained ministry can only be rightly understood within this broader context of various ministries, all of which are the work of one and the same Spirit.

MINISTRY IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

3. The life and self-offering of Christ perfectly express what it is to serve God and man. All Christian ministry, whose purpose is always to build up the community (*koinonia*), flows and takes its shape from this source and model. The communion of men with God (and with each other) requires their reconciliation. This reconciliation, accomplished by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is being realised in the life of the Church through the response of faith. While the Church is still in the process of sanctification, its mission is nevertheless to be the instrument by which this reconciliation in Christ is proclaimed, his love manifested, and the means of salvation offered to men.

4. In the early Church the apostles exercised a ministry which remains of fundamental significance for the Church of all ages. It is difficult to deduce, from the New Testament use of 'apostle' for the Twelve, Paul and others, a precise portrait of an apostle, but two primary features of the original apostolate are clearly discernible: a special relationship with the historical Christ, and a commission from him to the Church and the world (Matt. 28.19; Mark 3.14). All Christian apostolate originates in the sending of the Son by the Father. The Church is apostolic not only because its faith and life must reflect the witness to Jesus Christ given in the early Church by the apostles, but also because it is charged to continue in the apostles' commission to communicate to the world what it has received. Within the whole history of mankind the Church is to be the community of reconciliation.

5. All ministries are used by the Holy Spirit for the building up of the Church to be this reconciling community for the glory of God and the salvation of men (Eph. 4.11-13). Within the New Testament ministerial actions are varied and functions not precisely defined. Explicit emphasis

¹ cf. *An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, para. 1, which similarly speaks of a consensus reached with regard to the Eucharist.

is given to the proclamation of the Word and the preservation of apostolic doctrine, the care of the flock, and the example of Christian living. At least by the time of the Pastoral Epistles and I Peter, some ministerial functions are discernible in a more exact form. The evidence suggests that with the growth of the Church the importance of certain functions led to their being located in specific officers of the community. Since the Church is built up by the Holy Spirit primarily but not exclusively through these ministerial functions, some form of recognition and authorisation is already required in the New Testament period for those who exercise them in the name of Christ. Here we can see elements which will remain at the heart of what today we call ordination.

6. The New Testament shows that ministerial office played an essential part in the life of the Church in the first century, and we believe that the provision of a ministry of this kind is part of God's design for his people. Normative principles governing the purpose and function of the ministry are already present in the New Testament documents (e.g. Mark 10.43-45; Acts 20.28; 1 Tim. 4.12-16; 1 Peter 5.1-4). The early churches may well have had considerable diversity in the structure of pastoral ministry, though it is clear that some churches were headed by ministers who were called *episcopoi* and *presbyteroi*. While the first missionary churches were not a loose aggregation of autonomous communities, we have no evidence that 'bishops' and 'presbyters' were appointed everywhere in the primitive period. The terms 'bishop' and 'presbyter' could be applied to the same man or to men with identical or very similar functions. Just as the formation of the canon of the New Testament was a process incomplete until the second half of the second century, so also the full emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon required a longer period than the apostolic age. Thereafter this threefold structure became universal in the Church.

THE ORDAINED MINISTRY

7. The Christian community exists to give glory to God through the fulfilment of the Father's purpose. All Christians are called to serve this purpose by their life of prayer and surrender to divine grace, and by their careful attention to the needs of all human beings. They should witness to God's compassion for all mankind and his concern for justice in the affairs of men. They should offer themselves to God in praise and worship, and devote their energies to bringing men into the fellowship of Christ's people, and so under his rule of love. The goal of the ordained ministry is to serve this priesthood of all the faithful. Like any human community the Church requires a focus of leadership and unity, which the Holy Spirit provides in the ordained ministry. This ministry assumes various patterns to meet the varying needs of those whom the Church is seeking to serve, and it is the role of the minister to co-ordinate the activities of the Church's fellowship and to promote what is necessary and useful for the Church's life and mission. He is to discern what is of the Spirit in the diversity of the Church's life and promote its unity.

8. In the New Testament a variety of images is used to describe the functions of this minister. He is servant, both of Christ and of the Church.

As herald and ambassador he is an authoritative representative of Christ and proclaims his message of reconciliation. As teacher he explains and applies the word of God to the community. As shepherd he exercises pastoral care and guides the flock. He is a steward who may only provide for the household of God what belongs to Christ. He is to be an example both in holiness and in compassion.

9. An essential element in the ordained ministry is its responsibility for 'oversight' (*episcopate*). This responsibility involves fidelity to the apostolic faith, its embodiment in the life of the Church today, and its transmission to the Church of tomorrow. Presbyters are joined with the bishop in his oversight of the church and in the ministry of the word and the sacraments; they are given authority to preside at the eucharist and to pronounce absolution. Deacons, although not so empowered, are associated with bishops and presbyters in the ministry of word and sacrament, and assist in oversight.

10. Since the ordained ministers are ministers of the gospel, every facet of their oversight is linked with the word of God. In the original mission and witness recorded in Holy Scripture lies the source and ground of their preaching and authority. By the preaching of the word they seek to bring those who are not Christians into the fellowship of Christ. The Christian message needs also to be unfolded to the faithful, in order to deepen their knowledge of God and their response of grateful faith. But a true faith calls for beliefs that are correct and lives that endorse the gospel. So the ministers have to guide the community and to advise individuals with regard to the implications of commitment to Christ. Because God's concern is not only for the welfare of the Church but also for the whole of creation, they must also lead their communities in the service of humanity. Church and people have continually to be brought under the guidance of the apostolic faith. In all these ways a ministerial vocation implies a responsibility for the word of God supported by constant prayer (cf. Acts 6.4).

11. The part of the ministers in the celebration of the sacraments is one with their responsibility for ministry of the word. In both word and sacrament Christians meet the living Word of God. The responsibility of the ministers in the Christian community involves them in being not only the persons who normally administer baptism, but also those who admit converts to the communion of the faithful and restore those who have fallen away. Authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sin, given to bishops and presbyters at their ordination, is exercised by them to bring Christians to a closer communion with God and their fellow men through Christ and to assure them of God's continuing love and mercy.

12. To proclaim reconciliation in Christ and to manifest his reconciling love belong to the continuing mission of the Church. The central act of worship, the eucharist, is the memorial of that reconciliation and nourishes the Church's life for the fulfilment of its mission. Hence it is right that he who has oversight in the church and is the focus of its unity should preside at the celebration of the eucharist. Evidence as early as Ignatius shows

that at least in some churches, the man exercising this oversight presided at the eucharist and no other could do so without his consent (*Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 8.1).

13. The priestly sacrifice of Jesus was unique, as is also his continuing High Priesthood. Despite the fact that in the New Testament ministers are never called 'priests' (*hiereis*),¹ Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in these ministers and used priestly terms in describing them. Because the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, the action of the presiding minister in reciting again the words of Christ at the Last Supper and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice. So our two traditions commonly use priestly terms in speaking about the ordained ministry. Such language does not imply any negation of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ by any addition or repetition. There is in the eucharist a memorial (*anamnesis*)² of the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ, who through his minister presides at the Lord's Supper and gives himself sacramentally. So it is because the eucharist is central in the Church's life that the essential nature of the Christian ministry, however this may be expressed, is most clearly seen in its celebration; for, in the eucharist, thanksgiving is offered to God, the gospel of salvation is proclaimed in word and sacrament, and the community is knit together as one body in Christ. Christian ministers are members of this redeemed community. Not only do they share through baptism in the priesthood of the people of God, but they are—particularly in presiding at the eucharist—representative of the whole Church in the fulfilment of its priestly vocation of self-offering to God as a living sacrifice (Romans 12.1). Nevertheless their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit. It exists to help the Church to be 'a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, to declare the wonderful deeds of him who called them out of darkness into his marvellous light' (1 Peter 2.9 RSV).

VOCATION AND ORDINATION

14. Ordination denotes entry into this apostolic and God-given ministry, which serves and signifies the unity of the local churches in themselves and with one another. Every individual act of ordination is therefore an expression of the continuing apostolicity and catholicity of the whole Church. Just as the original apostles did not choose themselves but were chosen and commissioned by Jesus, so those who are ordained are called by Christ in the Church and through the Church. Not only is their vocation from Christ but their qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit: 'our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit' (2 Cor. 3.5-6 RSV). This is expressed in ordination, when the bishop prays God to grant the gift of the Holy Spirit and lays hands on the candidate as the outward sign of the gifts bestowed. Because ministry is in and for the community and

¹ In the English language the word 'priest' is used to translate two distinct Greek words, *hiereus* which belongs to the cultic order and *presbyteros* which designates an elder in the community.

² cf. *An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, para. 5.

because ordination is an act in which the whole Church of God is involved, this prayer and laying on of hands takes place within the context of the eucharist.

15. In this sacramental act¹, the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers, with the promise of divine grace for their work and for their sanctification; the ministry of Christ is presented to them as a model for their own; and the Spirit seals those whom he has chosen and consecrated. Just as Christ has united the Church inseparably with himself, and as God calls all the faithful to life-long discipleship, so the gifts and calling of God to the ministers are irrevocable. For this reason, ordination is unrepeatable in both our churches.

16. Both presbyters and deacons are ordained by the bishop. In the ordination of a presbyter the presbyters present join the bishop in the laying on of hands, thus signifying the shared nature of the commission entrusted to them. In the ordination of a new bishop, other bishops lay hands on him, as they request the gift of the Spirit for his ministry and receive him into their ministerial fellowship. Because they are entrusted with the oversight of other churches, this participation in his ordination signifies that this new bishop and his church are within the communion of churches. Moreover, because they are representative of their churches in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles and are members of the episcopal college, their participation also ensures the historical continuity of this church with the apostolic church and of its bishop with the original apostolic ministry. The communion of the churches in mission, faith and holiness, through time and space, is thus symbolised and maintained in the bishop. Here are comprised the essential features of what is meant in our two traditions by ordination in the apostolic succession.

CONCLUSION

17. We are fully aware of the issues raised by the judgment of the Roman Catholic Church on Anglican Orders. The development of the thinking in our two Communion regarding the nature of the Church and of the Ordained Ministry, as represented in our Statement, has, we consider, put these issues in a new context. Agreement on the nature of Ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries. What we have to say represents the consensus of the Commission on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence. It will be clear that we have not yet broached the wide-ranging problems of authority which may arise in any discussion of Ministry, nor the question of primacy. We are aware that present understanding of such matters remains an obstacle to the reconciliation of our churches in the one Communion we desire, and the Commission is now turning to the examination of the issues involved. Nevertheless we consider that our consensus, on questions where agreement is indispensable for unity, offers a positive contribution to the reconciliation of our churches and of their ministries.

¹ Anglican use of the word 'sacrament' with reference to ordination is limited by the distinction drawn in the Thirty-nine Articles (Article XXV) between the two sacraments of the Gospel and the 'five commonly called sacraments'. Article XXV does not deny these latter the name 'sacrament', but differentiates between them and the 'two sacraments ordained by Christ' described in the Catechism as 'necessary to salvation' for all men.

APPENDIX

This Appendix was written at the request of the Commission, but carries only the authority of the Co-Chairmen and the writer.

**The Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission's
Discussion of the Doctrine of the Ministry**

by the Rev. Colin Davey

In 1966 Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury announced their intention of inaugurating 'a serious dialogue founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions' in the hope that this might 'lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed.'¹ The conversations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians who have engaged in this dialogue have been in two stages. In 1967 and 1968 the Anglican/Roman Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission met 'to draw up a programme and establish priorities in the theological dialogue, as well as considering matters of practical ecclesiastical co-operation.'² From January 1970 onwards the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission has been meeting to discuss the subjects selected by the Preparatory Commission. At its first meeting the International Commission decided, on the basis of the recommendations made in the Preparatory Commission's 'Malta Report', that the three subjects on which its attention should first be concentrated were: *Eucharist, Ministry and Authority*.

In discussing these the Commission's aim has been to see whether it is possible to find a way of advancing together beyond the doctrinal disagreements of the past to a point where these doctrines 'will no longer constitute an obstacle to the unity we seek.'³ Its method has been to re-examine these questions in the light both of 'biblical teaching and the tradition of our common inheritance'⁴ and of 'the development of the thinking in our two Communions'⁵ about them. Within such a study, the members of the Commission have also asked themselves and each other 'what is our faith on this point? What is our understanding of this doctrine?' By asking and answering such questions it has proved possible for the Commission to discover 'a convergence of testimonies,'⁶ and to express in

¹ Common Declaration of March 24th 1966 in *The Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Rome March 1966*, (Church Information Office 1966) p.14.

² *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue: The Work of the Preparatory Commission*, edited by Alan C. Clark and Colin Davey, (Oxford University Press 1974), p.7. This includes an account of the work of this Commission, its Report and recommendations, and a selection of the papers prepared for it.

³ Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission: *An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, (S.P.C.K. 1972), para. 12. This 'Windsor Statement' was first published in the January 1972 issues of *Theology*, *The Clergy Review*, and *One in Christ*.

⁴ *Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, para 1; *Agreed Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry*, para 1 above.

⁵ Para. 17 above.

⁶ Thomas Wieser.

its Agreed Statements a true consensus 'on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence.'¹

From the first, Anglican/Roman Catholic discussions of the Doctrine of the Ministry have had to take into account both 'the judgment of the Roman Catholic Church on Anglican Orders'² and the complete absence of any doubt about their orders on the part of Anglicans, as expressed for instance in a letter written in July 1925 by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Old Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht on the matter.³ However, the policy of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission has been to approach this question not in isolation but in the context of the *doctrine* of the Church, the sacraments, and the ministry, as was recommended by the Preparatory Commission's 'Malta Report'⁴.

'The theology of the ministry forms part of the theology of the Church and must be considered as such. It is only when sufficient agreement has been reached as to the nature of the priesthood and the meaning to be attached in this context to the word "validity" that we could proceed, working always jointly, to the application of this doctrine to the Anglican ministry of to-day.'

At the first meeting of the International Commission at Windsor in January 1970 Dr. Arthur Vogel, in a paper on 'The Church, Intercommunion, and the Ministry', commended the way in which the Anglican/Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States 'tried to avoid hardened attitudes and the mind set of old controversies by looking at the ministry within the setting of the eucharistic community as a whole.' In a parallel paper Fr. Jean Tillard asked the primary question: 'Have we the same conception of the nature and purpose of the ministry?', and answered it by showing a remarkable doctrinal convergence in two recent documents: the Ordinal and its Preface drawn up for the proposed Anglican/Methodist Unity Scheme in England, and the Ordination Rites of the new Pontificale Romanum.⁵ Following discussion of these and other papers, the Commission was divided into three groups on *Eucharist, Ministry, and Authority* to outline the problems and questions to be worked on in preparation for its second full meeting. The group on *Ministry* proposed that this should be studied under three main headings: The Essence of Ministry, Ministry in a Divided Church, and Renewal and Service. The preparatory work on this was assigned to a subcommission convened by Dr. Vogel and Fr. Tavard in the United States. They corresponded with Archbishop Arnott, who was a member of the Joint Working Group of the Australian Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church which was studying this same subject that year. A position paper on 'Ministry in a Divided Church' was also prepared by Fr. Herbert Ryan S. J.

¹ Para. 17 above.

² Para. 17 above.

³ G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity, a Selection 1920-30*, (O.U.P. 1925) p.202

⁴ Para. 19; Clark and Davey *op. cit.* p.112.

⁵ J. M. R. Tillard, 'Roman Catholics and Anglicans: the Eucharist', in *One in Christ* (1973 No. 2.) pp.181 ff. This is the English translation of a revised and extended version of his original paper which was published in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, June 1971.

The International Commission's second meeting took place in Venice in September 1970. The conversations there resulted in the production of three working papers on 'Church and Authority', 'Church and Eucharist', and 'Church and Ministry'. These were published in *Theology*, the *Clergy Review*, and *One in Christ* in February 1971¹ in order to show the stage the Commission's work had reached and to invite comments and criticisms. The Venice paper on 'Church and Ministry' spoke first of the Church and the Gospel, and then of the many forms of ministry (*diakonia*), vocation, and the priesthood of Christ which is 'shared in a special way by those who have received holy orders.' The second section of the paper was on 'The Apostolic Ministry'. It affirmed that 'in both our Churches the several orders of (the threefold) ministry are accepted, as sharing, in varying degrees, in the apostolic commission.' Yet differences arise over 'the relation between the episcopate as a whole and the Bishop of Rome.' The third section was on 'The Problem of Orders', and the question was asked 'whether the *new* situation with which we are faced—a pastoral situation—calls for a new policy in the Roman Church.'

At the end of the Venice meeting it was decided that the pattern of the International Commission's future work would be to take one of the three subjects at a time, beginning with the eucharist. After preparatory work by individuals and by subcommissions in England, South Africa, and North America the third full meeting of the Commission at Windsor in September 1971 completed 'An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine' which was published on December 31st that year.²

At the conclusion of the meeting at Windsor, plans were made for continuing the International Commission's work on Ministry. Dr. Halliburton and Fr. Yarnold were asked to convene a subcommission in Oxford to make a study of Ministry in the New Testament. Professor Fairweather and Fr. Tillard in Canada examined the concept of 'Sacerdotium'.³ The Southern African Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission looked at the problem of Orders within the general context of Church and Ministry, and use was made of a paper written for that Commission on 'Anglican Orders' by Fr.

¹ *Theology*, (February 1971), pp. 49-67; *The Clergy Review*, (February 1971), pp.126-145; *One in Christ*, (Nos. 2-3, 1971), pp.256-76.

² See note 3 on p.10 Commentaries on this have been published by A. M. Allchin, *Eucharist and Unity: Thoughts on the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, (S.L.G. Press, Fairacres, Oxford); Julian Charley, *The Anglican/Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist with an Historical Introduction and Theological Commentary*, (Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts.); Bishop Alan Clark, *Agreement on the Eucharist: the Windsor Statement with an Introduction and Commentary*, (R.C. Ecumenical Commission of England and Wales, 44 Grays Inn Road, London W.C.1); Fr. Herbert Ryan, S.J., in *Worship*, January 1972, pp.6-14. For the background papers to the Windsor Agreed Statement and a brief bibliography see *One in Christ* 1973 No. 2, pp.106-198, and *Lumen Vitae*, Brussels 1973 No. 1, pp.113-175. The Statement is also included in *Modern Eucharistic Agreements*, (S.P.C.K. 1973) which has a Foreword by Bishop Alan C. Clark and an Introductory Essay by Bishop H. R. McAdoo.

³ Fr. Tillard's paper on 'The "Sacerdotal" quality of the Christian Ministry' has now been published under the title *What Priesthood has the Ministry?* as No. 13 of Grove Booklets on Ministry and Worship, Grove Books, Bramcote, Nottingham, and in the 1973 No. 3 issue of *One in Christ* pp.237-269.

Jerome Smith O.P. Fr. George Tavard in the U.S.A. was invited to write a paper on 'The Recognition of Ministry.' In addition, full notice was taken of recent studies on the ministry by individuals and by other dialogue groups. Papers were provided from the Anglican/Roman Catholic Consultation in the U.S.A.¹ and from the Joint Working Group of the Australian Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church.² Special attention was given to the published Report and Papers of the World Council of Churches/Roman Catholic Joint Theological Commission on 'Catholicity and Apostolicity',³ and to the Fourth Volume of *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue* in the U.S.A. on 'Eucharist and Ministry'.⁴ The relevant section of the Anglican/Lutheran Report⁵ was also considered and so was a valuable paper on 'Apostolicity and Ministry' written by Professor R. H. Fuller for the Episcopal-Lutheran Dialogue in the U.S.A. in April, 1971⁶.

A small subcommission⁷ was convened at Woodstock College, New York, in May 1972 by Fr. Herbert Ryan to sift and assess all this material, and to suggest an outline way of working. It proposed that the next full meeting of the Commission should examine three subjects: The Church as Eucharistic Community: Priesthood and Ministry in the New Testament; and a Historical Understanding of the function of Ministers. Two further subjects were added for a subsequent meeting of the Commission: (a) the threefold Order of Ministry, Ordination, and Apostolicity; (b) the Church's freedom to alter this pattern, and to recognise ministry and order in itself and in 'separated churches'.

When the full Commission held its fourth meeting at Gazzada near Milan in August-September 1972, the plan of working was changed. This was in response to the need felt to begin not directly with Priesthood but with Mission and the totality of Ministry in the New Testament. It was also agreed not to postpone discussion of Apostolicity. The result of this change of direction was that by the end of the meeting two documents were produced which clarified the Commission's thinking on Ministry in the New Testament and on Apostolicity. The first distinguished between: the unique priesthood of Christ; the priestly ministry exercised by the whole

¹ Including 'The Function of the Minister in the Eucharistic Celebration: An Ecumenical Approach', by Fr. George Tavard, published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 4 No. 4, 1967.

² 'Ministry', the Report and Papers from its fourth meeting in Sydney, May 1970, was produced by the Australian Council of Churches, Third Floor, 511 Kent Street, Sydney, N.S.W. 2000.

³ Published in the 1970 No. 3 issue of *One in Christ*.

⁴ Published 1970 by Representatives of the U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation (315 Park Avenue South, New York 10010) and the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (Publications Office, U.S. Catholic Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington D.C. 20005).

⁵ *Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations*, (S.P.C.K. 1973) and pp.139-175 of *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, A Progress Report*, (Forward Movement Maxi Book, U.S.A., 1972).

⁶ Published in *Concordia Theological Monthly* February 1972, and in *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, A Progress Report*, pp.76-93, under the title, The Development of the Ministry.

⁷ Its members were: Bishop Clark, Bishop McAdoo, Bishop Vogel, Fr. Tillard, Fr. Tavard, Prof. Fairweather, Mr. Charley, and Fr. John Reid, S.J.

people of God; and the office and function of ministers, which 'originate in the specific purpose of Christ for his Church' and 'are not simply a particular expression of the "priesthood of all believers", but exist to promote the holiness of the whole Church.' The second document spoke of 'the basic apostolicity of the Church', and of apostolicity as 'the quality of all the factors which contribute to the preservation of (the Church's) fidelity' to the apostolic witness to Christ. These two documents formed the basis of the subsequent work of the Commission, but were seen as material to be used as needed rather than as finished sections of a future Statement.

At the end of the Gazzada meeting a provisional structure for a document on Ministry was agreed. Its three main sections were: Apostolic Succession, Priesthood, and Ordination. Subcommissions in Oxford, North America, and Southern Africa were asked to write a draft for each of these, which would be circulated to all members of the Commission for comment. It was arranged that a Subcommittee would meet at Poringland, Norwich, June 11-15th 1973 to take the draft sections and comments and from them to complete a draft document on the Ministry from which the Commission would begin its work at its next full meeting.

In preparation for the Poringland meeting¹ Bishop Clark and Bishop McAdoo each produced a paper incorporating the material received from the Subcommissions, and portions of 'The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective' by the World Council of Churches' Faith and Order Commission,² the French Roman Catholic/Reformed 'Groupe des Dombes' Statement on the Ministry entitled *Pour une réconciliation des ministères*,³ and *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue IV*.⁴ Members of the Subcommittee had also been supplied with a paper by Fr. George Tavard 'A Theological Approach to Ministerial Authority'⁵, Bishop Butler's recent articles on the Ministry in *The Tablet*,⁶ Bishop Clark's summary in English of an article by Fr. Louis Bouyer *Ministère Ecclésiastique et Succession Apostolique*,⁷ and a passage on the office of bishops from the new *Directorium de Pastoralis Ministerio Episcoporum*.⁸

At Poringland it was agreed to start not from the pattern: Christ, the Church, and the Ministry, but from where we are: two churches in which there are ministries and, within these, ordained ministry; to speak next of our role as ministers; and then to give the theological and New Testament justification for this. Discussion focussed on the function of episcopate (oversight) and the role of the ordained minister 'as a unifying figure, as co-ordinator, as judge, as director, as leader who serves.' Ordination as a sacramental act was also debated, and emphasis laid on 2 Corinthians 3.4-6,

¹ Those present were Bishop Clark, Bishop McAdoo, Bishop Butler, Bishop Moorman, Fr. Tillard, Fr. Duprey, Mr. Charley, and Mr. Davey.

² Published as item SE/34 in *Study Encounter*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, obtainable from the Publications Office, W.C.C., 150 route de Ferney, CH-1211, Geneva 20, Switzerland.

³ Published by Les Presses de Taizé, F-71460, Taizé, France, January, 1973.

⁴ See note 4 on page 13 above.

⁵ Printed in *The Jurist* Vol. 32, No. 3, Summer 1972 pp.311-329, published by the School of Canon Law, the Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

⁶ *The Tablet*, 17th and 24th February, and 3rd March, 1973.

⁷ Published in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, March 1973, pp.241-252

⁸ Vatican 1973, paras. 13-16.

where St. Paul writes that 'our sufficiency is from God'—a reminder of 'the mystery of ministry', and that our faith is 'in the power and authority of Christ in the Spirit in and through the minister.' The Poringland draft document included sections on 'Ministries in the life of the Church', 'The Co-ordinating Ministry', 'Vocation to the Special Ministry' and 'The Special Minister and the reconciling work of Christ.' This last section spoke of the president of the eucharist, ordination in the apostolic succession, and the way priestly terms came to be used of the minister.

The Poringland document was sent to all members of the International Commission for comment and criticism. In preparation for the full meeting at Canterbury August 28th-September 6th 1973 they also received copies of the Report of the Joint Lutheran/Roman Catholic Study Commission on 'The Gospel and the Church',¹ the third section of which is on 'The Gospel and the office of the Ministry in the Church'; the Report of the Joint Commission between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Methodist Council 1967-1970², section six of which is on Ministry; the Six Propositions with which the Roman Catholic International Theological Commission concluded their October 1970 report on 'The Priestly Ministry';³ and the document on 'The Ministerial Priesthood' issued by the Second General Assembly of the Roman Catholic Synod of Bishops in 1971.⁴ The Poringland document was the starting-point for the discussions at Canterbury, which began by considering what should be added to or subtracted from it. The Commission then agreed a draft outline for what was planned to be a biblically and historically informed document on the ministry, which used and applied the material completed at Gazzada and Poringland.

The outline contained an Introduction, followed by sections on Ministries in the Life of the Church (including reference to the New Testament and early church situation), Ordained Ministry (episcopate, New Testament images descriptive of the ordained ministry, vocation to holiness, word and sacrament, priesthood and priestly language) Ordination (its unrepeatability, ordination in the apostolic succession) and a Conclusion indicating the import of this agreement in doctrine on the question of the reconciliation of our respective ministries.

This outline was filled out by three drafters, and their draft was then scrutinised, debated, and revised by the full Commission. Out of this process the International Commission's Agreed Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry emerged. Its conclusion emphasises that 'agreement on the nature of the Ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries'. It recognises 'that we have not yet broached the wide-ranging problems of authority which may arise in any discussion of ministry, nor the question of primacy.' It considers however 'that our consensus . . . offers a positive contribution to the reconciliation of our Churches and of their ministries.'⁵

¹ Published in *Lutheran World* Vol. 19 No. 3, 1972.

² Published in the Information Service of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity No. 21 May 1973/III pp.22-38.

³ Published by Editions du Cerf, 29 Boulevard Latour-Maubourg, Paris VIII.

⁴ Published by the Vatican Polyglot Press, 1971.

⁵ Para. 17 above.

SECTION 2

THEOLOGICAL COMMENTARY

By Julian W. Charley

Figures in parentheses refer to the paragraphs of the Statement printed above on pages 5-9.

INTRODUCTION

Though current usage has obscured the fact, 'ministry' denotes service. This is fundamental to our understanding of Christian ministry. Whatever else it may imply, service is at the heart of it. Strange then that its nature and practice have long been a matter of dispute. One wonders why. Surely service should be unifying rather than divisive. Is there perhaps a clue in the fact that controversy on the subject has largely been carried on by those already in some ordained role? Lay people appear to be far less bothered about it than clergy. A case of professional pride and protection of status? The cynical observer may be permitted a wry smile. Undoubtedly vested interests and prejudice colour our thinking far more than we care to admit or even realize. But there is far more to it than that. The Church exists to minister. How its official ministers function is therefore of paramount importance, as any cursory study of Church history will show. Divergences of opinion at this point, however petty they may at first sight appear, may stem from theological differences that are very far-reaching in their implications. Once such an antagonism has been created, a meticulous reappraisal becomes necessary. So far as Anglican and Roman Catholic attitudes are concerned, the last ten years have witnessed the beginnings of just such a fresh examination. It has become clear that traditional patterns of thought are not always the most helpful for progress.

It is with this in mind that the Commission has endeavoured to take a fresh look at the areas of doctrine that have provoked controversy between us. The Statement expresses a 'consensus on essential matters' (17), while not claiming to give exhaustive treatment (1). A treatment of controversial matters alone would result in a very lop-sided picture of what we understand the ministry to be. Major omissions would seriously distort the picture. Consequently the points of contention have been set 'in the wider context of our common convictions about the ministry' (1). The Statement could have been presented in a more traditional, systematic pattern—Christ, the Church, the ministry. However, it was felt to be more constructive for our purpose to begin where we are—two Churches with varied ministries including an ordained ministry—and then to assess the position theologically and historically.

This leads on to another factor that needs to be borne constantly in mind when studying the Statement. Anglican theology has generally drawn a clear distinction between the essential nature of ministry and the policy practised to safeguard it. For instance, the Anglican Reformers of the sixteenth century argued initially for episcopacy and the threefold ministry

on historical and practical rather than theological grounds. Even at the height of Puritan opposition, when Hooker and Bancroft asserted the divine origin of episcopacy, they appeared reluctant to regard it as an essential mark of the true Church. Now the Commission's Statement emphasizes 'oversight' (*episcopo*) as an essential element in the ordained ministry (9). It does not say the same about 'bishops' (*episcopoi*). Instead there is a *description* of Anglican and Roman Catholic practice—what happens and why it happens (e.g. 9). No exclusive claim is made for possessing the only acceptable form of Church order. This is implicit in the words of the Co-Chairmen about 'respecting the different forms that ministry has taken in other traditions' (Preface). It leaves wide open the question whether other denominations would be obliged in any future ecumenical *rapprochement* to take episcopacy into their system. In the light of the grave difficulties experienced in non-episcopal Churches by the maximising Anglican interpretations of the inclusion of the historic episcopate in the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888, the nature of this present Statement is profoundly significant. That this is no mere polite sop is explicit in the Statement's theological exposition.

It is important to notice another point made in the Preface: 'there may be differences of emphasis within our two traditions'. We not only recognize their existence, but we also accept them as permissible. The extent of comprehensiveness is a problem that dogs both our Churches, but we would deplore a rigid theological conformity in every detail. Difference of outlook is inherent in man made in the image of God. To stifle diversity is to run counter to the pattern of creation. Unity of belief does not require uniformity of expression. With regard to the ministry, some will lay the greater emphasis on the word, others on the sacraments, and others yet again on pastoral counselling. This does not entail necessarily any basic contradiction. A consensus Statement of a representative body of Anglicans and Roman Catholics must therefore be comprehensive. Certainly there are limits beyond which diversity should not go, though the criteria for determining them are very difficult to formulate. The question is whether both Anglican and Roman Catholic can recognize their own faith here. It is the Commission's belief that they will (Preface).

1. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE MINISTRY TO THE CHURCH

Service should be the hallmark of every Christian. The task of the whole Church is a reconciling ministry, of men with God and with one another (3). Ministerial service may assume an endless diversity of forms (2). The Statement emphasizes the need to appreciate 'this broader context of various ministries' for a proper understanding of the ordained ministry. So often in the past discussion about the ordained ministry has isolated it from the life of the serving Church, with the result that the ministry becomes determinative of the Church instead of being its servant. At the same time lay members feel obliged to leave more and more of the 'spiritual' functions of the Church to the clergy alone. Thus what was intended to be a joint enterprise of clergy and laity becomes disintegrated and ineffectual. The Church then ceases to be 'the reconciling community' in the fullest sense.

The service of all Christian people, whether specifically ordained or not, shares three characteristic features. First, there is the worship of God in a 'life of prayer and surrender to divine grace' (7) which furthers the Church's sanctification (3). Secondly, there is the building up of the Christian community, where the reconciliation of Christ is to be lived out (3). But Christian ministry is not an introverted thing for, in the third place, it is concerned with 'the needs of all human beings' (7) both in compassionate concern and in evangelism (7 and 3). All of this is shared by clergy and laity alike.

Moreover the Statement indicates that Christ is the 'source and model' of all Christian ministry (3). All is 'the work of one and the same Spirit' (2). This stress upon the Holy Spirit is fundamental, for the same conclusion is drawn whether the ministry in question has official mandate or not. It is because of the Holy Spirit's operation that all ministries can build up the Church (5). What all this shows is that there is a great deal of common ground between an ordained ministry and the service of the rest of the Church.

The New Testament evidence shows a primary concern with ministerial actions rather than ministerial office. A process of development is discernible in the documents, leading to the locating of certain functions in specific officers of the community (5). But the development was gradual, with considerable variety in different places. Ministry evolved in accordance with the needs of the Church in any given locality. There was no imposed blue-print. No proof exists for a direct pipe-line transmission of ministerial authority from apostles to bishops and so down to the present day. Such theorising remains completely unsubstantiated. On the contrary, the picture of the early Church is an untidy one with great variety and many anomalies. The New Testament provides no uniform pattern. What it does supply is 'normative principles' with regard to the purpose and function of the ministry (6). It also shows that ministerial office was soon recognized to play an essential part in the Church's life. But the Church was well able to survive and grow in its early stages without the threefold structure of bishop, presbyter and deacon that became universal after the apostolic age. This past history of development is very relevant today when, for example, in all churches there is great uncertainty about the role of the diaconate. The normative principles of the New Testament are not regulative of a particular kind of structure.

2. THE ORDAINED MINISTRY

The appointment of specific officers was the result of the recognition of the essential nature of certain ministerial functions. Simply on the human level any community needs some focus of leadership and unity. But the Statement is careful to show that the Church's Ministry is not just a copy of human institutions. The Holy Spirit provides such a ministry (7), though God's provision is compatible with normal human requirements. Because it exists to serve the community of the faithful, it 'assumes various patterns to meet the varying needs of those whom the Church is seeking to serve' (7). Nevertheless there are three basic constituents. The ordained minister's

task is to *co-ordinate* the Spirit-given diversity of the Church's life. The various strands must be held together. But his task is not merely a kind of holding operation. He is also there to *promote* all that is needful for the Church's life and mission. It is a pioneer ministry that ought both to blaze the trail and urge on others along it. The third factor is the need to *discern* what is of the Spirit amid this diversity of the Church's life—probably never more needful than at the present time when so much experimentation is in the air. Conservative reactions are equally in need of just such a discriminating assessment.

Some form of recognition and authorization of such a ministry was found necessary as early as the New Testament period (5). Subsequent patterns of ordination have sought to safeguard the essential features of this God-given ministry. Ordination 'expresses' and 'signifies' certain things—each word is used twice in sections 14 and 16 respectively. Ordination rites cannot be understood in either an exclusive or a mechanical sense, for vocation to this ministry is from Christ and the capacity to fulfil it a gift of the Spirit (14). What follows is a description of Anglican and Roman Catholic procedure, together with an explanation of what is thereby intended (16). Both Churches believe they have been led by God to this manner of ordination, which is not therefore to be regarded as merely an ineffectual symbol. It is our conviction that something is 'ensured' and 'maintained' in this way (16). The broad context of this section indicates that no value judgment on the Ministry in other Churches is implicit in what is being said about Anglican and Roman Catholic procedure. It is left entirely open whether or not apostolicity and catholicity could be preserved in a different way.

The call of Christ to the ordained ministry is 'in the Church and through the Church' (14). Consequently ordination is 'an act in which the whole Church of God is involved' (14). To view the clergy as some kind of exclusive, self-perpetuating club is therefore wholly erroneous. It would be much nearer the truth to say that the ministry belongs to the Church than that the Church belongs to the ministry.

3. THE ROLE OF EPISCOPACY

As already noted, the Statement nowhere says that bishops (*episcopoi*) are essential to the Church but it does affirm that oversight (*episcopo*) most certainly is. There was much discussion on this theme on the Commission where it was agreed that there is one essential ministry in the Church, that of oversight. That it came to be exercised commonly within a threefold structure did not alter the basic fact. This shared responsibility is variously expressed in our ordination rites (16).

All are agreed that the ministry of the apostles was of fundamental significance, but there has not been unanimity within the Churches with regard to the conclusions to be drawn from this. The Statement says nothing about apostles appointing bishops and thus establishing an unbroken chain down to the twentieth century: the fact is that there are too many links missing for such an assertion. The apostolicity of the *Church* is what

matters most, not the credentials of its ministers. Para. 9 explains the significance of this. The apostles were the first witnesses to Jesus Christ, so that the apostolic faith has become normative for the Church. To be apostolic the Church must be faithful to that apostolic witness. Those who exercise oversight in the Church must ensure that that is the case. Furthermore, it is not enough to know the truth—it must be embodied in the Church's life. The apostolic faith is not a mere philosophy of life. It must be allowed to work that transformation in people's lives which the apostle Paul could describe as a 'new creation' (2 Cor. 5.17). But this fidelity to the apostolic faith is not solely a question of keeping the Church's own house in order. The Church is charged with the responsibility 'to continue in the apostles' commission to communicate to the world what it has received' (4). This is the groundwork of apostolicity before we ever start thinking about an apostolic *ministry*. The task of the ministry is to ensure and promote the Church's apostolic role. Not only must this be true of today: a full awareness of this apostolic commission must be transmitted to the Church of tomorrow (9).

'Ordination in the apostolic succession', as understood in our two traditions, is spelt out in para. 16. Episcopal ordination symbolises both a continuity with the past and a participation in the wider fellowship of the churches. In this way apostolicity and catholicity are closely related. 'The communion of the churches in mission, faith and holiness, through time and space, is thus symbolised and maintained in the bishop'. The Church's ministry has links backwards in history and contemporaneously with other existing churches. Mission, faith and holiness are not things that can be guaranteed simply by the laying-on of hands. Such a claim would be to stretch credibility to the breaking-point. At the same time the Statement is positive on this score, neither asserting too much nor too little. Apostolic succession, rightly understood, is essential to the Church's existence.¹

4. THE MINISTER AND THE EUCHARIST

The Statement spells out very carefully the relationship between the ministry of the word of God and that of the sacraments. This is particularly salutary when controversy has so raged around the sacramental functions of the ministry that everything else has been obscured. Recent trends among Roman Catholics indicate a re-discovery of the importance of the ministry of the word, much as the sixteenth century Reformers felt the need to reinstate it. On the other hand Anglican Evangelicals have been re-asserting the centrality of sacramental worship. This general convergence is auspicious for a more satisfactory and harmonious understanding of the nature of the ministry.

All aspects of the ministry are associated with the word of God (10). Its source and authority are traceable to this Biblical witness. The Statement spells out very clearly the implications. Yet it is easy enough simply to pay lip-service to the importance of the ministry of the word. The positioning of this section shows that it is absolutely fundamental and that, without it,

¹ See 'Notes on Apostolic Succession' on page 25 below.

any meaningful sacramental ministry is impossible. Moreover, the New Testament description of the ministry touches upon almost every aspect of Ministry as we understand it today except that of the sacraments. A variety of expressive images is employed (8). They indicate clearly a priority given to imparting the word of God to others with pastoral application.

'The part of the ministers in the celebration of the sacraments is one with their responsibility for ministry of the word' (11). These two aspects of ministry are not to be placed in separate departments but are intimately linked. 'In both word and sacrament Christians meet the living Word of God.' When we talk of 'means of grace' we are not suggesting some kind of divine drip-feed whereby an ethereal fluid is transmitted to the needy Christian. Grace is personal. It is God in his love approaching us, bestowing on us a mercy that we do not deserve. Thus there are not different types of grace, one derived from the word and another from the sacraments. To depersonalize grace in this way is a travesty of the truth, but it is often the actual under-current of thought among Christian people. On the contrary, what the Statement teaches is that it is the same Christ whom we encounter in every means of grace. What is said here is therefore very significant for our understanding of the sacraments.

Similarly, with this context in mind, 'the authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sin' (11) should not be open to misconstruction. The relationship of such a ministry with the word of God is fundamental. The forgiveness is God's, not ours, for sin is primarily an offence against God who alone therefore can offer pardon. As in the Anglican Prayer Book, where the Absolution is either a prayer to God or a statement about God, so here the minister is simply said to 'pronounce' it. This is based upon the authority given by Jesus to his first disciples (Matt. 18.18, John 20.23). Absolution is an extension of the ministry of the word.

With regard to the eucharist, para. 12 picks up again the theme of reconciliation with which the Statement began (3). Reconciliation is the heart of the gospel and therefore central to the continuing mission of the Church. The eucharist is the memorial of that reconciliation achieved by Christ for men and 'nourishes the Church's life' for the fulfilment of its reconciling mission. Consequently he who exercises oversight in the Church and seeks to promote its reconciling work is the most appropriate person to preside at the celebration of the eucharist. The Statement says nothing about a 'priestly character' necessary for such a responsibility, by which an ordained man is empowered to do something which no layman can do. It speaks rather of what is right in the light of the nature of both the eucharist and the ministry. The Lord's people gather together around the Lord's table. If the minister is the focus of the people's unity, who could be more fitting to act as president? It was this realization that undoubtedly accounts for the early confining of this task to the one who exercised oversight in the Christian community. The New Testament itself tells us nothing about who should preside.

5. THE SPECIFIC USE OF PRIESTLY LANGUAGE

What are we to make, then, of the use of priestly terms to describe this ministry? The situation is not helped by the complicated etymology of the English word 'priest' as the footnote to para. 13 points out. 'Priest' as a description of the minister is deeply entrenched in the Catholic tradition: it has largely been eschewed by Protestants because of its associations. The Anglican Prayer Book constantly uses the term. However, in both our Churches there is a gradual move among scholars to employ the more correct word 'presbyter' and thus eliminate ambiguity; but customary language dies hard.

The Statement is emphatic about the priestly sacrifice of Christ. It was unique (13). It 'was': i.e. it happened once-for-all in history. Such finality permits of no 'addition or repetition'. This past completeness of the sacrifice of Christ stands in contrast with his High Priesthood. This 'is': i.e. it continues into the present on our behalf. It also is 'unique'. The theological implications of this are of the utmost importance. It means that, however vividly we understand the *anamnesis* in the eucharist, 'the memorial of the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ', any suggestion of the sacrifice of Christ being somehow continued in heaven and represented by priests at altars on earth is positively excluded. Here there is reiterated and elucidated what was said in the Commission's former Statement on the eucharist.¹ Priestly language to describe the presiding minister must never be allowed to obscure the fact.

Though we cannot say with absolute certainty why the New Testament writers never called ministers 'priests' (*hierais*), the very fact that they did not is significant to say the least. They employed a considerable range of descriptive terms, but never this one. Yet it was not as if this were either an unfamiliar concept or a rare Greek word. The Jewish Levitical priests were familiar enough and were duly called 'priests' by the New Testament writers. The Epistle to the Hebrews used the term frequently. A word from the same Greek root could be used to describe the Christian community as a whole (1 Pet. 2.5.9). 'Spiritual sacrifices' were to be offered by the Church to God (1 Pet. 2.5, Heb. 13.15). Cultic language could even be employed for ministerial service (Phil. 2.17). Nevertheless, despite all this, ministers were nowhere designated 'priests'. For the Christian ministry is not simply a modification of the Old Testament priesthood, since the Jewish system has been fulfilled by Christ. The Epistle to the Hebrews explains what has happened. One sacrifice, once presented, has made the Jewish sacrifices redundant. They are superseded. The writer even claims that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is retroactive (9.15); in short, the old system was symbolic. It could only be effective, even during its own period of currency, through that which it symbolised. The coming of Christ inaugurated a new era. So there is now only one High Priest, Jesus Christ, 'exalted above the heavens' (7.26). He has no further sacrifice to offer (7.27); rather he intercedes for his people (7.25; Rom. 8.34). It is the victorious Christ, 'seated at the right hand of the throne of

the Majesty in heaven' (8.1), who intercedes on the grounds of his completed self-offering. He does not have to wring favours out of a reluctant God, for every request of his is granted. 'Our Lord's life in heaven is his prayer' (H. B. Swete). That of itself would be sufficient reason why Christian ministers are never called 'priests' in the New Testament.

Even so a priestly vocabulary did come to be used of the ministry in early times. The Statement accepts this historical fact and indicates the way in which the two traditions have often explained it (13). As the eucharist relates sacramentally to the priestly sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross, so the language of priesthood and sacrifice has understandably clustered round the eucharist. The minister, especially when he presides at the eucharist, is 'representative of the whole Church', whose priestly calling involves a self-offering to God as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12.1). Insofar as he helps the Church fulfil that priestly vocation, the term 'priest' may be justified for him. However, when the Statement has acknowledged these undoubted tendencies in our respective histories, it quickly goes on to correct any misunderstanding in the light of the New Testament principles set out above. In unambiguous terms it denies that the ministry of the ordained man (including his sacramental ministry) is 'an extension of the common Christian priesthood'. In the strictest sense it is not a 'priesthood' at all, but 'belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit'. To press this yet further, we find Christian ministers in the New Testament, *not* in the categories of priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but rather in the gifts to the Church of the ascended Lord portrayed in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

It ought to be clear from what has been said that, although it is possible to provide a justification for the use of priestly terms to describe the ministry, the grounds on which it is based are not very secure. History shows how much unhappy confusion arose from its adoption. I guess that in the end we shall see that the New Testament writers were wise to avoid it.

One further point needs to be made at this stage. The Statement on the eucharist claimed to be a 'substantial agreement' from which, according to the Chairmen in the Preface, 'nothing essential has been omitted'. That Statement spoke explicitly of the sacrifice of Christ, but it never described the eucharist as a sacrifice. Even a 'substantial agreement' did not require that. This present Statement on the ministry is 'the consensus of the Commission on essential matters' (17). There is a straight acknowledgment of the absence from the New Testament of priestly epithets for the ministry. Why this terminology was accepted later among Christians is explored very carefully. No claim is made for the ministry of a priestly role derived from Christ, for his High Priesthood is unique. There is no suggestion of a continuance or repetition of his priestly sacrifice, for what he did was unique and unrepeatable. All that is said is that the priestly role of Christ is 'reflected' in the presiding minister, which is a very different matter. Put the substance of all these facts together, taken from two agreements claiming to include all essentials, and you have a very notable result.

¹ The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist, para. 5.

6. OPEN QUESTIONS

The Commission has not offered an exhaustive treatment of the whole subject of the Ministry, but it does claim to provide a consensus on 'essential matters' (17). No mention is made of the debate about full-time and part-time ministry. In the Anglican Communion the signs are that the ordination of women may increase quite swiftly. The Roman Catholic Church does not give much indication of following suit. Then there are questions of authority and primacy; this is the area now being studied by the Commission. So there are still very important issues to be tackled.

Perhaps the biggest surprise for readers of the Statement is that Leo XIII's encyclical letter *Apostolicae Curae* of 1896, which condemned Anglican Orders as null and void, is never specifically mentioned. This would appear to be the number one obstacle to a mutual acceptance of ministries. Pope Leo's condemnation was made on particular theological grounds. It can be argued that, if those grounds were sure, then his conclusion was justified. When the Anglican Archbishops replied, stating the opposite position within the same categories, they sidestepped the question which faces us to-day: were the categories employed the right ones at all? Not only Anglicans, but many Roman Catholics also, would answer 'no' to this question to-day.

Why then does the Commission not allude to *Apostolicae Curae*? For three good reasons. One is that the authority of such an Encyclical (even one which, as this does, claims it has closed a question for all time) is complex, and would have taken the Commission off at a tangent. Another reason is that the Commission determined from the outset to get behind the wholly juridical debate about 'validity' with which the Encyclical is preoccupied. And a third reason is that the Commission was engaged upon a broad doctrinal task and has not seen its role as that of making premature judgments upon canonical questions. Nevertheless the direction the discussion is taking is fairly clear, and what the Commission does claim is that these problems have now been placed 'in a new context' (17) because of the progress in mutual understanding of the theology of the ministry. 'Agreement on the nature of the ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries.' The agreement has now been achieved: the consideration must surely follow.

When it is studied as a whole, I believe this Statement will be found to give a comprehensive and lucid account of Christian Ministry. In many instances what it does *not* say is as important as what it does. There is a balance between the New Testament norms and the descriptive account of the way in which the two Churches have sought to express them. Since it is a building upon and advance from the earlier Eucharistic Agreement, together they provide a hopeful contribution to ecumenical progress.

Faced with this range of agreed material, one is compelled to ask one searching question. Is there not here a change of theological stance on the part of Roman Catholicism? If 'change' is too strong a word, then at least there appears to be a considerable shift of emphasis when these documents are compared with previous official statements. If one can detect a new trend, how far is it likely to go?

APPENDIX

NOTES ON APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

[A memorandum written by Julian Charley for the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission during its discussions on Ministry].

1. The Role of the Apostles

Though their precise identity poses problems, the 'apostles of the Lord', as distinct from what might be called the 'apostles of the churches', occupy a unique position in the New Testament. 'The Twelve', reminiscent of the patriarchs, are founder members of the New Israel. Despite this privilege, their vocation is more associated with humility and service than with the exercise of authority, which all stems from their closeness to Christ (e.g. Mark 10.41-45). As Rengstorf concludes:

'One should avoid the word "office" in this connexion, and use "commission" instead.'¹

But the apostles are not only commissioned by the Lord in person: they were the first witnesses to Christ and, in particular, witnesses to his resurrection (Acts 1.22; cf. the emphasis of Paul on his having seen the Lord, 1 Cor. 9.1, Gal. 1.1, 15-16). Their role is unrepeatable, for the witness of their successors is derived and not direct. Ultimately the apostolic writings replaced the living voice of the apostolic band. The choice of Matthias had called for a man who had accompanied the first disciples 'during all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us.' The case of Paul was undoubtedly *sui generis*.

'The Apostolate does not belong to the period of the Church but to that of the Incarnation of Christ.'²

Consequently their names are associated with the very foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. 21.14).

All this helps to elucidate the meaning of Eph. 2.20—'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner-stone.' It is in Christ that all is joined together and grows (v.21). The association of apostles and prophets (the context suggests New Testament prophets) with Christ as the foundation of the whole structure stems from this first-hand testimony to the unique saving work of Christ. The inclusion of 'prophets' here should be sufficient indication of the point.³

¹ *Apostleship*, p.36 (Eng. Trans., London, 1952). It should be noted that there is nothing to suggest that the powers of 'absolution' given by the risen Lord (John 20.22-23) were confined to the Apostles. To maintain that only the Apostles were present on that occasion has no evidence to substantiate it.

² *Christianity Divided*, p.10, by Kung, Barth, Cullmann et al. (London, 1961): from an essay by O. Cullmann on 'Scripture and Tradition'. For the extension of the idea of 'apostle', see B. Rigaux, 'The Twelve Apostles' in *Concilium* 4.4, p.7. The recognition of the uniqueness of the original apostles by Ignatius is well known: all the more significant in view of his high regard for the position of the bishop.

³ Compare J. A. Allan, *Commentary on Ephesians* (Torch Bible Commentary, 1959) in loc.: 'The Church rests on the total unique Event of which Christ is the centre, but in which the apostles and prophets, filled and guided by the Spirit and doing their work in unique closeness to Christ, had an indispensable and untransmissible part.'

2. Credal Affirmation

The statement of the 'Nicene' Creed, 'I believe one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church', recognizes apostolicity as a hall-mark of the whole church, not just of a particular office or spiritual elite. Now the apostolic office was undoubtedly unique and unrepeatable, but the apostolic mission continues, for it will last until the end of the world (Matt. 28.20). To succeed the apostles is to heed their witness and to continue their ministry.

'Who then are the followers of the apostles? . . . There can only be one basic answer: the Church. The whole Church, not just a few individuals, is the follower of the apostles . . . The Church has only to be open to the Spirit in faith, and it will find the necessary obedience to the apostles and their witness. In this sense apostolic succession is a thing of the spirit.

'Apostolicity, like unity, holiness and catholicity, is not a static attribute of the Church. Like them it is an historical dimension, a dimension which has constantly to be fulfilled anew in history.'¹

The apostolicity of the Church is not just a question of abstract theological argument: it is also 'a concrete question of credibility which cannot be separated from the concrete history of the Church.'² Thus the true tests of apostolicity are a loyalty to apostolic doctrine, a continuance of the apostolic mission and a following of the apostolic example. Doctrine is of primary importance, because it is through the witness of the Apostles that the Church hears the voice of the Lord. This is why an 'apostolic' origin, in the widest sense, was the major criterion in finalizing the New Testament canon. To limit apostolic succession to certain hierarchical figures or sees was felt by the sixteenth century Reformers to be a stifling of the full implications of the Word and of the free operation of the Spirit.

3. Apostolic Succession

The problem of reference back to apostolic documents, whose message was held to be faithfully summarised in the profession of belief made by catechumens before baptism, met with real difficulty when challenged by second century Gnosticism. The Gnostic claims to *secret* traditions, traced back also to the apostles and subsequently brought to light, appeared more expressive of the dynamic development of the Church. In answer to such claims there was argued a *public* succession in the fellowship of the Church to which the apostolic writings had been committed. Of this the duly recognized and duly appointed bishops were the guarantee that the existing Church was indeed truly apostolic. Hence, then, the beginning of succession lists. Nor was each Church acting in isolation: the strength of the argument was on a 'catholic' basis.

'The appeal in its fullest scope was never to a single line of succession only. Behind even the greatest and most illustrious of these lines there lay in reserve that which gave its strength to each, the consent of all. Not even the Church of Rome was, in and by itself, a final witness.'³

¹ Hans Kung, *The Church*, pp.355, 356, 358 (London, 1967). Cf *Apostolicité de ministère et apostolicité de doctrine*, by Yves Congar (Freiburg, 1967), who shows that the primarily juridical view of succession is not compatible with either primitive or even medieval church tradition.

² Hans Kung *Structures of the Church*, pp.95-96 (London, 1965), in examination of Luther's teaching on the 'real, old Church'.

³ C. H. Turner, 'Apostolic Succession' in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry*, ed H. B. Swete, (London, 1918), p.106.

That is to say, the Church was catholic as well as apostolic. It should be noted that the first use, therefore, of succession in sees as an apostolic test had nothing specifically to do with transmission of orders or the conferring of sacerdotal powers. It was a necessary public safeguard, verifiable by all, for apostolic truth. Such would appear to be the implications of what we can deduce from Hegesippus and Irenaeus. It will be quite clear that such a rationale for apostolic succession is dependent upon all bishops having always taught the same doctrine. This was a very credible rationale over against the Gnostics in the second century, but it is a palpably incredible one for the heirs of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation to claim for themselves today.

Nevertheless, the relation of catholicity to apostolicity had important corollaries. While the Jewish and Gentile Churches in the first century enjoyed considerable local liberty and pluriformity of ministries, yet the necessary safeguard against fissiparous tendencies was a form of connexionism ensured by the apostles, of which the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15 is the most striking case. It is the same principle that lies behind the later developments concerning episcopal appointments.

'When the neighbouring bishops met to bestow on the bishop-elect the laying-on of their hands, they in fact ratified with the sanction of the Church at large the choice of the individual community. To settle all the elements of a lawful election or a lawful ordination was a task incumbent only on later generations: principles must be established first, and the rules which apply them had not yet been thought of.'¹

It is when the subsequent rules become of paramount importance over against the basic principles that trouble ensues. With Cyprian succession in *office* becomes combined with a theory of *transmission*. With Augustine, under the pressures of the Donatist schism, *transmission* comes to stand almost on its own.

Two interpretations of apostolic succession have confused the issues.

- (i) *The pipe-line theory*. Though so widely repudiated, it still gains tacit admission in the Vatican II documents.

'The order of bishops is the successor to the college of the apostles in teaching authority and pastoral rule; or, rather, in the episcopal order the apostolic body continues *without a break*.'²

'Among those various ministries . . . the chief place belongs to the office of those who, appointed to the episcopate *in a sequence running back to the beginning*, are the ones who pass on the apostolic seed.'³

However, the relation between the apostles and subsequent official ministry is notoriously difficult to assess. The apostles certainly made

¹ *Ibid.* p.107. That this was very likely the procedure in the late second century we would not question, but there is no evidence to confirm it before Hippolytus that is other than wholly conjectural.

² *Christus Dominus*, 4. (The italics are mine).

³ *Lumen Gentium*, 20. (The italics are mine).

appointments (1 Clem. 44), but the evidence suggests 'elders' (e.g. Acts 14.23). Did they appoint 'bishops'? If so, in what sense were they 'bishops', when the New Testament evidence suggests that 'bishop' and 'elder' were interchangeable terms (Acts 20.17, 28, Titus 1.5, 7)? The monarchical episcopate developed later. Any rigid adherence to a line of tactual 'transmission' runs into extreme difficulty here. If it is a case of transmission of teaching authority, then apostolic doctrine remains the constant criterion. If it is a charism for ministry of word and sacraments, then the apostolic succession is in the presbyterate (which poses some problems for traditional ideas of succession). Witness the conviction and practice of John Wesley. If it is the transmission of the power to confer orders, then that becomes the supreme ministerial function, whereas the presbyteral ministry as just stated is widely held to be in fact the essential ministry.

The Irenaean doctrine is not the problem. The difficulty lies in what the Latin Church did with it. As Dr. W. Telfer puts it:

'So these Latin churchmen created a historical myth, the unhistorical nature of which they were secure from discovering. This was to the effect that the apostles had provided for the future of the Church by creating an order of monarchical bishops. The first of these they ordained, according to this myth, with their own hands, and sent them to govern the several churches with which they were concerned.'¹

- (ii) *Addition to the College of the Apostles.* This is how Dix interprets the prayer of Hippolytus, 'Do Thou *now* pour forth', as a fresh creative act of divine power, analogous to but not simply dependent upon the imparting of the Spirit to the original apostles.

'The idea is not that of bishops as "successors" of the apostles, but of each new bishop as an actual *addition* to the original apostolic college, made by the heavenly Christ Himself, as in the cases of St. Paul or St. Matthias.'²

This obscures the unique role of the original apostles, as already described, besides raising serious historical objections.

4. The Historic Episcopate

The difficulties in the whole question of apostolic succession spring from the divorce of the apostolic *ministers* from the apostolic *ministry* of the whole Church. Traditional Catholicism has leant almost all its weight upon the *ministers* as embodying both apostolicity and succession.³ Furthermore, judging the apostolicity of those ministers, juridical and formal criteria have so predominated as practically to oust any more dynamic and charismatic recognition of them. *Apostolicae Curae* is a case in point. The dropping of the old arguments about the *porrectio instrumentorum* and the questions concerning the consecrations of Barlow and Parker was in large part a bowing to historical evidence. On the other hand, the alleged defectiveness

¹ *The Office of a Bishop*, p.119 (London, 1962). Compare T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p.279 (London, 1902).

² *The Apostolic Ministry* ed K. E. Kirk, p.200 (London, 1946).

³ It is significant, though understandable, that the articles on 'Apostolic Succession' in *Sacramentum Mundi* and *A Catholic Dictionary of Theology* (Nelson) both assume ministerial succession in office to be the heart of the matter.

of the Anglican 'Form of Ordering Priests' does seem to Anglicans an unduly niggling criticism. As for the matter of 'intention', this must be examined in the light of our present understanding of the nature of the priesthood and of the eucharist, for which the Windsor Eucharistic Agreement is of great importance.

On the Anglican side, was the inclusion of the historic episcopate in the Lambeth Quadrilateral intended to be an inflexibly dogmatic *sine qua non*? As Bishop John Robinson put it:

'The Lambeth Quadrilateral (of Bible, Creeds, Sacraments and Bishops) was formulated as a basis of unity, an attempted expression of the fulness of the Church: it has come in these latter years to be used as a pre-condition of inter-communion, a minimum qualification of catholicity.'¹

Perhaps a clue can be found in the phrase '*locally adapted*' in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.' *Episcopate* is certainly needed, but can it only be fully exercised by *episcopoi* in the historic succession? To maintain the necessity of apostolic succession through the historic episcopate, we need to ask *what* it guarantees. Here comes in the question of credibility. Is it to safeguard unity? For all the benefits granted through episcopacy, one could not pretend that it has ever guaranteed freedom from schism. For instance, the Non-Jurors claimed to be 'the Catholic remnant of the British Churches.' Is it to protect truth? It can hardly have looked like it to Athanasius. Is it to be the channel for sacramental grace? As Aquinas put it, 'The sacrament of Order is directed to the sacrament of the Eucharist'.² Anglicans have retained in their Ordinal the *porrectio* of the Bible but not of the chalice and paten. Is the virtual isolation of eucharistic celebration as *the* priestly distinction really tenable? When Anglicans in their Anglican/Methodist negotiations and Catholics in the documents of Vatican II have gone so far in recognition of the ecclesial status of non-episcopal churches, for how long can we go on behaving as if their manifest spiritual-ity was only explicable in terms of 'uncovenanted mercies'? Their ministries are real and not illusory. In Anglican history at least, there has not always been the same intransigence. However we may try to explain it, when Archbishop Bancroft re-established episcopacy in Scotland in 1610 no re-ordinations followed. As he explained:

'Where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.'³

The equivocal attitude of the 1948 Lambeth Conference towards the Church of South India was a retrogressive step, especially when the 1920 Conference re-wrote 'historic episcopate' as 'a ministry acknowledged by

¹ *On Being the Church in the World*, (1960), p.127 (Pelican edition). Also, Rouse and Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, pp.264-5 (London, 1967 edition).

² *Summa Theologica*, Vol. III Supplement, 37.2.

³ Quoted in N. Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, p.101 (Cambridge, 1957).

every part of the Church', going on to ask 'May we not claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?' Previous dogmatism was at least toned down a little. There remains the further question of whether episcopacy is a necessary form of Church government. Anglican divines such as Whitgift and Hooker were convinced it was not so laid down in Scripture. Again, the matter of credibility arises.

The New Testament church was characterised by pluriformity of ministerial patterns. Specific 'gifts' and what appear more like permanent 'offices' were alike the gift of the Spirit to the Church. The Church continues the apostolic mission, in obedience to the risen Lord—'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and for ever' (Heb. 13.8). It is to him that the apostolic teaching bears witness. In submission to this teaching episcopacy arose very early in the church. Here was a focus for unity, catholicity and apostolicity that appears to have swiftly become universal. Is not this the acid test? Insofar as the historic episcopate is most congruous with apostolic teaching and continuing the apostolic mission, so is it pre-eminently desirable. That in fact it arose as it did suggests that this is true. It is not that it is in some mysterious way of the *esse* of the Church: one might say that the historic episcopate was that *incidentally* in the second century, in that it fulfilled its purpose in the Gnostic crisis. Nor dare we claim that it is necessarily the mark of the fulness of the Church. A church without a ministry is a defective church, but nowhere in the New Testament is a particular form of ministry associated with the Church's fulness. It should give us pause before calling the orders and sacraments of others 'defective'. This befogging word was introduced into the 'Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry' of 1923, where all ministries were acknowledged as liable to be defective in varying degrees.¹ But it has seriously obscured the real issues at stake.

Apostolic succession is fundamental to the life of the Church, but so also is unity, holiness and catholicity. It is disastrous to conceive it only mechanically or juridically.² It is the continuance of the apostolic mission in the whole life of the Church. Apostolicity has also an eschatological dimension—it looks to the end as well as to the past. Rigidity can only stifle healthy growth. The true perspective is admirably stated in a passage in *Growing into Union*:

To isolate episcopacy as something which can, so to speak, be injected into a Church without organic relation to its faith, liturgical practice, and pastoral structure is not only to reduce episcopacy to "gimmick" or mascot status, it is to empty it of

¹ There was a major controversy on this concept of 'defectiveness' at the Nottingham Faith and Order Conference of 1964, but it was still eventually included in the text *Unity Begins at Home*, pp.67-68).

² E. L. Mascall in 'Faith and Unity', XV No. 1 (January 1971) gives a brief list of references to some Roman Catholic theologians whose attitude to the question is very different from the rigid position that tended to characterise both Roman and Anglican Catholics in the past', p.5. and Note 4 on p.6. The Lambeth Conference of 1930, while insisting on the historic episcopate, emphasised that this did not mean 'a particular theory or interpretation' (Lambeth Conference Report, p.115).

its historic meaning and to invert its real purpose. Episcopacy is not an accolade bestowed on the Church as a finishing touch or a final decoration, nor is it a trifle of which a Church should make as little as possible, lest its members be offended. The historic episcopate—which, as such, must be sharply distinguished from the corrupt prelatial forms it has too often taken—is a pattern of apostolic pastoral ministry.¹

With such an understanding of apostolic succession the historic episcopate could become positively constructive instead of ecumenically divisive.

5. Conclusion

There are several major questions which the Commission will need to answer. How far is the nature of the Church only properly understood in terms of the nature of its ministry? In the light of what has been said, have Roman Catholics been asking the right questions about Anglican Orders? If the Catholic juridical and formal criteria do confirm Anglican Orders to be invalid on their terms, does this seriously matter? What view is to be taken of non-episcopal orders, both as they stand and in the context of reunion (e.g. the Church of South India)?

Besides these questions relating to Apostolic Succession, there are further questions concerning the ministry which must also be tackled. What is the theological relation between ministry and sacraments, and also between ministry and priesthood? Do the conclusions of the Eucharistic Agreement open up a new approach to the subject of ministry?

¹ Buchanan et al., p.77 (London, 1970). See also the quotation from D. N. Power on pp.81-82. The dual emphasis in the New Testament on the church's historicity and newness, as exemplified in the Pastoral Epistles and the writings of John respectively, is clearly brought out in E. Schweizer, 'Church Order in the New Testament', pp.166-170 (London, 1961).

SOME ADDITIONAL NOTES (NOVEMBER 1973)

The 'porrectio'

It has been pointed out to me that it is misleading to say that Anglicans 'retain' the giving of the Bible, when in fact it was an innovation of the Reformation era. Thus Cranmer phased *out* the *porrectio* of the 'instruments' of the sacrament, and phased *in* the *porrectio* of the 'instrument' of the Word—a very symbolic change of emphasis. Some few Provinces of the Anglican Communion have in recent times *revived* the giving of the paten and chalice.

'Re-ordination' questions

Scotland in 1610 was paralleled by the arrival of the first Anglican Bishop in India in 1814. The S.P.C.K. and other societies had employed German and Scandinavian missionaries in India for most of the eighteenth century and, up to this point, in the nineteenth. These men were not episcopally ordained, but were Lutherans who became Anglicans solely by virtue of their employment by Anglican societies. They in turn ordained India pastors. With rare exceptions, no 're-ordinations' were conducted in the years following 1814.

'Defective' orders

Those who were at Nottingham suggest that although the word 'defective' sneaked through into the Conference findings, it is only in their *sphere of operation* (or 'jurisdiction') that orders are now admitted to be 'defective'. It is not *qua* orders that the defect is alleged. But as to a defect of jurisdiction, any minister who is not given the freedom of every parish in every church in the world suffers from a defect of jurisdiction. Such a defect is inevitable in the human situation, is totally shared by all ministers, and therefore irrelevant to the consideration of orders.

GROVE BOOKLETS ON MINISTRY AND WORSHIP

One a month—24 (or more) pages—20p each.

1. **The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist**
by Julian W. Charley (second edition)
(Also Statement only: 4p or 40p per dozen)
2. **Ministry in the Local Church**
by P. A. Crowe, A. R. Henderson and J. I. Packer
3. **Baptismal Discipline** by Colin Buchanan
4. **Reservation and Communion of the Sick**
by R. T. Beckwith, J. I. Packer and Colin Buchanan
5. **A Service of Thanksgiving and Blessing** by C. H. B. Byworth and J. A. Simpson
(Also Service-Sheet only 5p or 45p per dozen)
6. **Informal Liturgy** by Trevor Lloyd
Also Audio-Visual Media: A Guide to Sources of Materials
by Stephen Travis (second edition) 16 pages 12p
7. **The Church and the Gifts of the Spirit** by John Goldingay
8. **Communion, Confirmation and Commitment** by C. H. B. Byworth
9. **Patterns of Sunday Worship** by Colin Buchanan
10. **A Guide to Series 3** by Peter E. Dale
Also Collects with the New Lectionary by P. R. Akehurst and A. J. Bishop (third edition) 44 pages 20p
11. **Teaching in the Context of Worship** by Charles H. Hutchins
12. **The Language of Series 3** by David L. Frost
Also Series 3 for the Family. Text with notes and pictures. 32 pages 12p
13. **What Priesthood has the Ministry?** by J. M. R. Tillard
14. **Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England** by Colin Buchanan
15. **Institutions and Inductions** by Trevor Lloyd
16. **Alternative Eucharistic Prayers** by Derek Billings
17. **Evangelicals and the Ordination of Women.** Edited by Colin Craston
18. **Community, Prayer and the Individual** by Peter R. Akehurst
19. **Agapes and Informal Eucharists** by Trevor Lloyd
20. **A case for Infant Baptism** by Colin Buchanan
21. **Evangelistic Services** by Michael H. Botting
22. **Agreement on the Doctrine of the Ministry** by Julian W. Charley
23. **A Modern Liturgical Bibliography** by John E. Tiller (January 1974)

BOOKLETS ON SERIES 3 COMMUNION

Nos. 10, 12, 14 above. *Also Collects with the New Lectionary (20p) and Series 3 for the Family (12p)*

BOOKLETS ON ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC RELATIONS

Nos. 1, 13, 22 above.

GROVE BOOKLETS ON ETHICS

An occasional Series—Also 24 pages and 20p

1. **The Christian and the Unborn Child** by Oliver O'Donovan

Send for Catalogue to Grove Books, Bramcote, Notts.

THE AUTHOR

The Rev. Julian Charley was born in 1930. An Evangelical Anglican, he trained for the Church of England ministry at Ridley Hall, Cambridge after gaining a First in Theology at New College, Oxford. He was ordained in 1957, and served for seven years under the Rev. John Stott on the staff of All Souls Church, Langham Place, London. In 1964 he joined the staff of the London College of Divinity, an Evangelical Theological College of the Church of England. He became vice-principal in 1969, and went with the College to Nottingham, when it moved there in 1970 and took the title St. John's College, Nottingham. He lectures in Biblical Theology and Church History. He has been a member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission since it was first appointed in 1969, and was a member of the sub-committees which did the preparatory work on the 1971 Statement on the Eucharist first, and now the 1973 Statement on the Ministry and Ordination. He has contributed to several journals and synopsia and is the author of *50 Key Words—The Bible* (Lutterworth, London, 1971).

ALSO FROM THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

Booklet No. 1 in this series (listed on page 32 inside)

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist

by Julian W. Charley

The 1971 Anglican-Roman Catholic Statement on the Eucharist with An Historical Introduction and Theological Commentary.
(Also The Statement only in four-page leaflet).

Booklet No. 13 in this series (listed on page 32 inside):

What Priesthood has the Ministry? by J. M. R. Tillard

A special study by a Roman Catholic member of the Commission specifically commissioned as a contribution to the Commission's study of the doctrine of the ministry.

SBN 901710 42 3

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602-251114)

Distributed in **Canada** by Anglican Book Society, 228 Bank Street, Ottawa, K2P 1X1
in **Australia** by Kenyona Agencies, P.O. Box 301, Split Junction, N.S.W. 2088

Printed by Hasall & Lucking Ltd, Cross Street, Long Eaton, Nottingham. X 1111 HD Tel. L.E. 3292