

MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

TWO COMMENTS UPON THE ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC AGREED STATEMENT ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY, CANTERBURY 1973

Agreed Statements are a new kind of ecclesiastical document, made by a commission sponsored by the highest authorities of two Churches, formulated in a language which may break with the accustomed vocabulary of "official" declarations of faith. They are the first word of doctrinal reconciliation, an early part of a process of convergence by establishment of unity in faith.

From January 1970 the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission has been meeting to discuss three subjects: Eucharist, Ministry, Authority. At the first Ministry meeting at Windsor in 1970 it was agreed to study these subjects: the essence of ministry, ministry in a divided Church, renewal and service. The next meeting at Venice in September 1970 produced a paper which spoke first of Church and gospel, and then of the many forms of ministry, vocation and the priesthood of Christ which is "shared in a special way by those who have received holy orders". The paper went on to deal with the apostolic ministry, admitting that differences arise over "the relation between the episcopate as a whole and the Bishop of Rome". The paper then dealt with the problem of Orders, the question being asked "whether the *new* situation with which we are faced—a pastoral situation—calls for a new policy in the Roman Church".

Subcommissions then examined ministry in the New Testament, Sacerdotium, Orders within Church and ministry, the recognition of ministry; attention being given to catholicity and apostolicity, and Lutherans and Catholics in dialogue on ministry. The meeting at Gazzada (Milan) in the autumn of 1972 then turned its mind to mission and the totality of ministry in the New Testament, the emphasis being upon apostolicity in the Church as "the quality of all the factors which contribute to the preservation of fidelity"—the factors being the priesthood of Christ, of the faithful, of ordained ministers.

More subcommission papers ensued, notice being taken of current thought in France, Germany and U.S.A., and discussion beginning to focus on the fact of two Churches in which there are ministries and, within these, ordained ministry. It focused also on the function of *episcopé* (oversight) and the role of the ordained minister "as a unifying figure, as co-ordinator, as judge, as director, as leader who serves". Papers were then circulated to all Commission members for comment: they included the Pontifical Theological Commission's 1970 report on "The Priestly Ministry" and the 1971 Synod of Bishops' document on "The Ministerial Priesthood".

From all these papers, an outline draft was fashioned at the final plenary Commission meeting at Canterbury during 28th August-6th September 1973; and this was filled out, debated and revised by drafters and in full Commission session. From this process the Agreed Statement emerged, with its emphasis that "agreement on the nature of ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries". Authority and primacy remain, then, as problems in the future.

The two papers that follow, as our commentary upon this momentous document, come from Fr Echlin whose study, "Towards a Contemporary Appropriation of *Apostolicae Curae*", appeared in the *JOURNAL*, Summer 1972, 8-30; and a Roman Catholic theologian closely involved in the ecumenical dialogue, who wishes to avoid compromising his colleagues, and is therefore using a pseudonym.

I. THE BACKGROUND TO THE AGREED STATEMENT

by

EDWARD P. ECHLIN

FORTY years ago the respected canonist Capello argued that *Apostolicae Curae* was an *ex cathedra* statement. "It is a case of an *infallible* judgment delivered *ex cathedra*, so that there can be no doubt at all of the nullity

of Anglican ordinations".¹ On the eve of Vatican II Francis Clark conceded that not all theologians agreed with Capello, but Clark added that differences of opinion did not encroach upon the certainty of Leo XIII's decision, "a decision which rests on unalterable truths of theology and history and which is guaranteed by repeated decisions of the Holy See and by the age-long sacramental practice of the Church."²

In alluding to the practice of the Church Clark touched upon a crucial and neuralgic point. That is, even as Vatican II opened, with Anglican observers actively present, there seemed little hope for full communion between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church unless the issues raised by (and provoking) Rome's "repeated decisions" were placed in a new context.

The Council did not itself grapple with the question of "validity" of Anglican or protestant ministries, but it acknowledged some reality to their eucharists and mandated serious dialogue on ministry and eucharist. The Anglican Communion was singled out for its retention of certain Catholic institutions, among which is the historic episcopate.³

The dialogue which the Council requested proceeded so well among Anglicans and Roman Catholics that at Venice in September, 1970, the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) revealed its intention to seek agreement on the three previously divisive doctrines of eucharist, ministry and authority. At Windsor in September, 1971 the Commission reached "substantial agreement" on the eucharist. "Our intention has been to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching and the tradition of our common inheritance, and to express in this document the consensus we have reached."⁴ The Anglican joint chairman, H. R. McAdoo, explained the Commission's method.

"It [the Agreed Statement] attempts to go back to an earlier Christian approach, believing that this is the only and providential way forward. It seeks to go back beyond the divisive definitions of later times to Scripture, to the biblical realism, and to an earlier approach which it believes to be more consonant with scripture."⁵

At Canterbury, in September, 1973, the Commission announced that it had reached an historic "basic agreement" on the ministry: "Our intention

¹ *De Sacra Ordinatione*, Rome, 1935, p. 234. In retrospect, this was clearly a case of creeping infallibility, but Capello's influence, partly because of the compassion he mingled with his learning, was considerable. For a brief discussion of the development of the hierarchical magisterium and the definition of papal infallibility at Vatican II, cf. Nicholas Lash, "Change in Focus", London, 1973, pp. 73-80.

² Francis Clark, "The Catholic Church and Anglican Orders", London (CTS), 1962, p. 29.

³ Decree on Ecumenism, in "The Documents of Vatican II", ed. Walter Abbott, N.Y., pp. 356, 364.

⁴ "Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission: An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine", 1.

⁵ H. R. McAdoo, "The Status of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's Agreed Statement on Christian Doctrine", *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, London, 1973, p. 5.

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."⁶ The Canterbury Statement expresses agreement on the doctrinal areas concerning which agreement is necessary for reunion. Agreement was sought and found "in the wider context of our common convictions about the ministry."⁷ The Commission believes that the agreement it has reached puts the issues raised by the condemnation of Anglican Orders in a new context.

"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's 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."⁸

In other words, ARCIC does not deal explicitly with the mutual recognition of ministries, but by avoiding the *cul de sac* debates of the past four centuries and by reaching agreement about the ministry within the context of the Church and its mission it has prepared the way for such recognition. It remains for the leaders and other faithful of both Churches to find their faith in the Commission's Statement. If this agreement and the agreements on eucharist and authority are received by both traditions it should be possible for Rome to acknowledge the ministry of her "ever beloved sister" (Pope Paul VI) without repudiating *Apostolicae Curae* which should remain within the Church's memory as a decision reached in a different context.⁹ At this moment Rome is "waiting for the echo"—the reception by both traditions of the Commission's consensus.¹⁰

That ARCIC is correct that the developing thinking in both Churches has put the issues in a new context—that the different context is no sudden eruption but the result of a long development may be discerned in the unquiet history of Anglican ministry.

While it has ever been a conviction of Anglicanism that its ministry is in continuance with that "of the Apostles' times" it is no less true that its ministry had a new beginning, at least to the extent that it has been continued through an Ordinal which broke with the most widespread use in sixteenth century England, the Sarum pontifical.

Sarum signified and explicitly emphasized both the learning and holiness necessary in a minister of the gospel and the priest's role of leader-

⁶ "Ministry and Ordination: A Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry Agreed by the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission", Canterbury, 1973, 1.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁹ In a previous article in this journal I suggested that *Apostolicae Curae* may be reappropriated for a new context in which we are asking different questions about Anglican ministry and reaching different decisions than in the past. Cf "Towards a Contemporary Appropriation of *Apostolicae Curae*", *THE AMPLEFORTH JOURNAL*, Summer 1972, pp. 8-30, esp pp. 23-30; *ibid.*, Autumn 1972, 34f.

¹⁰ Lash, "Change in Focus", p. 79.

ship at the eucharist.¹¹ It retained from the ancient rites the Aaronic symbolism comparing presbyters to the sons of Aaron and the bishop to Aaron. In Sarum, however, the main point of the analogy is not the bishop's need of *cooperatores* but priestly sacrifice.

"So too thou didst richly endow the sons of Aaron, Eleazar and Ithamar, from their father's plenty, in order that the priestly ministry (*ministerium sacerdotum*) should not lack means to offer sacrifices (*ad hostias salutare*) for the people's welfare, and perform the sacred rites more frequently."¹²

It was *this* emphasis and signification—which appeared throughout the pontifical—which the reformers thought should be pruned. They were opposed by an important figure in the history of Anglican ministry—Stephen Gardiner. As Master of Trinity and Chancellor at Cambridge, secretary to Henry VIII, lawyer, diplomat, bishop of Winchester, theologian, traditionalist, a prisoner under Edward VI and Lord Chancellor under Mary, Gardiner was the acknowledged spokesman for the conservatives. While in the Tower Gardiner seemed vague and non-committal about the new English Ordinal except to say that he disliked its pruning of unction. Later, in the safer days of 1554, he condemned Ordinal priests as "lay, profane and married".¹³

Gardiner's protracted "supper strife" with Thomas Cranmer elicited numerous pages from the latter which have helped to show what Cranmer and the reformers wished their Ordinal to convey.¹⁴ Gardiner defended the traditional belief that at the altar priest and people pleaded Christ's unique sacrifice which was sacramentally present.

"The oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterated, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded on the scripture, agreed that the same sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in his most holy supper to be in the Church often remembered and showed forth . . ."¹⁵

Both Gardiner and Thomas Cranmer disapproved of the many abuses of the contemporary mass system. Gardiner acquiesced in the suppression

¹¹ *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, ed. William Maskell, 3 Vols, Oxford, 1882, Vol II, p. 217.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 254.

¹³ *Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli*, Paris V, p. 296.

¹⁴ "An Answer Unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner Against the True and Godly Doctrine of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Jesus Christ." Gardiner wrote a response in Latin, *Confutatio Cavillationem*, first printed in 1552 in Paris under the pen name of Marcus Constantius and in 1554 in Louvain under Gardiner's own name. Cranmer's rejoinder was neither completed nor published because of his imprisonment and death in the reign of Mary Tudor.

¹⁵ "An Explicitation and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith, Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, With Confutation of a Book Written Against the Same", in "Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper", ed. John Cox (P.S.), Cambridge, 1844, p. 344.

of cha
and, a
altars

"Wi
plac
dow
part
mini

A
the so
bishop

"No
agai
inve
som
of C
Can
of C
con

C
Ordin
to be
prefac
minis

"Ar
rev
tha
exe
acc

relati
of in
cerem
sacrif
Cran
"Tak
sacra

¹⁶ Jol
for
cf
¹⁷ Th
Ta
Jol
Os

¹⁸ A
an
in
¹⁹ Pr
Lc

of chantries where the abuses were extreme.¹⁶ Cranmer went beyond this and, as archbishop of Canterbury, signed a decree for the elimination of altars and the erection of communion tables.

"With all diligence all the altars in every church or chapel, as well in places exempted, as not exempted, within your said diocese, be taken down, and in the stead of them a table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel, within every such church or chapel, to serve for the ministration of the blessed communion."¹⁷

At the accession of Queen Mary in 1553, when rumours spread in the southeast that Cranmer had restored the Mass in his diocese, the archbishop firmly denied it.

"Now goeth the devil about by lying to overthrow the Lord's holy supper again, and to restore his Latin satisfactory mass, a thing of his own invention and device. And to bring the same the more easily to pass, some of his inventors have abused the name of me, Thomas archbishop of Canterbury, bruiting abroad that I have set up the mass again in Canterbury . . . the mass in many things not only hath no foundation of Christ's Apostles nor the primitive Church, but also is manifestly contrary to the same, and containeth in it many horrible abuses."¹⁸

Cranmer was the chief architect of the Edwardine Ordinal. The Ordinal's signification and the intentions of those who first used it were to become focal points of the debate about Anglican ordinations. The preface of the Ordinal clearly states its purpose to continue apostolic ministry in the Church of England.

"And therefore to the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following."¹⁹

Yet there was dispute about the *meaning* of this ministry, especially its relation to sacrifice. In a medieval addition to the rite, the transmission of instruments, the Sarum pontifical included a prayer which gave the ceremony unmistakable sacrificial import: "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass, both for the living and the dead." Cranmer's prayer was vague enough at least to confuse the signification. "Take your authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments in this congregation, when you shall be so appointed."

¹⁶ John Foxe, "Acts and Monuments", Vol VI, pp. 204, 233. Gardiner also left £400 for the erection of a chantry where masses were to be said for his soul after his death; cf J. A. Muller, "Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction", London, 1926, p. 290.

¹⁷ The Council's Letter to Bishop Ridley to take down Altars, and to place Communion Tables in their Stead, in "Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer", John Cox, ed. (P.S.), Cambridge, 1846, p. 524; cf Jasper Ridley, "Thomas Cranmer", Oxford, 1962, p. 312.

¹⁸ A Declaration of Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury Concerning the Untrue Report and Slander Which Reported that He Should Set Up Again the Mass in Canterbury, in "Writings and Disputations Relative to the Lord's Supper", p. 429.

¹⁹ Preface, in "The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI", ed. W. Benham, London, n.d., p. 270.

Yet the 1550 Ordinal as a whole, and this ceremony in particular, did not go far enough to satisfy the more radical reformers. To placate them Cranmer, in 1550, eliminated the vestment rubrics he had retained and revised the instruments ceremony further. According to the 1552 Ordinal the bishop delivered the bible alone without the accompanying bread and cup.

No sooner had it begun than Anglican ministry entered a stormy period. In March, 1554, Queen Mary issued injunctions that the bishop should supply what was lacking in clerics ordained "according to the new sort and fashion of order."

"Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any Orders, after the new sort and fashion of order, considering that they were not ordered in very deed, the bishop of the diocese finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in these men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before and then, according to his discretion, admit them to minister."²⁰

Pope Julius III authorized Reginald Pole to "promote" to orders men who, during the schism, were not "rightfully and lawfully promoted."²¹ And Pope Paul IV provided for clergy ordained by bishops who were not themselves ordered "in the form of the Church."

"Only those Bishops and Archbishops who were not ordained and consecrated in the form of the Church cannot be said to have been validly and lawfully ordained. Hence those persons promoted by them to those Orders have not received Orders, but ought and are bound to receive the said Orders anew."²²

In practice there were absolute reordinations during Mary's brief reign.²³ Condemned heretics who had received orders with the pontifical were degraded; other clerics were not.²⁴

When Elizabeth I assumed power Anglican ministry entered upon a still controversial second spring. She nominated Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury, appending a *supplentes* clause to provide for what might be legally lacking. Parker was consecrated with the Ordinal 17 December 1559 in Lambeth chapel by two pontifical bishops (Barlow and Hodgkin) and by two men consecrated by pontifical bishops using the Ordinal (Scory and Coverdale). Four days later Parker and three of his consecrators, using the Ordinal, consecrated three more bishops. Another pontifical bishop, Hugh Curwen of Dublin, consecrated by Edmund Bonner in 1555, also participated in consecrations early in Elizabeth's reign including that of a consecrator of William Laud who, like Parker, is in the genealogy of virtually all Anglican bishops.

²⁰ Gilbert Burnet, "A History of the Reformation", Vol V, p. 388.

²¹ Quoted in C. Hoare, "The Edwardine Ordinal", Bristol, 1957, p. 35.

²² Translation in J. J. Hughes, "Absolutely Null and Utterly Void", Washington, 1968, p. 261.

²³ Walter Frere, "The Marian Reaction", London, 1896, p. 121.

²⁴ John Foxe, "Acts and Monuments, Vol VI, p. 652.

But such lineal niceties did not engage the majority of Elizabethans, most (but not all) of whom accepted their prelates and vicars and went about their business. When the Stuart era began there were at last new rulers without a change in religion. Catholic polemics gradually focused on the Ordinal's signification, the intention of Parker's consecrators, and the practice of the Church.²⁵ In the recusant minority were determined women like Margaret Taylor of York who "cometh not to church because there is not a priest as there ought to be, and also that there is not the Sacrament of the Altar", and the daughter of Thomas Hewitt who absented himself from church "because there is no priest there nor right sacrament".²⁶

However, almost unnoticeably the context was beginning to change. Some Anglicans, especially in the Stuart era, by returning to scripture and the shared tradition, retrieved aspects of priesthood which had been clouded in polemics. The cognate issue between the Laudians and the protestant non-conformists was not primarily eucharistic sacrifice but the diocesan episcopal system. At the restoration the principal spokesman for the non-conformists, Richard Baxter, argued that the *local* "minster" or "pastor" of a congregation was its "bishop".

"You unchurch all our parishes Churches. Every Church then had a bishop, no church now hath a Bishop (proper to itself), or at least not many. Therefore no Parish (by this rule) is a church. *Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo adunata*. You make no Church below a Diocese."²⁷

The non-conformist apologetic made clarification of the Ordinal desirable. For the Laudians the bishop was indeed "pastor" of a diocese. There was a divinely established triadic order—bishop, priest and deacon—in the ministry. The local ministers were not on a parity with bishops but received orders and jurisdiction through them. John Cosin of Durham argued the Laudian case well.

"It is the full consent of revered antiquity to distinguish the ministers of the Gospel into the degrees answerable to the triple order under the Law, as servants to the same Trinity, the God both of Law and Gospel. There are bishops, successors to the apostles, answerable to the High Priest, presbyters succeeding the seventy disciples, answerable to the priests, and deacons, instituted by the apostles, answerable to the Levites."²⁸

It was this doctrine and not the priest's relationship to cult which was reflected in the revisions of the Ordinal in 1662. The biblical term "pastor" was reserved to bishops, and the tripartite gradation in the hierarchy was mentioned in the title and throughout the rite. Often unnoticed by commentators on the Ordinal's revised form for priesthood is that, in

²⁵ Hughes, "Absolutely Null and Utterly Void", pp. 17-22.

²⁶ John Bossy, "The Catholic Community of Yorkshire, 1558-1791", *THE AMPLEFORTH JOURNAL*, Summer, 1973, pp. 27-30; cf David Matthew, "Catholicism in England, 1535-1935", London, 1936, p. 41.

²⁷ "Richard Baxter's Answer to Dr Stillingfleet's Charge of Separation", London, 1680, p. 79.

addition to specifying the order conferred, the form also recalls the bishop's special power to ordain. "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.*" (1662 addition italicized)²⁹

The changes in the Ordinal, therefore, were intended neither to affirm nor deny the sacrificial dimension to priesthood. However, the free use of sacerdotal terminology is important as an indication of the convergence in eucharistic belief which had begun in Elizabethan times. Rome would take account both of the convergence and the terminology.

In 1684, however, Rome issued a negative judgment on Anglican ordinations. A "French Calvinist", ordained in the Church of England, became a Roman Catholic and petitioned to have his orders declared null so that he would be free from the diriment impediment to marriage. The Holy Office, referring to defects in form and intention and to the practice of the Church, responded by declaring the petitioner's orders null.³⁰ In 1703 the congregation declared null the orders of another convert, John Clement Gordon, erstwhile bishop of Galloway, who had petitioned to have his orders declared null so that he could receive the benefice of St Clement's.³¹ According to the now "age old practice of the Church" Gordon was reordained absolutely to the requisite minor orders. In 1875 at the request of Cardinal Manning the Holy Office assessed the Ordinal and found it wanting in sacrificial signification. In this decision there was recognition of the convergence in doctrine between Roman Catholics and at least some Anglicans and the use of priestly terminology in the 1662 rite. In a decisive *votum* Cardinal Franzelin noted the orthodox intentions of the Carolines and later Anglican ordainers and the additions to the form in 1662. In his brief Franzelin did not pass judgment on the later form but stated that the succession had lapsed.³²

In 1896 Pope Leo XIII decided to settle the question "forever" in an encyclical. In *Apostolicae Curiae* the Pope declared "that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void."³³ Even in the negative context of this condemnation the Pope implicitly conceded developments in Anglican theology and the Ordinal when he confined his arguments concerning form and intention to the Edwardine Ordinals and abstained from passing judgment on the 1662 addition to the form, "for the office and work of a priest [bishop]".

²⁸ "A Sermon at the Consecration of Dr William White, Bishop of Carlisle", "The Works of John Cosin", 4 Vols (LACT), Oxford, 1843, Vol I, p. 99.

²⁹ "The Form and Manner of Making Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons According to the Order of the Church of England", in "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and of Other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church According to the Use of the Church of England", London, 1680, n.p.

³⁰ Hughes, "Absolute Null and Utterly Void", pp. 278-280.

³¹ T. F. Taylor, "A Profest Papist, Bishop John Gordon", London, 1958.

³² Franzelin's *votum* was first published in full in 1956 in Francis Clark, "Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention", London, 1951, pp. 186-188.

³³ AAS 29, pp. 198-201.

Later ordi
tion were
had lapsed
rapprocher
Charles I,
priesthood
formed se
orthodox

The
Anglican
affirm its
hesitation
Orthodox
hood. In
the Polish
the Prote
hesitant

Alth
elements
Orthodox
cession a

"Althc
ments,
Eucha
There
autho
mend

The
west of
ment of
the Euc

Th
from th
Church
sion ar
Church
the Sec
to com
that th

³⁴ *Ibid*,

³⁵ "Do
1948

³⁶ Joan
Vati

³⁷ Dec
Lon

³⁸ *Ibid*

Later ordinations were invalid, the Pope argued, "even if" the 1662 additions were orthodox, for by that time the hierarchy and the power to ordain had lapsed. Although the context was negative the Pope conceded some rapprochement in eucharistic faith. "It was in vain that in the time of Charles I, some attempted to make room for some part of sacrifice and priesthood . . . equally vain is the contention of a fairly small and recently formed section of Anglicans that the rite can be made to bear a sound and orthodox sense."³⁴

The Roman Church was not the only Catholic Church troubled by Anglican ministry. In 1920 the Ecumenical Patriarch urged Orthodoxy to affirm its validity. In 1930 the Synod of Alexandria reversed previous hesitations by acknowledging Anglican priesthood. In 1936 the Rumanian Orthodox and Mar Thoma Syrian Churches acknowledged Anglican priesthood. In 1931 the Old Catholic Churches voted for recognition. In 1946 the Polish National Catholic Church entered sacramental communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.³⁵ The progress was hesitant and not without reverses but the thrust was towards recognition.

Although Vatican II acknowledged the retention of some Catholic elements in Anglicanism,³⁶ the Council limited intercommunion to the Orthodox especially because of Orthodoxy's preservation of apostolic succession and priesthood.

"Although these Churches are separated from us, they possess true sacraments, above all—by apostolic succession—the priesthood and the Eucharist, whereby they are still joined to us in a very close relationship. Therefore, given suitable circumstances and the approval of Church authority, some worship in common is not merely possible but is recommended."³⁷

The Anglican Communion, therefore, was among the Churches of the west of which "we believe that especially because of the lack of the sacrament of orders they have not preserved the genuine and total reality of the Eucharistic mystery."³⁸

The method of the Council was to argue to the reality of a Church from the reality of ministry and not the other way about. The Eastern Churches were recognized as Churches because through episcopal succession and sacraments they enjoy the essential elements constitutive of the Church of Christ. In its Directory and again in 1970, 1972, and 1973 the Secretariat for Unity defended Rome's different directives for admission to communion of separated Eastern Churches and others. The reason is that the Eastern Churches have true sacraments, especially priesthood and

³⁴ *Ibid*, p. 200.

³⁵ "Documents of Christian Unity", Third Series, 1930-1948, ed. G. K. A. Bell, London, 1948, pp. 13, 38-61.

³⁶ Joannes Feiner, "Commentary on the Decree", in "Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II", ed. H. Vorgrimler, 4 Vols, London, 1968, Vol II, p. 128.

³⁷ Decree on Ecumenism, in "The Documents of Vatican II", ed. Walter Abbott, London, 1966, p. 359.

³⁸ *Ibid*, p. 364.

eucharist, which are necessary for ecclesial and eucharistic communion. Rome's directives, however, are based on the traditional principle of tutiorism and do not preclude change if new contexts require new decisions.

"The *Directorium Oecumenicum* gives different directions for the admission to holy communion of separated Eastern Christians, and of others. The reason is that the Eastern Churches, though separated from us, have true sacraments, above all, because of the apostolic succession, the priesthood and the Eucharist, which unite them to us by close ties, so that the risk of obscuring the relation between eucharistic communion and ecclesial communion is somewhat reduced."³⁹

The culmination of these developments and hesitations was ARCIC's basic agreement on the ministry, grounded in the ministry of Christ, the Church, and its mission, which puts the issues of form, intentions, and disciplinary practice in a different context.

If Roman Catholics and Anglicans recognize the essentials of their faith in the Canterbury Statement then it will be clear that (at least) contemporary Anglican faithful, including ordaining bishops, have the intention of continuing this ministry. I would argue too that if Anglican *faith* (and beliefs) and intentions are Catholic and apostolic then the *form* which Anglicans use in their ordinations is determinable by their right faith and beliefs and intentions. If the Canterbury Statement and the statements on the eucharist and authority are positively received Rome will then be able in a public act to acknowledge Anglican ministry as apt for recognition by the universal Church.⁴⁰ To the pusillanimous in both camps who shrink from anything that appears to be a reversal of Roman practice let it be said that the Canterbury Statement and its sequence have so changed the context that Rome will be answering a radically different question than the ones that in the past issued in a negative.

I would like to conclude with two points that merit some consideration. Firstly, in all probability the distinctive reality that is Anglican ministry will, at least in some of its characteristics, have a place within the uniting Church until ordained ministry itself reaches its consummation. Within the ever uniting Church of the future there should remain the Anglican patrimony to enrich the Church and enhance its apostolicity and catholicity. There will, at least for the foreseeable future, be a communion of ministries; in the words of Pope Paul VI, "one authentic communion of the family of Christ: a communion of origin and of faith, a communion of priesthood and of rule, a communion of the Saints in the freedom and love of the Spirit of Jesus."⁴¹

³⁹ Instructions Concerning Cases When Other Christians May be Admitted to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church, 1 June 1972, in *The Clergy Review*, August 1973, p. 638.

⁴⁰ What is at stake is not precisely the "objective quality in the ordained man" but whether or not Rome can acknowledge the priesthood of her ever beloved sister as apt for universal recognition. Cf "Ecumenism—a new dimension", *The Tablet*, 15th December 1973, pp. 1194-1195.

⁴¹ Pope Paul VI, *In Solemni Canonizatione*, AAS, LXII, pp. 752-753.

Seco
basic agre
so it will
Churches
strong lar
rated bre
seen, of d
the initia
separated
Providenc
Spirit."⁴²

then, pra
must be

The
Pierre D
ment.

"If thi
each s
transce
someth
group.

Cou
ning, th
Spirit. I
have to
flying. I
in full c

⁴² Decr
⁴³ Pierr

Secondly, just as it took courage for the members of ARCIC to report basic agreement on doctrines that have divided the Church for centuries, so it will demand courage for the leadership and other faithful of both Churches to discern the agreed statement with openness. Vatican II used strong language when expressing the desire that Catholics and their separated brethren would be open to the promptings, no matter how unforeseen, of the Spirit of unity. "This most sacred Synod urgently desires that the initiatives of the sons of the Catholic Church, joined with those of the separated brethren, go forward without obstructing the ways of divine Providence and without prejudging the future inspiration of the Holy Spirit."⁴² What is demanded of both traditions is honest discernment and, then, practical steps to unity even if some venerable plausibility structures must be demolished.

The Under Secretary to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Pierre Duprey, makes the same point about assessing the Windsor statement.

"If this Agreement is confirmed by the authorities and the faithful on each side, then there must also be the courage to recognize it and to transcend the sociological reflex which sees this kind of agreement as something frightening, putting in question as it does the identity of the group."⁴³

Courage and transcendence are necessary in the process now beginning, that of discerning the agreement on ministry with openness to the Spirit. If Rome hears the echo, something sociologically dear to many may have to die—but such a death, in Cyrano's words, is a fall that seems like flying. For it is the necessary prelude to the resurrection of sister Churches in full communion.

⁴² Decree on Ecumenism, in "The Documents of Vatican II", p. 365.

⁴³ Pierre Duprey, "Aspects of Ecumenism", *One in Christ*, Vol IX, no 4, 1973, p. 322.