

## THE CANTERBURY STATEMENT ON MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

Report and Summary of Comments received at the Secretariat

## INTRODUCTION

The invitation extended at the end of the Canterbury statement brought in replies which differed widely in length, scope and value. They also came in in four other languages besides English. There were many purely congratulatory letters - these came mostly from U.S.A.. At the opposite pole there were letters from people who customarily write to the papers complaining of the activities of ARCIC and who welcomed this invitation to get a little nearer the target. There were also a few pleasant and sympathetic letters simply asking for further enlightenment and assurance in a field with which the writers were unfamiliar.

None of these seemed likely to be of sufficient use to the commission to justify the considerable labour of reproducing, translating, or summarizing them.

There remained those more extended and informed comments which seemed to come within the terms of paragraph 2 of the published note on "The Status of the Document". But even this material was in five languages and in other respects far from homogeneous. The question was how to reduce it to a form manageable by the commission as a whole. To have translated every word of it, besides being a task hard to find time for, would surely not have had this effect. After some thought and consultation with Colin Davey, I adopted a flexible method of translation and summary. In one or two instances where the pregnancy and conciseness of what was written suggested it, I have translated exactly (e. g. Congar and Schnackenburg). In no case have I omitted any substantial part of what was said. But I have in some cases abbreviated notably. In one or two cases, for reasons explained, I have arranged to make a photostat of the original available at Grottaferrata, and it goes without saying that any member of the commission who wishes to have for his personal use a photostat of any of the original comments has only to ask. The four languages involved besides English are French, Spanish, Italian and German.

W. A. Purdy

\*\*\*\*\*

1) **A. Lemaire, ~~author~~, lecturer in Paris and Orléans. Exegete. = Disappointed.**

Exegesis weak. 1) General recognition of diversity of ministries in the New Testament. but no distinction even between Twelve and "Apostles" (§ 4) though this is commonly made today. Silence on other ministries ("Seven", prophets, doctors, evangelists) only hurry to find episcopoi and presbyteroi. This does not treat inspired text seriously. 2) Subsequent reflection ignores N. T.. Three-fold ministry is taken as 'normative' solely on witness of Ignatius of Antioch - whom the church has not made a 'canonical' writer. Also for ordination: different forms of authorisation are acknowledged in N. T. but then you envisage nothing but imposition of hands. Is this really taking account of N. T. ? Subsequent history has favoured one form of structure and authorisation - but does this mean the Church is tied to one form? 3) Sacerdotal language § 13. You admit N. T. never calls minister hieris, but think it natural that Anglicans and Roman Catholics have always done so. Is this taking N. T. seriously? You should have denounced ambiguity of a word which confuses two ideas and hence inclines to falsify theology of ministry. You take no account of reformers' protest against this ambiguity.

Greater attention to N. T. would have broadened the basis of reconciliation to take in protestants.

(He calls attention to several of his own writings.)

2) Cardinal Duval (Algers) = Church's doctrine on ministry rests on N. T. taken as a whole. Not possible to establish different ministerial structures by appeal to earlier or later books - the N. T. should be taken with Apostolic fathers as witness of tradition. He does not like 'supervision' as translation of 'episcopus'. It suggests inspector rather than pastor. Superintendant is the right word. Cites Augustine, Sermo 94 (PL38, col. 580) and De Civ. Dei XIX, 19.

3) Rwanda and Burundi = Letter suggests that statement caused mild stirring of somewhat stagnant ecumenical waters.

4) G. Pasty, S. J., Istanbul = Calls attention approvingly to main features of the statement, and concludes that "in a truly spiritual fashion Anglicans live the sacrament of Order, even if they do not talk in the analytical and spiritual style to which we are accustomed in the Roman Catholic Church." But he thinks that the last sentence of para. 16 and the whole of para. 17 point to urgent problem which cannot be separated from the doctrinal question.

US/ARC = Unanimous in substantial agreement. "We are convinced that in this statement we see our own faith and the faith of our respective churches, and we find no major points of disagreement with it". Variations in use of capitals (e. g. Ministry) in different editions noted. US, ARCIC members denied any theological significance in this.

§ 13 : "Another realm of the gifts of the Spirit". Too divisive? Would have preferred more adequate expression of 'vital relationship' between two.

§ 16, sentence 2 : Could mean that bishops' and presbyters' commissions are coextensive.

§ 16, last sentence: Where is "here"? (14-16, we were told, but it is not clear).

§ 17, sentence 4 : Ambiguous (??).

J. Mejia, Professor of Scripture, Buenos Aires. Ecumenist. = It achieves declared purpose.

§ 6 (esp.) : N. T. doctrine, recognised as difficult, is set out clearly and objectively, paying attention to recent studies but avoiding excess.

§ 13 : Sacerdotal language satisfactorily explained.

§ " : Common/ministerial relation " " .

§ 10 : Service of Word given proper emphasis (cf. Presb. Ord. § 4) and related to sacraments. Sacramental nature of Order clear without recourse to 'character' language.

"Question which seems to have been at the centre of the controversy about Anglican Orders and their validity in Ap. Curae is treated with complete clarity and is entirely acceptable in view of Windsor, which is cited (§ 13, n. 3). If the sacrifice of Christ cannot be repeated, the Eucharist is none the less 'the anamnesis of the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ'. We see here the importance of the notion of anamnesis for both topics - Eucharist and Ministry.

Some constructive suggestions:

- a) § 11 : NT Reference to "authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sins" could have been given, e. g. John XX, 21-3.
- b) Catholic reader might find difficulty over teaching of Trent (s. 22, cap. 1 and can. 2) (D-S 1740-1752) that Christ constituted the apostles (and their successors) priests of the N. T. when he said "do this in commemoration of me" (Lk. XXII, 19; I Cor. XI, 24). The declaration does not cite this text, and consequently does not relate(it)to priesthood of apostles. Two underlying questions explain this omission - that of the correct interpretation of Trent and the strictly exegetical question. The difficulty should be borne in mind in any commentary, to avoid useless scandal.

- c) § 16 : Words "thus signifying the shared nature of the commission entrusted to them" are not clear in the context. (i) How does it follow - "thus" ? (ii) use of "them" is confusing since only one is being ordained (!). The reason for the presence of presbyters at the ordination of others is according to Vatican II (Presb. Ord. § 8) to manifest 'sacramental brotherhood'. Perhaps English is clearer - anyway this point is secondary.

7 Vagaggini, Rector and Professor of dogmatic theology at S. Anselmo, Rome, Member of the International Theological Commission =

Excellent within its stated limits. On one hand takes account of dialogue on topic to date: on other hand is superior in general to previous documents of kind - Malta Bericht, Marseille, Louvain, or private ones like Dombes and "Reform und Erkennung".

- 1) All its affirmations at least allow a Catholic interpretation.
- 2) Nine virtues:
  - a) Christological-pneumatological design §§ 3, 5
  - b) Ministry seen in setting of Church-sacrament of salvation §§ 3, 5. Church built by Holy Spirit primarily but not exclusively by means of ministers.
  - c) Historical position on origin and development of ministries (4, 5, 6).
  - d) General conception of apostolicity (4: cf also 9).
  - e) Presbyteral ministry seen as whole, extending beyond the Eucharistic function (8-13).
  - f) Ordained ministry represents Christ with authority and his ministry is not simple extension of common priesthood (8, 13).
  - g) Vocation, sense and necessity of ordination (14).
  - h) **Sacramental nature of order sufficiently expressed (15)**, especially taking account of sacramental nature of Church (3 sf and 5).
  - i) What is said on "character" (15) even if does not touch the heart of the problem (cf. below).

Certain formulations and expressions constitute advance toward solution of problems:

- a) Ministry seen in general framework of reconciliation carried on from Christ Comprehensive and biblical.
- b) Parallel between establishment of canon and crystallising of ministry (§ 6).
- c) Insistence on mission ad extra as integral part of ministry ( ; 10).
- d) Argumentation of § 12.
- e) "Not simple extension... different realm..." (13).

Points on which (I think) greater precision is desirable or necessary  
(by paragraph):

§ 3 last sentence : Suggests "free instrument... proclaimed and realised..."

§ 4, 1. 11 : Suggests "...faith, structure and life..."

§ 5 a), 1. 8 : Suggests "At least by time of the Acts, pastoral epistles, I Peter, III John and Revelation were written..." Reason: Acts gives an important witness which holds for at least the time in which Luke wrote. VI, 1 for the Seven; XIV, 23; XV, 6-22; (the presbyters of Ephesus) III John 9-10. If III John and Revelation have the same author, this (I think) confirms that 'angels' of Apoc. I-III are heads of Churches.

b), 11. 10-13: If it 'suggests' that every function belonged indifferently to all, and that only gradually were important ones reserved to some, certain nuances are needed:

- i) This could be defended for tasks of presbyters and bishops in certain Pauline churches. In some of these 'bishops' and 'presbyter' meant the same thing and function, and tendency after Paul's death was collegial. I Clement and Polycarp ad Phil. make no allusion to single heads of these churches. For other Pauline communities greater caution is needed, e. g. Ephesians (Coloss., Laodicea) with situation similar to that presumably of Tim. and Titus in pastoral epistles. For other Pauline churches we know nothing one way or other. Joannine writings show churches with responsible individual heads.
- ii) Evidence does not support the view that in the beginning every ministry belonged indifferently to all, even in Pauline churches. (Does the Statement say this? **WP**) Illustrates from Thessalonica, Philippi and extensively from Corinth (Clement). Suggests dropping § 5 sentence 5, "The evidence suggests...the community".

c) sentence 6: "Since the Church...name of Christ". Agrees, but would add for precision: "In N. T. passages in which a concrete form of this recognition is mentioned, imposition of hands appears as included" (Acts VI, 6, pastorals).

§ 6 sentence 1: "...we believe...people". This seems to mean assertion of divine origin. Thinks more could be said. Data suggest three stages: 1) Twelve constituted by Christ (this link should be as expressed). 2) Development and theological working out of concept of apostle in Paul. 3) "The twelve apostles" in Acts and Revelation.

11. 13-15: "we have no evidence...period". Fine, but present evidence does not exclude that reality of bishop-presbyter function was known under some other name, e. g. proistamanoi of I Thess. V, 12-13 or I Cor. XVI, 16.

§ 9 sentence 3: Implies too rigid derivation of presbyter from bishop. Excludes defensible "opinion of Jerome" (He enlarges on this).

§ 10 sentence 2: Leaves unsettled question of criteria for interpretation of Word in Bible. Scriptura sola? Scripture as lived and interpreted by Church? Suggests inserting after "Scripture..." and lived by the Church'.

§ 12 sentence 3: "Hence... Eucharist". This idea, now a common point of departure in ecumenical dialogue seems theologically sound, provided 'presidency' is understood in traditional way, so that anaphora and capital words of institution ( or epiclesis for orientals) are pronounced only by him and any concelebrants.

sentence 4: Instead of 'at least in some churches...' I would say 'at least in those communities which have an individual bishop, he because he exercised this oversight... etc. "

§ 15 a) sentence 1: Does "In" adequately express the dià of II Tim. I, 6 and I Tim IV, 14? The sacrament rite is not merely the external occasion of the grace.

b) last 2 sentences: He would prefer "In our two churches ordination cannot be repeated. This shows that, just as Christ as united the Church inseparably with himself, so God never reveals the radical gift he makes to his ministers in ordaining them, even if they fall from grace or are separated from the Church. This shows further that in ministerial actions it is first Christ and not the man who has the initiative and effects the salvation of the faithful. "

§ 16 sentence 2: "thus signifying ... to them". Reserves about this: if it means collective imposition it signifies that the ordinand becomes presbyter by sharing in bishop's mission. Significance is in fact obscure. Hyppolitus, Traditio, 8 is difficult to interpret.

Last part: "Moreover because they are, etc." If this means plurality of consecrators alone assures apostolic succession, independently of so-called validity or otherwise of the rite - I would be doubtful. This validity supposes substantial observance of the rite and an intention - which in turn supposes perseverance in the Catholic faith in the sacrament of order at least in the community or confession concerned. In other words, the account is acceptable only if it presupposes that the ordination is valid.

8  
J. Medina Estévez, Member of the I. T. C.

I. Introductory . Intends not total agreement. Domain of faith, (though word is not used.) Still, not all affirmations of statement belong to realm of faith. Point of departure for judgement should be content of faith (cf. Gaudium et Spes § 62, 2). Doctrine and faith not always easily distinguished. Starts with recognition that "ecumenical agreements" are a new literary genus , which are sometimes capable of two interpretations and hence do not achieve their real purpose.

II. Examination of Statement . What must we look for as necessary to Catholic faith ?

1) The ministry of bishops is willed by Christ and bishops succeed the apostles by divine institution ( Lk 9-18, 2 and 20, 2).

§ 6 comes nearest to saying this, but it is historic rather than dogmatic, and comes in section on ministry in general, before that on "ordained ministry". If sentence 1 applies to ordained ministry and "we believe" indicates a statement of faith, O.K. Elements elsewhere support this interpretation, but scattered nature of affirmations make it hard to grasp the essence. Underlying difficulty is lacunae in primitive evidence but he finds last sentence of § 5 "happy" and "illuminating". Doctrinal agreement does not demand an exclusive interpretation of N. T. data.

Verdict: on this prop. Statement is ambiguous but with an ambiguity easily cleared up.

2) Although profession of faith, celebration of worship and life in communion belong to the Church as a whole, ordained ministry and its responsibility cannot be fulfilled by laymen.

§ 7 and §§ 9-13:

- a) General Exercise of a visible headship ('participé par Christ') never explicit. Likes § 11. Focussing on life of Church in Eucharist is notably happy.
  - b) Ministry of Word: Role of safeguard, "charism of truth", is not brought out. Nothing on role of bishop of Rome. Here text is not even potentially adequate.
  - c) Sacraments: Baptism, O.K. - Confirmation, missing. - Eucharist, he sees no clear affirmation that there is no eucharist in full sense as willed by Christ without presidency of bishop or priest. (He has the impression that problems were avoided deliberately with Anglican eye on other Protestants!) Penance, elements there capable of developments. Anointing, nothing. Orders, bishop as minister. § 16 passim. "Succession" bit is satisfactory but " could wish for demand of possibility of valid ordination without intervention of bishops incorporated in the apostolic succession. Without this ambiguity remains. Matrimony, nothing, but no problem.
  - d) Bishop as head. Recognizes we have still to do this, but sees text with its "signs" and symbols as "rather woolly".  
Verdict = document does not do justice to demands of Catholic faith.
- 3) The only way of transmitting the ministry of bishops , presbyters and deacons attested since ancient times is ordination.

Verdict: text favours this proposition, but could be clearer.

4) Ordination is a sacrament, i. e. a sign which comprises a prayer and an action, instituted by Christ, and confers the gift of the Spirit for ministerial functions.

- a) Finds description of rite in § 14, but it is factual not "normative" (?) and description of form is very vague.
- b) Institution by Christ is Catholic doctrine for all seven sacraments. Is Act 2 XXV compatible ? (!)
- c) Has same difficulty as Vagaggini about § 15 sentence 1. "In ! Whole sentence ambiguous, though capable of right meaning.

Verdict: text not clear on these three elements of sacrament.

5) Gift of God conferred by ordination is twofold: divine grace and indelible character.

§ 15 speaks of "grace" ("sanctifying" and "actual") and "seal".

Verdict: corresponds clearly enough with Catholic faith.

6) The ordained ministry rightly called "sacerdotal" is not reducible to common priesthood.

§ 13 justifies sacerdotal language - happily, since this is no secondary matter. Affirms that ordained ministry is not an extension of common ministry.

Verdict: Fundamental agreement with Catholic faith.

III. What answer to the question put: "does the Canterbury Statement contain all the elements necessary for an agreement on ministry which answers to the demands of the Catholic faith ?" His answer: no ! Some lacunae, some ambiguities.

Nonetheless text should be judged favourably, and as advance on similar documents. Further dialogue should be able to resolve surviving difficulties on principles established.

IV. Additional remarks on certain formulae used.

- 1) Recognition of church as instrument of salvation § 3 is valuable.
- 2) §§ 4-6 not only possible biblical interpretation (at least in all its elements) astonishing to find no patristic argumentation - ministry question cannot be solved from Sacred Scriptures alone. Principle at end of § 6 should be better reflected in the text.
- 3) Ignatius' witness played down. Clement, Justine, Iraeneus, Ippolitus not mentioned. (!)
- 4) Finds "rather strange" silence about Eucharist at the beginning of § 7.
- 5) While true that "goal of the ordained ministry is to serve this priesthood



of all the faithful" (§ 7), might be clearer that common priesthood cannot be exercised fully except in communion with ordained ministers and through their proper and irreplaceable activity.

6) Very proper emphasis on role of Church toward World ( e. g. § 10, § 11).

7) Single reference to ordained ministers' vocation of prayer might have been developed.

8) § 13 ( one of the most successful) allows a of priest being thought of as kind of "sacrament" of Christ - very Catholic ! From this might have develop better explanation of minister as representative of community not by delegation but by ministerial participation in role of Christ.

9) Bishop is put in relation to entire Church - dynamism which is ecumenically important.

10) Applauds § 17 sentence 3.

11) Does this document express convictions of faith of Anglican communion? Don't more catholic affirmations represent only convictions of group, not moral unanimity ?

Y. Congar, O.P., member of I. T. C. = Does the Canterbury Statement contain all the necessary elements for an agreement on ministry which will satisfy the demands of the catholic faith? These seem to me to be:

1) Threefold ordained ministry is "specific"; not simply elevation or amplifying of baptismal priesthood.

Answer: O.K. cf § 13.

2) It is received through ordination in the apostolic succession. It is participation in the original ministry of the Twelve, received from Christ. Fundamental demand for this succession is fidelity to apostolic faith.

Answer: O.K. cf. § 16.

3) Ordination is not repeatable because sealed by the Holy Spirit.

Answer: O.K. cf § 15 ( though words "indelible character" are not found).

4) Threefold ministry ( diaconate to lesser extent) is service of a community - of its unity, both internal and with others: a general service or harmonization in the community of ministries and particular services. For the priest this comprises a specific ministry of the word of pardon, of presidency at the Eucharist, in the sense of a sacramental representation of the Lord.

Answer: O.K., expressly.

Hence I answer affirmatively the question put.

I add a few remarks:

- Personally I read the report with the priest in mind. But it speaks also of the bishop and even of the deacon: the ordained ministries. All right. But it speaks a little indistinctly of the bishop (even in numbers §§ 9 and 11). It brings out little the relation of dependance on the bishop (though cf. § 14). This is no doubt reserved for the forthcoming work on authority. It is a question of pastoral government, though nowhere is the word "jurisdiction" pronounced.

- When ordination is referred to, one finds (if I am not mistaken) very typically Anglican expressions like "recognition" and "authorization" (§ 5). But these terms express something authentic, and they are complemented by some satisfactory assertions.
- Ministry is several times put under the sign of reconciliation. This too is without doubt very Anglican (theology of atonement, etc.). But it is Pauline (II Cor. 5,18) and christian. Hence, O.K.
- I find in the document as a whole (particularly §§ 14 and 16) good formulations of what I asked should be brought out in the texts of the Theological Commission - the relation of ordained ministries to the community, the intervention of the latter, in the most traditional sense.
- The point remains, what value can this remarkable statement achieve in the Church of England? How will the latter commit itself, in the sense of what is said in § 17 "essential matters where ..... doctrine admits of no divergence"? The different reactions to the publication of "apostolic ministry" (1946) show that agreement is far from existing in the Church of England, either on priesthood or on episcopate (the idea of the "historic episcopate", as of the esse or bene esse or plene esse or melius esse - of the Church, etc.).
- It will be necessary, then, to clear these points up.

10 Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops =

This is a composit document, a digest of 23 responses from bishops, individuals or groups in both British and French Canada. It is divided into three parts: "merits", reservations and suggestions, each of them both "general" and "specific".

Such a document is inevitably uneven, and the specific suggestions of Part III are mostly for re-writing particular phrases (cf. general observations). Further summary would be unhelpful, so copy is available.

11 E. Lanne and Hilaire Marot in Irenikon =

On §§ 10 and 11: words "Bible" and "Word of God" are apparently interchangeable, while Vatican II (cf. Dei Verbum, 9 and 10) join Scripture and Tradition in the ministry of the word as foundation of the magisterium exercised by ordained ministry. But this silence may be deliberate in view of the next stage of discussion-authority: the more so since the munus regendi is explicitly enough attached to the ministry of the word, as well as very allusively the idea of authenticity (§ 10). § 11 is "good".

§ 12 could have gone further back to Didache 14 and 15 and I Clem., 44.

§ 13 : "to our mind" this paragraph as a whole and in some of its clearest expressions has found what Lumen Gentium 10 intended in distinguishing ministerial priesthood from that of the faithful essentia et non gradu tantum (but other interpretations will probably be advanced). But this does not prevent the Statement affirming on the other hand that the minister acts also as representative of the whole Church, an aspect distinct from the other even in the celebration of the Eucharist.

In §§ 14 and 16 they note that "even the doctrine of episcopal collegiality, recently reformulated by Vatican II, is explicitly mentioned".

Final judgement: document of capital importance: a decisive step, though it engages only the Commission and does not ipso facto modify "les douloureuses décisions de l'Apostolicae Curae". Still, the ~~ground~~ ground mown is considerable."

They draw attention to Theology's editorial on divergent interpretations, and to Lampe (CEN Feb. 14, 1974) who says that the Statement does not imply that episcopate is de esse. They think it "transcends these categories". All will depend on reception by Churches' authorities and faithful.

Dr. Francis Thijssen, dutch ecumenist =

General remark: A "Protestant" tendency is perceptible in the lack of an adequate notion of sacramentality.

Particulars: Page 3, last lines: "while the Church... offers to men" too weak: the Church realizes, achieves reconciliation.

§ 4 : Holy Trinity is origin of apostolate. The Church, and specifically the apostolic ministry, is terminus ad quem of the mission of the Holy Spirit. (cf. John 20, 21-22). Mention of this would clarify connections with No. 5 (cf. Eph. 4, 11-13).

§ 6: The parallel "processes" referred to at end should be seen as led by the Holy Spirit.

§§ 8 - 10 : Trinitarian element lacking here too. The participation of the faithful (as a gift of the Holy Spirit) in the sacrificial and so in the doxological act of Christ to his Father in heaven : this is the reconciliation of all men communicated by the apostolic ministry (cf. Col. 3, 3-14).

§ 12 line 1 : as above - "realize" as well as "proclaim" and "manifest". To forestall misunderstanding the reference to Windsor might already come here, after the word "memorial" (line 4). Pity that there is not clearer connection between the purely external relationship of Minister and Eucharist expressed in § 12 ("hence it is right...") and intrinsic relationship given in § 13.

§ 13, line 11: I would add after "his own sacrifice" the words "as mediator".

§ 13, line 22: again I would add, after "proclaimed", "and realized".

13) D. S. Hamilton (Rockville Center, New York), Chairman of Ecumenical Commission =

This is a lengthy position paper for a panel discussion at Graymoor and would be more useful if accompanied by an account of the discussion. It has four heads:

- I. What does the Catholic Church believe about ordained ministry?
- II. Does the Canterbury Statement affirm all the essentials?
- III. Some general observations on the Statement.
- IV. Some observations on the restoration of full communion.

The first two sections hardly lend themselves to summary (a full text is supplied since the paper has been seen as a representative example of intelligent conservative criticism). It is to be noted that the essentials required under heading I are more numerous and take longer to express than the e.g. those required by Congar. Even so, the Statement is not directly accused of omitting any of them, but only of affirming some "indirectly, implicitly, or in such an economical and compact fashion as to suggest, at least to this reader, some inadequacy, obscurity or ambiguity". Some play is made with the Charley-Clark contrasts, and a quotation from R.C. Jasper is rather polemically dragged in.

Section III merely repeats that the problem appears as a Catholic evangelical rather than an Anglican-Roman Catholic one; that there has been more emphasis on the Bible than on the 'traditions of our common inheritance'; and that Orthodox views might be profitably consulted or involved.

Section IV touches some questions, like "intercommunion", not relevant to the present summary.

14) Episcopal Conference of Argentina = This offers a short synthesis of the views of eight theologians.

General Impression:

- 1) Presentation of Church's "ministries" as service to the Christian community and to humanity is commended.
- 2) There is a satisfactory answer to all controverted points, except Anglican orders.
- 3) It is a highly positive document.
- 4) A step of decisive importance on the ecumenical road.
- 5) It faithfully reflects the Catholic conception of ministry, bearing in mind that it does not pretend to be exhaustive.
- 6) Untraditional expressions are used to define the priesthood, but without betraying what has always been affirmed (there is no mention of "character of configuration to Christ the Head, of essential difference from baptismal

priesthood, of cultic function; yet there is nothing that depreciates the Catholic faith - it persists here entire. Whatever is not fully explained looks forward to future agreements.

- 7) An exaggerated emphasis is given to ministry seen as "presidency" of the community.
- 8) There is no sufficient distinction between the priesthood of the bishops and that of presbyters and deacons (sic).
- 9) Nothing about the sacramental institution of Order by Christ, when he made apostles "priests of the New Covenant", saying "do this in memory of me".
- 10) No reference to the apostolate as the realization of the word of salvation proclaimed in the preaching of the apostles, by means of the eucharistic sacrifice and the other sacraments or misteries (cf. Vatican II Constitution on Liturgy, no. 6).

Particular paragraphs:

§ 4 - The mission received through the apostles should be specified: to proclaim salvation and realize it through the sacraments.

§ 7 - Instead of starting from the priesthood of Christ, in which ordained ministers participate (Epistle to Hebrews) starts from the common priesthood of the faithful which calls for ministers and servants to direct the community. The second view needs to be complemented by the first.

§§ 8-9 - There is excessive insistence on "supervision", presidency, direction of the community, so that the cultic aspect of ministry is left aside.

§ 9 - Word and Sacraments are spoken of twice as separate things: rightly, the word becomes sacrament, in likeness to the mystery of incarnation.

§ 10 - A reference to commitment to the Cross would complement the "responsibility for the word".

§§ 11-12 - The sacraments are restricted to Baptism and Eucharist (Penance ?), in accordance with the Anglican view.

§ 12 - Serious reserves about this if it is meant as doctrinally restrictive and not just historically, cf. Mysterium Ecclesiae.

§ 13 - History and exegesis should have much to say about this. How reconcile it with the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews ?

Instead of (line 20) "is most clearly seen in its celebration" we would like to see "is most profoundly exercised in its celebration".

The formula "nevertheless... Spirit" expresses well the meaning of Lumen Gentium 10 (non gradu sed essentia)

§ 15 - Celibacy might have been referred to here as of great significance though not essential to the Ministry.

15 ARC in Papua, New Guinea = Resolution passed after lengthy discussion:

"We have examined the Canterbury statement on Ministry and Ordination. We declare that we have found it acceptable.

We welcome it. We are aware of our need for further study of it. We believe that it reflects a constantly growing consensus between our two Churches on eucharistic doctrine (cf. no. 13 of the document).

We commend this document to the earnest study of the authorities of our two Churches. We recommend to the authorities of our Churches that they commend this document to clergy and seminaries for study".

16 Canon Georges Bavard, professor at Fribourg, writing in Eglise in the form of answers to eight questions makes the following points:

Commends the commission for 'sagely' holding its fire on 'intercommunion' and Anglican Orders.

Sees agreement on essentials as 'profound', but to be completed by examining "Magisterium".

Finds 'profound convergence' with Vatican II's handling of the question.

Does not find 'sola scriptura' approach: commends last part of § 6, "Just as the formation..."

Nor does he find any 'democratic' tendency to do away with bishops.

Underlines the importance of the retention (peculiar to Anglicans among reformers) of 'sacerdotal' language which, 'though not directly biblical manifests the sense of the Eucharist' (cf. § 13).

Canterbury expresses distinction between ordained and common priesthood 'more simply, less technically, than Vatican II'.

There is room for more precision, but there are no formules équivoques.

This is one of the most satisfying agreements of the kind so far published.

17 Irish Theological Commission =

1. The members of the sub-committee and some others of the Theological Commission submitted written comments, and a meeting was held on the 17th January, 1974 to draw up a common statement.
2. In varying degrees the reactions to the Canterbury statement (CA) was favourable. All contributors welcomed it though there were reservations of one kind or another.
3. A generally held reservation was that expressed by Newman in a strong form: "there are not two opinions so contrary to each other but some form of words may be found vague enough to comprehend them both...". The danger, he says, is that such agreements may come apart when "the principles beneath it are called upon to move and act". Arians of the Fourth Century, pp. 147-8. This should not take away from the achievement of the CA, but does recall the difficulties inherent in religious agreements, and the history of religious agreements illustrates the point.

4. Some doubts were expressed about the ability of the agreement to carry the evangelical wing of Anglicanism. This point was felt to be important in the Irish context where this wing is particularly strong. In other words some doubt was expressed as to how the CA might fare when the principles within Anglicanism itself began "to move and act". Again it was felt that if the formulae of CA could be understood to satisfy the evangelical sections of Anglicanism this is an indication that the formulae are too elastic to satisfy Catholics.

The obverse of n. 4 is that there is a good deal in CA which will gratify Catholics. The point, however, was made, that while a Catholic will recognise his positions at many turns an Anglican (though not Low Church) might take a different meaning from the same phrases. It was also noted that a Catholic theologian might recognise a short fall at certain crucial points. Without attempting a systematic account of the points raised, the following seemed to be among the most important.

- (a) One concerned epistemology : i. e. how do we know about ministry. Some felt that, while the document avoids a sola scriptura approach, **ministry** tends to be judged predominantly by the assertions or silences of scripture. In this view insufficient account is taken of the development of ministry in the Church and of Church decisions on ministry.

- (b) It is true that various phrases try to say what is specific to ministry. Thus:

N. 13... "It belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit" (than the general priesthood of the laity)

"Its essential nature is seen in its (Eucharistic) **celebration**".

N. 14... "Ordination is an act in which the whole Church is involved, the prayer and laying on of hands takes place within the context of the Eucharist".

N. 15... "The Spirit seals those who he has chosen... ordination is unrepeatable".

It was felt that the distinction between the priesthood of orders and the the general priesthood of the laity was insufficiently stressed, that the "context of the Eucharist" was unduly vague: also any short fall in the Agreement on the Eucharist (Windsor Agreement) tends to make its influence felt here. Much of what is positive in these statements is subject to what is said in (c) (below).

- (c) It was felt that the short fall in the document is largely because the doctrine of ministry is not sufficiently set in a sacramental theology of orders. We take the point (mentioned p. 6 n. 4) that difficulties of terminology exist but the realities that need to be covered may be summarised as follows: -

- (i) Is the ordained minister a priest?
  - (ii) Does he offer the sacrifice of Christ at the Mass?
  - (iii) Is ordination essential for the exercise of the ministerial powers and the existence of the Church? (This is touched on n. 12 where it is said that it is right that ordained minister should preside, and that as early as Ignatius only the ordained minister or one with his consent could preside).
  - (iv) Is ordination a sacrament?
6. It should be emphasised that this document makes no claim to be anything more than a "stage". It would be wrong to deny its "positive contribution" (n. 17). It does not claim to be "an exhaustive statement of ministry". It is a useful point of arrival, and hopefully a point of departure for deeper understanding between the Churches. Further progress would seem to demand fuller study of the place of the sacraments in the economy of salvation. Both CA and the Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist are closely connected: what they offer is a general chart for exploration that needs to be followed up in some greater detail. One must guard against premature euphoria which could set back true progress in Ecumenism.

18 R. Schnackenburg, Professor of Holy Scripture at Würzburg University=

This is an agreement on the fundamental questions of Ministry in the Church. It is to be welcomed and approved: it has achieved its purpose. It explicitly excludes questions of authority, e. g. primacy (cf. no. 17). The priority of doctrinal agreement in the process of reconciliation between churches is emphasised. It is the nature of ministry that is agreed about. As an exegete I venture a few remarks:

§ 3: To build up the community is justly described as the aim of every ministry. St. Paul says this of charisms (I Cor 14, 4; 12; 26), of apostolic authority (II Cor. 10, 8 etc...), of ministers (Eph. 4, 12). Acts say the same, but with stress on the work of the Holy Spirit, tacitly including that of ministers. Construction of the Church is from above, by Christ: ministers are instruments (Acts 4, 16). This should be more emphasised.

Koinonia is something other than the community. It can mean sharing of earthly goods (II Cor., 8, 4; Rom. 15, 26) but also spiritual (II Cor. 13, 13; I Cor. 10, 16). In Acts 2, 42 it is brotherhood including sharing: cf. *ibid.* 4, 32. Ministers are not mentioned explicitly in the context of koinonia. This text should be used in a more general communion-context than that of ministerial structure.

§ 4: It is right to note the diversity of the use of 'apostle' in the primitive church. Identifying of the Twelve with the apostles, as in Acts and Luke, is only



gradual. The assertion of the first half of § 4 holds only for the Twelve, not for Paul's idea of an apostle: he does not have the notion of reference to the historic Christ. But he has the notion of reconciliation, so prominent in the Canterbury statement (cf. II Cor., 5, 18-25).

'Mission' should lay stress first on that of the risen Christ even though this is rooted in the intra-Trinitarian mission.

This primitive, unclear notion of apostle does not limit the later New Testament conviction that the Church is founded on the apostles - the principle of apostolicity. Consider e.g. the attribution of all N. T. writings to an apostle (cf. Eph. 2, 20).

The increasing conviction of the apostolicity of the Church should be stressed as the product of self-reflection in the Church - as in § 5 ministry is seen as crystallising. It is good that the two churches agree in recognising this development, so fundamental for later times, for the principle of tradition.

§ 5: Passage "...with the growth of the Church..." is to be applauded. Recent research allows the adducing of the pastoral epistles and I Peter as well as the (later) Acts and Ephesians, which reflect more developed ministry. Cf. the presbyteral structure of Acts 14, 23 and 20, 17-38; cf. the 'pastors and teachers' of Eph. 4, 11. The transition to a ministerial structure clearly expressed in Ignatius (for larger areas) can be better understood by bearing in mind the N. T. pattern of development between 80-100.

§ 6: Also good, but Protestants would have to be told more clearly that the process is irreversible in terms of the fundamental idea of ministry. Catholics and Anglicans are related in realising this.

§ 7: Relation of ordained ministry to the priesthood of the faithful is well described ("The goal, etc...").

§ 9: The episcopate of the ordained minister is often misunderstood today. The word "involves" here is weak: there is not brought out the disciplinary power attached to the responsibility. But perhaps the commission did not intend a full description at this point.

The relation of presbyter and deacon to bishop and the power of the presbyter to preside and absolve should be more clearly set down as a realisation of legitimate process within the church - this is surely a shared conviction.

§§ 10-12: The theological intention of seeing sacramental and eucharistic ministries as part of a fundamental ministry of the gospel is to be applauded: it seems rooted in the N. T.. Recent reflection in Catholic theology on the exercise of priestly ministry has followed this line, which should be defended against the more traditional approach.

§ 13: This attempts to justify cultic, sacral expressions used (in spite of the N. T. evidence) in both churches. But "Christians came to see..." is not enough. In face of the evangelicals more precision is needed about the time and derivation of this conviction and its intrinsic justification. The latter has some beginning in the idea of the minister as representative of the Church, but should we not also say he is representative of Christ the high priest? Cf. Rom. 12, 1, in which the obligation of all the faithful is described in sacral-cultic language. The last two sentences of this paragraph ("Nevertheless, etc...") are important, but could not the point be made more deeply by stressing the role of the priest as representative of Christ, the high priest and supreme pastor, before the community?

§§ 14-16: The idea of ordination and apostolic succession developed here (only embryonic in the N. T.) is well set out, underlining irrevocability without talking about 'indelible character'.

These reflections of a Catholic exegete who is always conscious of Protestant interpretations are not intended to belittle the importance of the statement. The fact of such broad agreement remains highly gratifying and significant; but other traditions must be borne in mind in the ecumenical spectrum - for which the Bible is a common foundation. New Testament data should be emphasised fully and completely; but here they are seen in the light of later tradition and ecclesial life. In this statement there are formulations on ministry, ordination and apostolic succession which can extend Roman Catholic understanding along lines laid down by Vatican II, helping these things to be seen less narrowly and more in the framework of the Council's whole doctrine of the Church.

Thus ecumenical dialogue bears fruit within the Church.

#### Episcopal Conference of England and Wales =

"This Agreed Statement on Ministry and Ordination is the work of a Commission set up by the Holy See and the authorities of the world-wide Anglican Communion. It is therefore deserving of our serious consideration. At this stage it remains an agreed statement of the Commission and no more.

"The bishops therefore resolved:

1. That the statement be received for study.
2. That the International Commission be asked to clarify:
  - (i) the differences of interpretation of the statement on the Ministry published by members of the Commission;
  - (ii) the understanding of the role of the ordained minister as a sacrificing priest in the light of Mysterium Ecclesiae § 6 'Priests acting in the

person of Christ the Head offer this sacrifice in the Holy Spirit to God the Father in the name of Christ and in the name of the members of his Mystical Body".

20 J. Crehan, S. J., England =

There is a fundamental point of theology involved in the Canterbury Agreed Statement on Ministry which does not emerge at a first or second reading but which may be put as follows: -

Christ being our High-priest, as all agree, which priesthood is more nearly allied to His, that of the faithful or the ministerial priesthood? The two are analogates to the priesthood of Christ, but which is the princeps analogatum?

Mr. Charley in his Commentary (p. 19) on the Statement gives the Evangelical view "To view the clergy as some kind of exclusive, self-perpetuating club is 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". The same view is expressed by Père Congar (Mystery of the Temple, 172): "For many the 'Church' is an ideological system and a collection of rites of which a consecrated and specialised personnel is the privileged custodian... If this is the case, it is obvious that the faithful do not build the Church, they have only to obey her. But if the Church is the organic body of the faithful... then all her members build the Church, each doing his part".

Now while it is obvious that the hand cannot say to the foot: 'I have no need of thee', it is also obvious that the question of priorities is not settled thereby. The fallacy of presenting an analysis in terms of EITHER-OR instead of in terms of BOTH-AND is too common among modern theologians to need refutation here. But when Vatican II (Lumen Gentium, 10) said that ministerial priesthood and that of the faithful were coordinate one to another, it is also said that the ministerial priesthood was different in kind and not merely in degree from that of the faithful, and that it gave shape and guidance to the faithful (efformat ac regit). This is borne out by what Ignatius of Antioch wrote (Trallians, 3): "Without bishop and presbyters there is not even the name of a church". Clement of Rome, in his Epistle (40:3) said: "Where and by whose means God wishes offering to be made He has determined by His own high counsel... To the high priest has been given his own peculiar ministry, to the priests their place has been assigned and to levites special ministries belong, while the layman is bound by lay precepts".

That the Church is the new Temple of God is common theological ground to St. Peter (I Pet. 2:5 and 4:17), to St. Paul (I Cor. 3:16; II Cor. 6:17; Gal. 2:9) and St. John (Apoc. 11:15-19). But while Paul is most concerned to show the unity and holiness of the Church from its likeness to the Temple, Peter was primarily interested in the new Temple as a place of worship. (See R. McKelvey,

The New Temple, 1969, p. 129). He sees it as a place where spiritual sacrifices are offered to God by means of Christ (just as Clement does, save that Clement is more explicit about the order required in these sacrifices), and (I Pet. 4:17) he foresees that the time of testing is about to begin from the sanctuary of God (citing Ezech. 9:6: "Begin from my sanctuary. And they began with the presbyters who were before the House"). That the idea of spiritualising the Temple-worship was familiar in NT times is shown by the important passage in the Qumran documents (Manual of Discipline, 9f): "At that time the men of the community will constitute a true and distinctive temple - a veritable holy of holies - wherein the priesthood may fitly foregather". Qumran had broken with the Jerusalem Temple, but held to a spiritual notion of its own. The Qumran evidence is not treated in the Canterbury Statement. What it does say is wrong, namely that "priest" does not occur in the New Testament. In Rom. 15:16 Paul says he is the minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles, "giving priestly service to the gospel of God". The verb used includes the word "priest". In Eph. 4:11 Paul gives his idea of the priority of ministerial priesthood over that of the faithful when he says: "Apostles... shepherds and teachers... are for the perfecting of the saints unto a work of service". The word used: *καὶ τὰς λειτουργίας* is taken by early Christian writers to apply to the reconciling work of Christ in our regard. The Canterbury Statement (13) while it says that priestly ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood, adds that 'it exists to help the Church to be a royal priesthood' - and therefore must count as accessory and not principal. The evidence here submitted shows the opposite - that the perfecting of the faithful could not come about otherwise.

There is an erroneous idea of episcopal consecration in para. 16 of the Statement, that the participation of other bishops in a consecration signifies that the new bishop is within the communion of churches. This ignores the fact (cf. *Ordines Romani*, passim) that the Pope through the ages always consecrated bishops by himself, and that Christ (by tradition) was held to have made the Apostles bishops when He imposed hands on them at the Ascension. Bishop Clark in his commentary (p. 36) uses this error to justify rejecting the received notion of Apostolic Succession.