

AKSUM

THYATEIRA

A Festschrift

For
Archbishop Methodios
of Thyateira and Great Britain

General Editor

DR. GEORGE DION. DRAGAS

1985
THYATEIRA HOUSE
London W. 2

A Festschrift

In Honour of Archbishop METHODIOS of Thyateira and Great Britain, (1985).

Patrons:

Archbishop Robert Rancie of Canterbury
Cardinal Basil Hume Archbishop of Westminster
Metropolitan Meletios of France

Editorial Committee:

Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra, Istanbul.
Archbishop Basil of Brussels
Sir Steven Runciman, Dumfriesshire, Scotland., F.B.A.
Metropolitan Antony of Surozh.
Metropolitan John of Helsinki.
Prof. Gordon Rupp, Cambridge, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. F. F. Bruce, Manchester, F.B.A., D.D.
Prof. T. F. Torrance, Edinburgh, F.B.A., D.D.

General Editor:

Protopresbyter Dr. George Dragas, Durham, England.

FURTHER STEPS TOWARDS UNITY 1972 - 1984

By

The Rev. Colin Davey, M. A.

British Council of Churches, London

1. The Dialogue between Rome and the Orthodox

When the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras I died in July 1972, Pope Paul VI spoke publicly about the Patriarch's wish to concelebrate the Eucharist with him in these words: "We also have so desired. Now, this unfulfilled desire remains as his legacy and as our commitment".¹

Since then further significant steps have been taken towards the fulfilment of this desire for the restoration of unity and communion between Rome and the Orthodox, slowly at first, not without difficulty and opposition, but more steadily recently. As long ago as 1964 the third Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes issued a warning that a necessary first step towards fruitful theological dialogue was "adequate preparation" and the "creation of favourable conditions"². For Orthodox hostility towards rapprochement with Rome has led to accusations that this would result in "the reduction of Orthodoxy to a satellite of the heretical Papacy", "the welcoming of Orthodoxy with warm embraces as the prisoner of a totalitarian Papacy", and "the desertion, betrayal, and evasion of the Truth".³ The appointment of bishops to Uniate congregations in Greece in particular as recently as 1975 has continued to provoke the opposition of Orthodox who protest that "the road to unity between Rome and Orthodoxy does not pass through the *Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesiis Orientalibus*"⁴. There has therefore been a conti-

nuing need, as Cardinal Willebrands said in Bucharest in 1975, for prayer "that the Lord would guide us to overcome old differences and to heal even the most recent wounds that still weigh down our steps and slow our progress on the way to perfect unity in full liberty."⁵ There has also been a need to emphasise—in relation to the vital issues of ecclesiology and the papacy—that "the dialogue should begin in due course on an equal footing." So in 1973 Athenagoras' successor, the Oecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios said to a delegation from Rome: "We have entered upon a new period, the period of the deepening of the dialogue, in which we must proceed with perseverance, but also with attention and wisdom, so that the building may be solid and not endowed with merely outward appearance", and he repeated the Orthodox view that "the highest authority in the church is an Ecumenical Council" and that "no bishops possess authority without the consent of each other"⁶. There have in addition been a series of official exchanges and visits, particularly by Orthodox delegations to Rome for the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul in June, and by Roman Catholic delegations to Constantinople for the feast of St. Andrew in November. There have been theological conversations with the Russian Orthodox Church. There have been continuing contacts and co-operation at various levels⁷. All this has helped to create the right climate for the opening of the theological dialogue.

On December 14th 1975 celebrations were held in the Vatican and at the Phanar to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the removal of the excommunications between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. At the same time it was announced that by the unanimous decision of all the Orthodox churches, an inter-Orthodox commission had been established for the preparation of the theological dialogue with

1. 'The Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue' by Mgr. Eleuterio F. Fortino in *One in Christ* 1982 No. 3 p. 194; *Le Patriarche Athenagoras et l'Eglise Catholique* by Father Pierre Duprey in *Athenagoras I Oikoumenikos Patriarchis O Epirotis* 1975 pp. 339-40.

2. *Orthodoxos Parousia* I: 3-4: 1964 p. 261.

3. Constantinos Mouratides "The Ecumenical Movement—the great temptation of Orthodoxy to-day" 1973 pp. 30-33.

4. Metropolitan Bartholomew of Philadelphia speaking in Vienna in January 1983. *Episkepsis* No. 287 1-2-83. The Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity's Information Service No. 33 1977/1 p. 16 also reported Archbishop Seraphim of Athens' reaction to the appointment of a new uniate bishop in Greece in deciding to "break every contact with Rome so long as the Holy See continues to provoke these religious scandals."

5. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 33 p. 17.

6. *Ibid*—No. 27 pp. 15-16.

7. See Further E.F. Fortino *Op. Cit.* pp. 196-7 for a summary, and S.P.C.U. Information Service Nos. 27, 35, 37, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50 for details.

the Roman Catholic Church, and that a similar commission was to be set up by the Roman Catholic Church. In his address Pope Paul VI emphasised the importance of the events of 1965 which had "set free so many hearts which, up till then, had been prisoners of bitterness, locked in mutual distrust." He said that "a deep purification of memory clears an ever wider path for itself". He stressed that "the Catholic and Orthodox Churches have in common the same sacraments, the same priesthood, the same apostolic succession to guide the people of God." He added that "for centuries, celebrating together the ecumenical councils that have defended the deposit of faith against all alteration, we have lived the life of sister-churches." Then, at the end of the ceremony, to the astonishment of all present, as a sign of his humble affection and respect for the Orthodox Church, Pope Paul VI went down on his knees and kissed the feet of Metropolitan Meliton, the leader of the delegation from the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. As Fr. Pierre Duprey wrote, "the ceremony might have been no more than a memorial of the past, but it turned into a creative act for the future. It is the preface to the preparation of the theological dialogue between our two churches. May God grant that the dialogue develop under this sign which he has given and that it be marked by his Spirit." It was a symbolic action which "said more than any speech could have done and demonstrated that the only authority in the church is that which derives from the humble service of brotherly communion in love and truth." It showed to those who stress the grandeur of the Pope's role in the Church that "in the Kingdom of God he who is first must make himself the least of all and become the servant of all." A Pope who was seen to be the "servant of the servants of God" could quite properly be described by the Oecumenical Patriarch as "the first in rank and in honour of the whole Body of the Lord" as he did in a message of greetings on this occasion which spoke also of "the pentarchy of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, in which the Bishop of Rome is designated to preside in love and honour"⁸.

In order that "adequate preparation"⁹ should be made for the "Theological Dialogue of Truth in Love"¹⁰ there was a period of "immediate preparation for it. The two new commissions were not one joint commission but preparatory commissions. Their major task was to study the demands of theological dialogue and to elaborate an agenda of the major themes to be considered when the theological dialogue begins."¹¹ Their problem was whether to begin from the chief issues that divide Orthodox and

Roman Catholics, primacy, infallibility, filioque, purgatory, the new Mariological dogmas, divorce, the Uniate churches, ecclesiology, and so on.¹² If so, the risk would be that each would simply defend their traditional position and no progress would be made, except by way of what could be called concession or compromise. Alternatively a start could be made from "the full communion of faith, brotherly concord and sacramental life which existed between them in the course of the first millennium of the Church's life".¹³ The risk here might be that insufficient attention would be given to their doctrinal differences and to their different ways of exercising authority in the church. Also, an idealised picture of "brotherly concord" before the schism between East and West might lead to an idealised model for the restoration of unity, which would be difficult to put into practice.

In the event, the two commissions began by meeting separately; the Roman Catholics in Rome in October 1976 and in May 1978, the Orthodox at Chambésy, Geneva, in June and in November 1977 and in June 1978.¹⁴ There was also a meeting in Rome in March/April 1978 of a Joint Coordinating Group, which discussed the purpose, method, and agenda of the dialogue and drew up a Common Document with detailed proposals for the conduct of the opening of the Dialogue which were then submitted to the separate commissions and to the authorities in both churches.¹⁵

The Common Document came to grips with the problems of the dialogue's starting-point and priorities outlined above. Father Louis Bouyer explained later that "the preparatory commission on the Catholic side had made a summary of the points controverted in the past between the two churches and suggested that they should be discussed in turn; while it was the Orthodox themselves who insisted that in fact we had much more in common than in opposition and that we should rather start with a consideration of the varied ways in which our two traditions approach the things on which we are basically agreed. They said that this might provide an opportunity for seeing the points on which we are not agreed as being perhaps complementary rather than contradictory."¹⁶ So, as was reported later, "With regard to the document ment as a whole, stress should be laid particularly on the constructive spirit of the method proposed, which wishes to set out from what Catholics and Orthodox have in common, without, however, avoi-

8. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 31 pp. 1-10.

9. Rhodes Conference 1964. See note 2 above.

10. Oec. Patriarch Athenagoras quoted by E. Theodorou in "Athenagoras I etc." p. 324.

11. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 33. p. 12.

12. E.F. Fortino op. cit. p. 202.

13. Joint Declaration of 7 December 1965 quoted by Pope Paul VI on 14 December 1975. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 31 p. 3.

14. Metropolitan Damaskinos Papandreou, Les dialogues bilatéraux de l'Eglise Orthodoxe avec les autres Communions chrétiennes, in *Irenikon*, 1982 no. 4 p. 456; S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 32 p. 27, No. 35, p. 3.

15. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 37 pp. 5-6, no. 39 p. 13.

16. *Sobornost* 1981 vol. 3 no. 1 p. 88.

ding controversial problems (II,1) and more recent developments (II,2), keeping in mind the necessary distinction between differences compatible with unity and differences incompatible with it which make it necessary to find a common solution and agreement (II,3).

As regards the subjects of the first phase, the preparatory document proposed study of the sacramentality of the Church and of the sacraments considering that this subject 'is a suitable one to examine the problems of dialogue thoroughly and positively. Sacramental experience and theology are expressed through each other. It is for this reason that study of the Sacraments of the Church, in a first phase, presents itself as a very positive and natural subject. Study of problems regarding the Sacraments will lead normally to examination of ecclesiological aspects and to other aspects of faith, without departing from the character of lived experience which is fundamental for theology' (III,1).

Obviously, the main aim of the study of the subject of the sacraments is not that of examining all aspects, but in the first place the ones that concern the unity of the Church. 'Consequently, the main problems that must be proposed for discussion are connected with ecclesiology in its wide theological sense. More particularly these problems are bound up with the way in which the presence or absence of unity between Roman Catholics and Orthodox influences communion in the sacraments and the Christian life in general of members of the two Churches and vice versa' (III,3).

In this perspective the definition of the purpose of the dialogue, drawn up by mutual consent, is particularly important: "The purpose of the dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church is the re-establishment of full communion between these two Churches. This communion, founded on the unity of faith according to the common experience and tradition of the ancient Church, will find its expression in the common celebration of the Holy Eucharist".(1)

The purpose of the theological dialogue is not an intermediate phase, but directly the goal of full unity. At the same time, the definition of the purpose of the dialogue contains two important annotations concerning the full communion to be re-established:

a) full communion founded on unity of faith, in the line of the experience and common tradition of the ancient Church, will find its expression in the common celebration of the Eucharist; this reference to the celebration of the Eucharist confers on the search for full unity a direction based on sacramentality, appropriate to the nature of the Church;

b) the reference to unity in the line of the common experiences and tradition of the ancient Church proposes a historical criterion. On the one hand this means that it is not necessary to seek a model of unity to be invented completely; the history of the Church

and theology offer a model that has already been experienced in a way. On the other hand the reference to past experience does not wish to be preclusive. The communion to be re-established is in the line of (according to) lived experience, it follows and develops this experience. The text does not call, therefore, for a model to be sought definitively in the past. The document advises, in fact, keeping in mind the historical developments¹⁷.

In 1978 the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches were drawn closer together by their shared grief, as they mourned the deaths of Pope Paul VI and then all too soon of Pope John Paul I, and also that of Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad, President of the Moscow Patriarchate's Commission for Ecumenical Relations, who suffered a fatal heart attack whilst in conversation with Pope John Paul I. Grief was however mingled with shared joy at the elections of two popes and, as the Editor of the Secretariat for Unity's Information Service wrote, these events "have been the occasion for a striking witness to what binds us and brings us together far beyond and beneath official and formal relations. We are grateful to our Christian brethren of all traditions who have been so profoundly one with us, so much brothers in our alternations of sorrow and joy"¹⁸.

On the morning after he was elected Pope, John Paul II committed himself to continue the work for Christian Unity: "We intend to proceed along the way happily begun, by favouring those steps which serve to remove obstacles. Hopefully, then, thanks to common effort, we might arrive finally at full communion."¹⁹ He also asked the representatives of other churches whom he received in audience after his inauguration to "say to those whom you represent and to everybody that the engagement of the Catholic Church in the ecumenical movement as it was made in the Second Vatican Council is irreversible"²⁰.

Pope John Paul II initially gave a priority in the ecumenical field to dialogue with the Orthodox churches. This may partly be because he sees the Orthodox as allies on whom he can count for "support for many of the positions he has taken up within the Roman Catholic Church: his insistence on 'high' christology, sacramental doctrine, mariological devotion, a 'sacred' view of the priesthood, resistance to 'secularizing' trends and so on."²¹ It is also because, as he said to the Plenary Session of the Secretariat for Christian Unity in February 1980: "I am convinced that a re-linking of the ancient Eastern and Western

17. November 1981 Report for the Plenary Meeting of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Information Service no. 47 p. 117. See also E.F. Fortino op. cit. pp. 199-200.

18. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 38 p. 188, No. 39 p. 5 and pp. 17-20.

19. Peter Hebblethwaite "Introducing John Paul II" (1982) p. 141.

20. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 39 p. 5.

21. Peter Hebblethwaite op. cit. p. 152.

traditions and the overall balance that will result when full communion is rediscovered could be of the greatest importance for the healing of the divisions that came about in the West in the sixteenth century."²²

In November 1979 Pope John Paul II set out on his first ecumenical journey to visit Istanbul and to celebrate with His Holiness Patriarch Dimitrios of Constantinople the feast of St. Andrew, the patron saint of that church. "I did so", the Pope said, "in order to show before God and before the whole people of God my impatience for unity. We felt painfully how regrettable it was that we could not concelebrate. Everything must be done to hasten the day of this concelebration, and the very length of our separation makes it even more urgent to end it."²³

During this visit the Pope and the Oecumenical Patriarch issued a Common Declaration which first emphasised the importance of the Dialogue of Charity between the Churches:

"The dialogue of charity has to continue and to be intensified in the complex situation we have inherited from the past and which represents the reality within which our effort is to be made".

It also spoke of the theological dialogue, which the Pope had already said would need to overcome outstanding disagreements between Catholics and Orthodox "if not at the level of faith, at least at the level of theological formulation", and which the Patriarch had said he hoped would solve "serious theological problems about some essential points of the Christian faith". "This theological dialogue", the Common Declaration affirmed, "does not only aim at progressing towards restoring full communion between our sister churches, Catholic and Orthodox, but also at giving a contribution to the multiple dialogues going on in the Christian world in search of its unity."²⁴

They envisaged three results from the dialogue: "a better understanding of our mutual theological positions", "new approaches to theological work," and "a new attitude with regard to the common past of our Churches" since "this purification of the collective memory of our Churches is an important fruit of the dialogue of charity and an indispensable condition of future progress."²⁵

The following year the first meeting of the Roman Catholic-Orthodox Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue took place. It began with a pilgrimage to the island of Patmos on May 29th, 1980. The delegates then moved on to the island of Rhodes for the conference proper which lasted until June 4th. The Orthodox elected Archbishop Stylianos of Austra-

lia as their Chairman, and the leader of the Roman Catholic party was Cardinal Willebrands, President of the Secretariat for Unity in Rome. After two days of separate meetings as Orthodox and Roman Catholics, the commission held a series of plenary meetings at which messages from heads of churches were read out, a declaration was made by the Orthodox participants that "the presence of Eastern Rite Catholics on the commission did not signify recognition by the Orthodox of Uniat Churches or of the principle of Uniatism". The dialogue then got under way and as Father Louis Bouyer said later was "not only extremely friendly but extremely constructive. The only opposition came from some theologians of the Greek Church who raised difficulties at every attempt to formulate a programme and who would have preferred the agenda proposals to have had a different order"²⁶. As the Communique issued at the conclusion of the conference stated, "its main concern was to define the procedure and organise the details of the work for the first phase of the dialogue. This task has been accomplished.

a) The plan for the dialogue, proposed by the mixed technical preparatory commission of theologians in 1978, approved by the Roman Catholic and all the Orthodox Churches, was adopted in common and unanimously, as the agenda of the first phase of the dialogue.

b) The precise themes for the initial theological studies were chosen.

c) Sub-Committees consisting of Roman Catholic and Orthodox members were set up and will prepare papers for the next plenary session.

d) A joint coordinating committee to monitor the progress of the dialogue was established."²⁷

As Father Bouyer explained, "we came to the decision finally to start our study with the local Church and especially with the way in which the local Church finds both its expression and its realization in the eucharistic celebration. We thought that by a common study of the two traditions of East and West of the way in which the local Church lives in and by the Eucharist we could be brought to the question of the unity of the local Church with the universal Church, then to the problem of communion between the bishops, and subsequently to the role of Pope and Patriarchs. We also thought that by a discussion of the eucharistic liturgy itself we would be brought to the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Son".

He concluded: "It is very interesting that at this stage of the conversations it was agreed that we should start with the assumption that there should be some way of understanding our divergencies which

22. *Ibid.* p. 152. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 43 p. 67.

23. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 43 p. 67.

24. E.F. Fortino *op. cit.* pp. 202-3.

25. *L'Osservatore Romano* (English Edition) 10 December 1979 p. 4.

26. Sobornost 3:1 p. 90, from an article by Norman Russell "Catholic Orthodox Dialogue: Patmos and Rhodes" from which this general account has been taken.

27. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 4 p. 103.

would see them as complementary rather than contradictory."²⁸

This all indicates, as Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra described in a sermon he preached at the inter-Orthodox Liturgy celebrated in the presence of members of the Joint Commission on Sunday June 1st, that "the historical setting of the dialogue has changed; that the approach to dialogue has changed from an insistence on the points, great and small, that separated Orthodox and Roman Catholics"; and that "the People of God is on the side of reconciliation, the unity of our forces in a world divided in so many ways, secularized, shaken by the opposed forces that deny God."²⁹ The Communique concluded with a reminder that the search for unity was not undertaken for the sake of the Churches alone: "We hope that the re-establishment of the full communion of our Churches will contribute to the reconciliation of mankind and to the peace of the world of which the Church is the sign and divine instrument according to the will of God."³⁰

However a much more critical note was sounded by Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Peristerion, leader of the Greek Church's delegation. In his report to the Holy Synod he made a number of positive and appreciative points about the progress of the Dialogue, but added the following criticisms: "the unjustifiable haste with which the Joint Commission's proceedings took place; the inadequate and insufficient preparation of Church members for the dialogue; the great difficulties and disagreements over the selection of subjects for the next meetings; the Roman Catholics' insistence on participation by Uniats in the Joint Commission; and finally, and most important, the moving of ecclesiology to the margin of the dialogue"³¹. He wrote also that "the thorny problems requiring consideration from the point of view of history, dogma, ecclesiology, canon law, and liturgy have by no means disappeared, but have come more sharply and more urgently into view. The present Dialogue will be hard, long, delicate, and sensitive for both sides. It will require much prayer, penitence, time, and patience". He hoped that there would be a careful comparison of the Eastern and Western systems of thought, teaching, and interpretation of revealed truth. He was also convinced that the success or failure of the Dialogue "will depend chiefly on whether or not there is agreement about the doctrine of the Church. This is the most central, basic, fundamental and to-day the most complex, sensitive, and "controversial sign" in every ecumenical discussion. If

it is not solved, there will simply be the joining together of an old piece of creased and ill-fitting patchwork with a bright and expensive new piece of clothing."³² The Holy Synod accepted his formal proposals on the Dialogue which included both a commitment to its continuation and express reservations about the method of producing "Ageed Statements" which can "mislead orthodox people and orthodox opinion"³³.

A report to the Plenary Session of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in November 1981 summarised the next stage of the Roman Catholic-Orthodox Dialogue as follows: ³⁴ "The subject chosen for this first phase of the dialogue is: 'The mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the light of the mystery of the Holy Trinity'. This subject comprised the three following questions:

1. How is the sacramental nature of the Church and of the Eucharist to be understood with regard to Christ and with regard to the Holy Spirit? What is the relationship between the sacraments—and especially the Eucharist—and Christology, pneumatology and trinitarian theology?"

2. What is the relationship between the Eucharist celebrated round the bishop by the local Church and the mystery of the One God in the Communion of Three Persons?"

3. What is the relationship between this eucharistic celebration of the local Church and the Communion of all the local Churches in the one, holy Church of the One God in three Persons?"

In the course of the year the three Sub-Commissions met, one at Chevetogne in Belgium, one in Rome and one in Belgrade, and drew up three documents which were agreed unanimously. All three Sub-Commissions studied the whole subject.

The coordination Committee (eight Catholic members and eight Orthodox) met in Venice (25-30 May 1981). The Committee examined the reports of the Sub-Commissions and worked out a draft of a synthesis. This draft, sent to members of the Commission together with the three documents of the three Sub-Commissions, will constitute the basis of the discussions of the forthcoming plenary meeting of the Joint-Commission, which is scheduled to take place in the summer of 1982.

The dialogue, therefore, is proceeding in a positive way."

The attempt on the Pope's life on May 13th 1981 occasioned an unprecedented response in the worldwide expression of affection and sympathy voiced in the flood of messages that began to pour into Rome as soon as news of the attack became known. Messages came from the heads and leaders of many churches, including the Orthodox. The Oecumenical Patriarch

28. Sobornost 3:1 pp. 90-91.

29. *Diakonia* Vol. XVII (1982) pp. 244-7; S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 44 pp. 109-11.

30. S.P.C.U. Information Service No. 44 p. 403.

31. *Episkepsis* No. 264 (15-12-1981) p. 4 quoting from his book "Orthodoxia Kai Romaiokatholikismos - O arxamenos Theologikos Dialogos" Athens 1981 pp. 84-85.

32. *Episkepsis* no. 264 pp. 6-7.

33. *Ibid* p. 8.

34. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 47 pp. 117-8. For details see no. 45 p. 27 and no. 46 p. 58.

Dimitrios immediately sent Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon as his personal envoy to Rome to express the Church of Constantinople's solidarity with her sister-church of Rome in this hour of trial. On May 14th he joined with Cardinal Poletti in offering prayers for the Pope in St. Peter's Square. As Cardinal Willebrands expressed it, "At a time like this no brethren can feel separated".³⁵

Three weeks later, during the celebrations in Rome, held on June 7th, the feast of Pentecost, simultaneously with celebrations in Constantinople, to mark the 1600th anniversary of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (381), Pope John Paul II gave a pre-recorded address in which he quoted in Greek and Latin the "truth as it was then expressed: We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father". The Pope also made his first public appearance since the attempt on his life when he appeared at the inner loggia of St. Peter's Basilica to give the blessing at the end of the Mass.³⁶

The second Plenary Meeting of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches took place in a former royal castle Schloss Furstenried, near Munich, in Germany, 30th June to 6th July 1982. There was an atmosphere of "openness and fraternal cooperation", worship in the liturgical traditions of both East and West, and generous hospitality provided by the Archdiocese of Munich and Freising, and by the civil authorities of Bavaria.

The report of the co-ordinating Committee formed the basis for the Commission's work. As the Communique stated, "the discussions at Munich centred around questions of the nature of the Eucharist, the expression through it of the activity of the Holy Trinity in the economy of Salvation, the relationship of the Eucharist to the Church and the centrality of the Eucharist for an understanding of communion within the local Church and for communion among the local churches in the Universal Church. Large areas of agreement were outlined and foundations were laid for further consideration of questions about which there remain differences".³⁷ As Father Louis Bouyer commented, "Once a drafting committee had been appointed, the wisdom was soon revealed of the decision on the part of the Orthodox to include on their side some of the most cautious theologians who proved very positive in their contribution to the final text, which was both fuller and clearer than the preliminary report. The text suggests a first reconciliation between the views traditionally held by East and West in that it makes clear that neither the epiclesis nor the words of institution can make a valid

Eucharist in isolation but can only do so through their conjunction within the unbroken continuity of the eucharistic prayer. It also introduces some stepping-stones towards an approach (along similar lines) to the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The agreement on the nature of the episcopal ministry, which is the link of unity both within the local Church and between that Church and the total communion of all the other local Churches, may, by leading to a further consideration of the ways through which the unity of the episcopate has to be furthered, open a new path towards a study of the function of the see of Rome, precisely in conjunction with the other metropolitan or patriarchal sees and the local and universal synods."³⁸

The full report of the Commission, "The mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity" was published in August 1982.³⁹ The most interesting points I find in it are the following:

1. The *epiclesis* is not merely an invocation for the sacramental transforming of the bread and the cup, it is also a prayer for the full realisation of the communion of all in the mystery revealed by the Spirit. (I:6)

2. The Church describes a "local" reality. It manifests itself when it is assembled. In the local church, a new unity is communicated which overcomes divisions and restores communion in the one body of Christ. This unity transcends psychological, racial, socio-political or cultural unity. By the power of the body and blood of the Lord there is healed the sin of division, all of whose forms contradict God's design. (II:1). The ecclesial community is called to be the prototype of the human community renewed (II:3).

3. The eucharist is celebrated by the local church gathered about the bishop, or the priest in communion with him. Orthodoxy (correct faith) is expressed most clearly through the proclamation of the symbol of faith which is a summary of the apostolic tradition of which the bishop is the witness in virtue of his succession (II:2).

4. By the sacrament of ordination the Spirit of the Lord "confers" on the bishop, not juridically as if it were a pure transmission of power, but sacramentally, the authority of a servant which the Son received from the Father. The bishop cannot be separated from his church any more than the church can be separated from its bishop. Apostolic succession, therefore, means something more than a mere transmission of powers. It is succession in a church which

38. Sobornost 5:1 1983 pp. 65-66.

39. French Text in *Episkepsis* (French Edition) no. 277 15.7/1.8 1982 and in *Irenikon* 1982/no. 3 p. 350.

Greek translation in *Episkepsis* (Greek Edition) no. 277 15.7./1.8.1982 pp. 12-20;

English translation in S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 46 pp. 107-112, and in "One in Christ" 1983 no. 2 pp. 188-197.

35. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 46 p. 50.

36. *Ibid* p. 51.

37. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 49 pp. 59-60, *Episkepsis* no. 277 15.7/1-8-82 pp. 288.

witnesses to the apostolic faith, in communion with the other churches which witness to the same apostolic faith. (II:3,4).

5. The body of Christ is one. There exists then only one church of God. Each eucharistic assembly is truly the holy church of God, the body of Christ, in communion with the first community of the disciples and with all who throughout the world celebrate and have celebrated the memorial of the Lord (III:1).

6. Two conditions must be fulfilled above all if the local church which celebrates the eucharist is to be truly in ecclesial communion.

(a) The identity of the mystery of the church lived by the local Church with the Mystery of the Church lived by the primitive Church is fundamental.

(b) Mutual recognition today between one local Church and other Churches is also of capital importance. Each should recognise in the others, through their individual features, the identity of the Mystery of the Church. Communion within the same region should be extended further to communion between sister-churches. This mutual recognition, however, is true only under the conditions of communion in the same kerygma, and so in the same faith; and the will for communion in love and in service, not only in words but in deeds.

Permanence through history and mutual recognition are particularly brought into focus in the eucharistic synaxis by the mention of the Saints in the Canon and of the heads of Churches in the Diptychs. This explains why these latter are signs of catholic unity in eucharistic communion, responsible, each at his own level, for maintaining that Communion in the universal harmony of the Churches and their common fidelity to the apostolic tradition (III:3).

The members of the Commission were as follows:⁴⁰

(a) *Orthodox*:

Abp. Stylianos of Australia, Co-Chairman
Prof. J. Zizioulas (Constantinople)

Metr. Parthenios of Carthage
Prof. S. Papadopoulos (Alexandria)

Metr. Germanos of Petra
Prof. G. Galitis (Jerusalem)

Abp. Kyril of Vyborg
Prof. L. Voronov (Moscow)

Bp. Savvas of Soumadia
Prof. S. Gosevic, Co-Secretary (Serbia)

Metr. Antonie of Transylvania
Prof. D. Staniloae (Romania)

Bp. John of Dragovitsa
Prof. N. Shivarov (Bulgaria)

Metr. Chrysanthos of Morphou
Prof. M. Papachristophorou (Cyprus)

Metr. Chrysostomos of Peristerion
Prof. M. Pharandos (Greece)

Bp. Savvas of Bialystok and Gdansk
Bp. Simon of Lodz and Poznan (Poland)

Abp. Ananias of Achaltsike
Abp. David of Souchoum and Aphazia (Georgia)

Rev. Pavel Ales (Czechoslovakia)

Rev. Matti Sidoroff,
Archim. Ambrose (Finland)

(b) *Roman Catholics*

Cardinal J. Willebrands (Utrecht: Co-Chairman)
Cardinal W. Baum (Vatican: Catholic Education)
Cardinal J. Ratzinger (Vatican: Doctrine of the Faith)
Cardinal R. Etchegaray (Marseilles)
Abp. M. Brini (Vatican: Eastern Churches)
Abp. N. Foscolos (Athens)
Abp. M. Magrassi (Bari)
Bp. A. Pichler (Yugoslavia)
Bp. R. Torrella (Vatican: Christian Unity)
Bp. R. Jakab (Romania)
Bp. M. Marusyn (Commission on Eastern Canon Law)
Bp. A. Nossol (Poland)
Bp. M. Maccarone (Pontifical Institute of Historical Studies)
Prof. F. McManus (Washington)
Prof. D. Salachas (Athens)
Prof. E. Suttner (Vienna)
Prof. H. Vogt (Tubingen)
Dom. E. Lanne (Chevetogne)
Fr. J. Tillard (Ottawa)
Fr. A. de Halleux (Louvain)
Fr. J. Long (New York)
Fr. P.H. Kolvenback (Pontifical Institute of Eastern Studies)
Fr. L. Bouyer (France)
Fr. W. Hryniewicz (Poland)
Fr. P. van der Aalst (Holland)
Fr. V. Peri (Vatican Library)
Fr. P. Duprey (Vatican: Christian Unity, Co-Secretary)

40. Listed in *Episkepsis* no. 277 pp. 4-6. *Irenikon* 1982 no. 3 pp. 367-8.

Four members of the Joint Commission [Metr. G. Khodr and G. Attieh (Orthodox) and the Melkite Habib Bucha and the Maronite Georges Abi-Sader (Roman Catholic)] were "prevented from coming to the meeting from Lebanon because of the painful events which are still in course in that war-torn country" (Communique).⁴¹ Cardinal Hume (Westminster) was unable to attend the Munich meeting.

The next phase of the Dialogue has the general heading: "Faith, Sacraments, and Unity" and will revolve around the following questions:

1. Faith and sacramental communion; in what sense is right faith (Orthodoxy) related to the sacraments of the Church? Is it a presupposition of sacramental communion, and if so, in what sense? And up to what point? Or is it perhaps the result and the expression of such communion together? Or are both these things true? This subject is fundamental chiefly in view of sacramental and in particular of eucharistic communion.

2. The sacraments of initiation, the relations between them, and the unity of the church: What is the relationship between the sacraments of initiation, that is Baptism, Chrismation, and the Eucharist? In the West, these three sacraments have become separated from each other, at the liturgical level, in the case of infant baptism. In the East, these three sacraments have remained unified. What is the significance of this question for our consideration of the unity of the Church, and also for the spiritual life of the faithful?

Another question concerns the recognition of these sacraments between churches. To what extent can we say that we recognise a Church's Baptism without also sharing in that Church's Eucharist? How can we have unity only in relation to one or two of these sacraments?⁴²

These questions have been considered by the Sub-Commissions (which have met in 1982 in Serbia, Vienna and Chambes) and their reports will go to a meeting of the Coordinating Committee in Cyprus in June 1983 in preparation for the next plenary meeting of the Joint Commission.⁴³

There has been a generally favourable welcome for the Munich Agreed Statement. In November 1982 during the celebrations at the Phanar of the feast of St. Andrew in the presence of a delegation from Rome, Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon said "the progress to date of the work of the great Joint Theological Commission is a source of encouragement and hope. We must face the thorny dogmatic and ecclesiological subjects which separate us and which must, as such, be placed on the table of the Dialogue in due course". But, he concluded, "the table of Dialogue should be considered as the pledge and preparation of the holy table of the Eucharist."⁴⁴

In reply, Cardinal Willebrands affirmed that "this document contains fundamental affirmations that show a common sacramental concept of the Church, the same understanding of the local Church, of the role of the bishop in the local Church, and of the Communion between sister churches in the universal symphony of the Holy Church of God." He stressed the Commission's declaration that "in composing this document we intend to show that in doing so we express together a faith which is the continuation of that of the Apostles." He then added: "This perspective—which implies a distinction between the faith and the different theological expressions or formulations it can be given, and which also affirms its link with the faith of the Apostles—is the only perspective which can allow of a true progress in mutual understanding and lead us to a true unity in full respect for the diversity of our traditions."⁴⁵

Metropolitan Parthenios of Carthage described the text as "the first small step in a long journey" and added: "It does not follow the usual method of examining the subjects concerned—correctly, I am sure—but another more fruitful way. Not a 'scholastic' or a 'constricted' way, but a free approach, which I really believe is the traditional patristic methodology."⁴⁶ Metropolitan Bartholomew of Philadelphia pointed out that "The Dialogue does not exist for dialogue alone, but for the truth which liberates and saves mankind." He also said that the publication of the agreed text "will silence the accusations of some Orthodox circles that the Theological Dialogue is being carried on by specialist 'technocrats' in a secret ghetto, without informing the faithful who would find such things unacceptable." He then added that the Dialogue has been greatly facilitated by "the changes within the Roman Catholic Church over the last twenty years and its present theological positions which move away from scholastic theology and return to the spirit of the Fathers."⁴⁷

The Joint Committee of the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference of West Germany and the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Germany welcomed the Munich report as "a significant step in the direction of rapprochement between the Churches of East and West, given that it is the first common theological text since the schism. Its importance for the whole of Christendom should not be underestimated."⁴⁸ A similar welcome came from M.A. Panotis in 'Ekklesiastiki Alitheia' the official paper of the church of Greece.⁴⁹

However, a more critical note has been struck, first by Cardinal Ratzinger, who emphasised the

45. *Ibid* p. 126.

46. *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 1980–82 pp. 474–5: *Episkepsis* no. 289 p. 3.

47. *Episkepsis* no. 287 pp. 5–6.

48. *Episkepsis* no. 286 p.9.

49. *Episkepsis* no. 282 pp 11–12. See also *Irenikon* 1982 no. 4 pp. 522–3.

41. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 49 p. 59.

42. *Episkepsis* no. 277, p. 4 *Irenikon* 1982 no. 3 p. 369.

43. *Irenikon* 1983 no. 1 p. 54.

44. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 50 p. 125.

limitations of the document as well as its positive points.⁵⁰ And a more forceful attack was made by Professor Megas Pharandos, one of the delegates of the Church of Greece on the Joint Commission, who is most concerned about the Commission's method of working. He wrote:⁵¹

(1) The method of working (Full Commission meeting to approve a text prepared by subcommissions and the co-ordinating committee with minor alterations but no *substantial* changes) meant that the 'Dialogue' had already taken place before the Full Commission met.

(2) The text certainly contains Orthodox views on the doctrinal matters it deals with. But it has many weaknesses; (a) It was designed as a *common document* without each side presenting its own faith and tradition first. It is a typical 'ecumenical document', neutral and impersonal, lacking the character of either the Orthodox or Roman Catholic tradition; (b) It attempts to harmonise, it emphasises all the points of agreement, yet the serious and substantial points of disagreement on the Holy Trinity, on the Church, and on the Eucharist are not mentioned at all, on the assumption that they will be examined later; (c) Instead of tackling one subject at a time, as in the other Dialogues, it tries to embrace the whole of theology, Christology, Pneumatology, Ecclesiology, Mystieriology, and all that relates to them. This results in a confusion of themes and ideas, and too much identification without distinctions, on the pattern of: Christ is the Spirit, the Spirit is Christ, Christ is the Church, the Church is the Eucharist etc. The *reason* is that the Roman Catholics do not want a systematic examination of each subject out of which disagreements would emerge as well as agreement. As a result, the Dialogue keeps on returning to the same themes e.g. the *next* meeting, like the last, is concerned with the Sacraments, the Eucharist, the Church etc; (d) Instead of beginning from the formulation of the basic dogmatic points which unite and divide us, so that *dialogue* can be promoted, there has been an attempt to write a general 'theology' of the Eucharist, the Church etc, a theology which expresses the views of one or two theologians trusted by the Co-Chairmen rather than traditional Orthodox and Roman Catholic theology e.g. by such a focus on the Eucharist that all the other great ecclesiological issues are put in the margin; (e) The language of the report is "existential" i.e. incomprehensible and is far from traditional doctrinal definitions and leaves the way open for individual or subjective interpretations; (f) The text is full of individual interpretations using quotations from Scripture in a very Protestant way, rather than—as was proposed but not allowed—the binding authority of tradition and of the church of the seven ecumenical Councils. A text like this is in the end useless for the promotion of the Dialogue.

I feel it is essential therefore (a) to begin from the examination of Orthodox and Roman Catholic views on each topic and (b) that an attempt should *then* be made to put them together. Otherwise the Dialogue will later meet insuperable obstacles. I do not wish this to happen since I believe it should continue, as Orthodoxy has much to offer to-day to Western Christendom".

By way of conclusion I would make the following comments on the steps so far taken on the way towards unity between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches.

1. The very process of engaging in bi-lateral dialogue makes possible the considerable progress already described, which to many of those outside is quite astonishing, given that old conflicts and enmities are still kept alive in some quarters. However, in other places Orthodox and Roman Catholics are well ahead of the rest and even impatient (like the late Oecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I or Pope John Paul II himself) with the slowness of the whole process. Yet is this growing together in the Dialogue of love, and the increase in mutual respect it creates, sufficiently taken into account *theologically* in the Dialogue of truth? Just as (conversely) the deterioration of relationships between Orthodox and Roman Catholics led to a hardening of *theological* attitudes to each other.⁵²

2. The whole enterprise of healing the centuries-old rift between Rome and the Orthodox is an awesome responsibility and a humbling one. If it is always hard for two schools, or businesses, or football clubs, or local churches of the same denomination to amalgamate, how much harder, humanly speaking, for two worldwide institutions. Yet the process of healing this rift between the two major Churches of Christendom will make easier the approach of other Churches to each of them, just as other bi-lateral dialogues will already have facilitated this dialogue between Orthodox and Roman Catholics. It may be the latest in a long series, but it is in many ways the most important.⁵³

3. How do the Orthodox (who "believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true church of Christ, which as his body is not and cannot be divided"⁵⁴) and Roman Catholics (for whom "the one true church of Christ subsists in the Roman Catholic Church"⁵⁵) now view each other? Will they be able to "recognise in each other, through their individual features, the

52. See Timothy Ware. *Eustratios Argenti* (Oxford 1964). pp. 85-6.

53. For a full account of Bi-lateral Dialogues see "Confessions in Dialogue" by Nils Ehrenstrom and Gunther Gassmann WCC Geneva 3rd Edition 1975.

54. Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission: Sub Commission I Report.

55. Documents of Vatican II: Conciliorum Ecumenicorum Decreta 3rd Ed. 1972 p. 854. Concilium Vaticanum II 1962-65, de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium).

50. *Irenikon* 1983 no. 1 p. 54.

51. *Epispepsis* no. 286 p. 11.

identity of the Mystery of the Church"⁵⁶? Will they, (as Metropolitan Damaskinos of Switzerland has put it) as "Churches which claim to continue exclusively the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church" be willing to "seek and recognize as the Church, in the full sense of the term "Church", outside their own canonical frontiers, with which they identify the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, the Churches with which they will be called to eucharistic communion"⁵⁷? Will they be in a position to agree that they do "witness to the same apostolic faith?"⁵⁸ Certainly the route towards full unity between Rome and the Orthodox can be charted: sufficient agreement on matters of faith (it is the Joint Commission's task to show this) to provide the grounds on which each can recognise in the other "the identity of the Mystery of the Church", as a result of which full communion can be restored, and Pope and Patriarch can concelebrate the eucharist as can the rest of their bishops and clergy.

4. But will this journey be taken? The conflict over the Commission's method indicates the confidence of the majority that there exists sufficient agreement in faith between the two churches, but the fears of the minority that "insuperable obstacles" will be encountered further along the route unless particular issues such as the Papacy are tackled head on. As Peter Hebblethwaite has written, "the papal office itself, if interpreted strictly according to the definitions of Vatican I, remains an insuperable obstacle to unity."⁵⁹

Furthermore, in spite of changes within the Roman Catholic Church over the last twenty years noted by Metropolitan Bartholomew, problems still arise from what Peter Hebblethwaite describes as "a kind of schizophrenia in much Catholic discourse. One kind of statement is made in an ecumenical context, while quite different statements are made, on the same topic, for internal consumption."⁶⁰ Most important of all, can a stage be envisaged of mutual recognition and full communion *without* Orthodox acceptance or Roman Catholic retraction of (for instance) Marian dogmas and Papal infallibility, and *without* Papal *jurisdiction* over Orthodox local churches? If so, then the way forward to unity will have been found not only for Orthodox and Roman Catholics but for others also. If not, then what passage remains open towards that "communion of these two communions," which was Athenagoras I's legacy and Pope Paul VI's commitment?⁶¹

56. Munich Report III: 3.

57. S.P.C.U. Information Service no. 46 p. 55 Homily in St. Peter's Basilica, Rome, on June 6th 1981 at First Vespers of Pentecost.

58. Munich Report: Introduction.

59. Introducing John Paul II p. 12.

60. *Ibid* p. 142.

61. See further Metr. Damaskinos Papandreou, *Les dialogues bilatéraux de l'Eglise orthodoxe avec les autres Communions Chrétiennes*, in *Irenikon* 1982 no. 4 pp. 451-470 especially his "Reflexions et Perspectives" pp. 459 ff.

2. Anglican/Roman Catholic dialogue 1972-1982*

a. *The Fourth Meeting of the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission at Gazzada.*

Following the completion and publication of the Commission's first Agreed statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, the A/RCIC turned its attention to Ministry and Ordination. For its fourth meeting it met at the Villa Cagnola, Gazzada, North Italy, from August 30th-September 7th 1972. Before the main meeting a small group of members had gathered at Woodstock College, New York, from 23rd-26th May.¹ What it succeeded in doing was to provide a suggested programme of work and agenda for Gazzada. This was done by a sifting of the extensive body of papers, already in hand for the fourth meeting, and by the individual members of the group submitting schemas for the treatment of the subject of ministry. Out of this process there evolved a proposed outline for Gazzada under the headings (1) Church as Eucharistic Community (2) Priesthood and Ministry in the New Testament (3) Historical understanding of the function of ministers. To which was added for 1973, (4) The three-fold order of Ministry and (5) Some Implications. Each item was spelt out in detail and points of agreement and divergence between the two Churches were noted. The complete document was circulated to all members with a covering letter from the Co-chairmen, suggesting that both the Roman Catholic and Reformed traditions, by over-emphasising certain aspects of priesthood, had produced inadequate interpretations which required to be reconciled in the light of a richer notion of ministry more consonant with New Testament teaching. It was further suggested that at the fourth meeting there should be an attempt to re-assess this central idea, to see that it has become an umbrella-term covering two distinct ideas, i.e. *sacerdotium and ministerium, hierateuma and diakonia*, and to identify the presence or absence of these functions in Christ, in the Church and in the ordained ministry.

When the Commission gathered at Gazzada, the members were therefore in possession of a large number of papers consisting of material commissioned by ARCIC and support documents provided from different sources. Among the former was a paper 'La qualité sacerdotale du Ministère' by Fr. J.M.R. Til-

* Most of the section on Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue was written by Archbishop Henry McAdoo and is reproduced from *H. R. McAdoo: Anglican/Roman Catholic Relations 1717-80* in 'Rome and the Anglicans' edited by Wolfgang Haase, published by Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York (1972); his account of Anglican/Roman Catholic dialogue 1972-1980 appears on pp. 236-260 and 272-3 and incorporates an *aide-memoire* on the work on the theme of Authority by Rev. C.J. Hill on pp. 243-53. It is supplemented by material from the Final Report of the A/RCIC published by CTS/SPCK 1982 and from 'The Pope in Britain' published by St. Paul Publications 1982.

1. Bishop Clark, Bishop McAdoo, Bishop Vogel, Fr. Tillard, Fr. Tavad, Prof. Fairweather, Mr Charley and Fr. John Reid S.J.

lard O.P. Later published as a booklet in English 'What priesthood has the Ministry?' with a foreword by an Anglican member of the Commission, the Rev. Julian Charley², this paper proved influential in the work at Gazzada and at the fifth meeting, as did also a paper on 'The Recognition of Ministry' by Fr. George Tavard. Under the first three of the Woodstock headings work was at once allotted to three sub-commissions reporting to the plenary sessions. As this process went on it became evident that the main thrust was in the direction of sub-commission (2) which had as its subject priesthood and ministry in the New Testament, although valuable insights were coming through in the other areas particularly that of apostolicity³. This resulted in a revision of the Woodstock working-plan. The natural drift of discussion led to a decision to concentrate on producing some provisional work on ministry in the New Testament and material was also produced on apostolicity and the historical aspect. Some of this material and a good deal of the thinking embodied in it found its way into the final statement. After close analysis in plenary session of the work thus evolved the conclusion was to establish a working plan, allotting to groups centred in England, Canada/U.S.A. and South Africa, the following subjects for study: (1) *Apostolic Succession*; its relation to the apostolicity of Christ, of the Apostles and of the Church (2) *Priesthood*; in relation to Christ and the Church, in relation to the eucharist, in relation to forgiveness of sins and in relation to other functions of the ordained ministry, special reference being made to a note on apostolicity provided by sub-commission(1). (3) *Ordination*; do we agree on the purpose of ordination and, if so, what is it? How can we be sure that this purpose is effected? What part is played by community and continuity of faith, action on behalf of a Church, tactile succession and sufficient form? What light is thrown on the functions of bishops, priests and deacons by our pontificals and ordinals?

The procedure decided upon was that each group would endeavour to send in an agreed conclusion on its area of investigation before the end of May 1973. The Commission then appointed seven of its number to meet at Poringland from 11th-15th June 1973 with the task of drawing up, in the light of these written conclusions, a draft statement on Ministry, (if such an agreement seemed possible) for submission to ARCIC in the following September.

The working pattern of the Commission, dictated largely by the spread of its membership over four continents, may seem clumsy on paper. In fact, it possesses advantages in that the procedure makes

for deliberation and careful work. It can also involve all the members of the Commission by inviting them to undertake specific tasks and the wide-spread provenance of the membership incidentally ensures contact with an extended range of theological activities and developments in many countries. The working pattern also established conclusively the need for such a widely separated group to have before it a document, if only for demolition purposes, when it met. Without this, progress would become almost impossible.

In the course of the plenary discussions at Gazzada many matters received attention. For example, these included, Do the members of the Church share in the priesthood of Christ or in its effects? *Who* were apostles? Are there two levels of apostolicity, namely, a quality of the Church and signs and criteria of this? The importance of the local Church in the context of apostolic succession was emphasised and the comment was made that the recent Anglican-Methodist Ordinal and its preface contained almost all that was essential for a doctrine of ministry. Once again, stress was laid on the theological and practical importance of the concept of substantial agreement. It seemed to some that at Gazzada there was not a confrontation of ministry between two Churches, but a confrontation between two or more theologies of ministry which cut across denominational lines. Gazzada was a time of hard and far-ranging work; a process of digesting the important papers provided; a process of subjecting argumentation to close scrutiny and to frank and intensive criticism. It was an essential workshop in which as work proceeded - though this was not always easily discernible - the shape of a future document on ministry was already in the mould.

b. *The Fifth Meeting at Canterbury: an Agreed Statement on Ministry and Ordination*

The Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission held its fifth meeting at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury from August 28th-September 6th 1973. The preliminary meeting arranged at Gazzada by the Commission took place at Poringland from 11th-15th June and was attended by eight members.⁴

What Gazzada had achieved was to establish a distinction between Christ's unique priesthood, the 'royal priesthood' of the people of God, and the rôle and function of ministers within and for the whole Church. This proved significant for the form and content of the statement on Ministry as did the emphasis on the apostolicity of the whole Church.

At the Commission's request, the proceedings at Poringland and Canterbury were summarised by the Rev. Colin Davey. This summary was printed as an

2. Grove Booklet No. 13 (Bramcote, Notts., 1973). The paper also appeared in the 'Nouvelle Revue Théologique' and in 'One in Christ' (April 1973). It was translated into English by Canon W. A. Purdy.

3. The Woodstock meeting had seen this as a subject for the following year.

4. Bishop Clark, Bishop McAadoo, Bishop Butler, Bishop Moorman, Fr. Tillard, Fr. Duprey, Mr. Charley and Mr. Davey.

Appendix to the Statement in order to give some indication, not only of the Commission's method and procedure, but also of the stages by which the conclusions were reached. For convenience, the section of the Appendix relating to the work is included as an account of both meetings: 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. Subcommittees 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 Sub-committee would meet at Poringland, Norwich, from 11 to 15 June 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 meeting Bishop Clark and Bishop McAdoo each produced a paper incorporating the material received from the subcommittees and portions of 'The Ordained Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective' by the World Council of Churches Faith and Order Commission, the French Catholic-Reformed 'Groupe des Dombes' Statement on the Ministry entitled 'Pour une réconciliation des ministères', and 'Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue IV'. Members of the subcommittee had also been supplied with a paper by Fr. George Tavard, 'A Theological Approach to Ministerial Authority', Bishop Butler's recent articles on the ministry in 'The Tablet', Bishop Clark's summary in English of an article by Fr. Louis Bouyer, 'Ministère Ecclésiastique et Succession Apostolique', and a passage on the office of bishops from the new 'Directorium de Pastoralis Ministerio Episcoporum'.

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 rôle as ministers and then to give the theological and New Testament justification for this. Discussion focused on the function of *episcopus* (oversight) and the rôle of the ordained minister "as unifying figure, as coordinator, as judge, as director, as leader who serves". Ordination as a sacramental act was also debated and emphasis laid on 2 Cor. 3:5-6, 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 from 28 August to 6 September 1973 they also received copies of the Report of the Joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic Study Commission on 'The Gospel and the Church', 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 1967-1970, section 6 of which is on Ministry; the Six Proposition with which the Roman Catholic International Theological Commission concluded their October 1970 report on 'The Priestly Ministry', and the document on 'The Ministerial Priesthood' issued by the Second General Assembly of the Roman Catholic Synod of Bishops in 1971.

The Poringland document was the starting-point for the discussions at Canterbury which began by considering what could 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 (*episcopus*, 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 scrutinized, 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 Ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries." It recognizes "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

The Agreed Statement on 'Ministry and Ordination' was widely welcomed by many, including the Secretary of the Methodist Conference and the Joint Secretaries of the United Reformed Church (in a letter to the 'Times' of 19th December 1973). They

5. Ministry and Ordination: A Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry Agreed by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Canterbury 1973 (London 1973), pp.17-20.

commended "the return to the New Testament" and found themselves "in substantial agreement with the understanding of the doctrine of the ministry there expressed." There were criticisms of course from conservatives on both sides and there were those who wished that there had been more thrust towards recognition of actual ministries, but on the whole it was recognised that the Commission was concerned with establishing more and more common ground between the Churches as an essential preliminary. This approach was clearly stated in paragraph 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".

The methodology of the Statement is the same as that on the Eucharist, namely, to express an understanding of the fact of Ministry, "which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the traditions of our common inheritance" (Canterbury Statement (1) and to achieve a substantial agreement: "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" (17). Such substantial agreement allows for "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" (Preface).

Detailed evaluations of the Agreed Statement have been published by individual members of the Commission covering most aspects of its structure and content.⁶ Perhaps, therefore, but one matter bearing on Anglican Roman Catholic relations requires re-emphasising. The final paragraph, pointing out that agreement about the nature of ministry is an indispensable prelude to the mutual recognition of ministries, draws attention to the development of thinking on the subject in the Churches and asserts that this development is represented in the Agreed Statement. In other words, if it can be shown that the presuppositions of 'Apostolicae Curae' are no longer those of the Roman Catholic Church today then, in fact and to quote the

Canterbury Statement, the issues are indeed "put in a new context". The view, commonly held in 1896, that the essence of priesthood is the emphasis on a sacrificing priesthood, that *sacerdotium* means sacrificing priesthood and is the equivalent of ministry, never had support from the ordinals and ordination forms which did not mention sacerdotal powers,⁷ and it differs from patristic theologies of priesthood. That there has been development (towards the earlier view) since then, can be seen from a study of Vatican II's 'Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests' (described in an introduction as enlarging our vision of the priesthood: no longer is the focus almost exclusively on the priest as the "cult man")⁸. In the Agreed Statement, as a commentator put it, there is a "developed theology" and "it is not so much that new ideas are introduced; rather, traditional ideas are related to a new balance".⁹ A similar developed theology may be seen in the Synod of Bishops' 'The Ministerial Priesthood' (1971), especially, for example, I (4): "Among the various charisms and services, the priestly ministry of the New Testament, which continues Christ's function as mediator, and which in essence and not merely in degree is distinct from the common priesthood of all the faithful (cp. L G 10) alone perpetuates the essential work of the Apostles: by effectively proclaiming the Gospel, by gathering together and leading the community, by remitting sins, and especially by celebrating the Eucharist, it makes Christ, the head of the community, present in the exercise of his work of redeeming mankind and glorifying God perfectly"¹⁰. Similarly, the report of the Roman Catholic International Theological Commission on 'The Priestly Ministry', dated 10th October 1970, ends with six propositions which testify to this development of thinking about priesthood¹¹. That this development represented in the Agreed Statement is a convergent one is clear from comparison of the documents mentioned with the 'Reply of the English Archbishops' (1897) and with, for example, the section on priesthood in the report on 'Renewal in Ministry' to the Lambeth Conference of 1968.¹² It may well be that by its rigorous process of seeking for common ground and agreement at the level of faith, within which there can be both unity and diversity, the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission is doing a service and making a contribution which will be creative in the future.

6. E.g. The Canterbury Statement, With an Introduction and Commentary (Catholic Information Office, 1973) by ALAN C. CLARK; 'Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry (London 1975)', Foreword by ALAN C. CLARK and Introduction by H.R. McADOO; Agreement on the Doctrine of Ministry' (Grove Booklet No. 22, 1973) by JULIAN W. CHARLEY; A Step Forward: the Canterbury Agreement on Ministry (Lumen Vitae, Vol. XXIX, 1974, No. 2) by J.M.R. TILLARD O.P.

7. Cp. Stewards of the Lord (London 1970), by JOHN JAY HUGHES, pp. 23-25.

8. The Documents of Vatican II (1967) ed. WALTER M. ABBOT S.J., pp. 526-527.

9. The Month (January 1974), p. 436.

10. Published by the Vatican Polyglot Press 1971.

11. Published in Editions du Cerf (Paris 1971).

12. The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports (London and New York 1968), pp. 100-102.

c. *The Agreed Statement on Authority in the Church* (Venice 1976).

The origins of the Venice Statement on 'Authority in the Church' (1976) are to be traced far back in the meetings and discussions of the Commission. Although "the question of authority, its nature, exercise, and 'implications'" constituted the final part of the Commission's briefing as set out in the 'Malta Report' (22), it was inevitable that aspects of this theme would constantly make themselves felt throughout the dialogue.

This will be clear from the following account of the course of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission's discussion on authority. It has been compiled by the Reverend Christopher Hill of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Counsellors on Foreign Relations, who is also the Commission's Anglican Secretary and to whom I am indebted for the use of the material compiled as an *aide-mémoire*:

At the first meeting of the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission at Windsor in the January of 1970 a decision was taken to divide the Commission for part of the time into three groups, one of them concentrating on the question of 'Church and Authority' while the other two groups dealt with 'Church and Ministry' and 'Church and Eucharist'.

Papers providing a basis for an exploration of agreements and differences on the question of authority were provided by Bishop Christopher Butler, OSB, Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Dean Henry Chadwick. (These papers had been commissioned at an informal meeting in Dublin during May 1969 prior to the final formation of the Commission itself). Bishop Butler concentrated on the question of the location and quality of 'official' authority in the Church (presupposing its existence alongside that of expertise and charisma). In the Roman Catholic view there were occasions when the formulations of ecumenical councils or popes might not be discarded as false, Nicea's 'consubstantial' being an example. Though such a decision was *non ex consensu*, it was nevertheless the articulation of the mind of the whole Church. Bishop Knapp-Fisher (with a Roman Catholic consultant, Fr Edmund Hill, OP) examined the question of 'Fundamentals'. Areas of agreement and disagreement were explored in relation to the problems of: 'Revelation and Faith,' 'Scripture and Tradition,' 'Church and Authority' and finally 'Dogmatic Definitions and Comprehensiveness'. Dean Chadwick set the specific question of Christian authority in the wider context of the current debate on authority in general and (following Max Weber) he discerned patriarchal, functional and charismatic categories. An antithesis between evidence and authority as the ground of belief was eschewed both in the general and more specifically Christian discussion. Nevertheless there were differing emphases between Anglican and Roman Catholic exercises of authority; a preference for a dif-

fuse, 'indefectibility' on the one hand and a unitative organ of 'infallibility' on the other.

After discussion in the sub-commission a draft schema on 'Church and Authority' was presented to the full Commission. Significantly this schema was divided into two major sections: 'Church as Koinonia' and 'Koinonia and Authority'. All three sub-commissions were asked to prepare fuller drafts in preparation for the next meeting of the Commission in Venice during the September of the same year.

Bishop Butler and Dean Chadwick were responsible for convening the 'Church and Authority' sub-commission which was to be based in the United Kingdom. It was agreed that all the sub-commissions might co-opt help from outside the Commission itself and, acting as Secretary, Dr. John Halliburton encouraged a number of theologians to contribute short papers on the themes of the Windsor draft. These included a re-examination of the concept of infallibility by Fr. Edward Yarnold, SJ.

At Venice where the Commission's Second Meeting took place, the Windsor schema on 'Church and Authority' was discussed at length, elaborated and amended. The resulting Venice paper on 'Church and Authority' spoke jointly of the Church as the People of God, a community entrusted with the task of preserving and witnessing to the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles. The local churches shared the same word and sacraments and were constituted a single universal family. The chief bond of unity, both local and universal, was the apostolic ministry of oversight. Apostolic faith, sacraments, and ministry were thus deemed to be constitutive of the Church. Authority was to be located in the tradition of the Christian community of which the Scriptures were the supreme document. Creeds and councils required both consonance with Scripture and reception by the Church. Ecumenical Councils could not be reversed. Bishops were the normal teachers in the Church and their president endowed with a special dignity.

There then followed two views of the *koinonia* and of authority in the Church. On the Roman Catholic side it was noted that Vatican II implied that perfect communion was preserved in communion with Rome. The episcopate exercised its responsibility in collegial fashion, either collectively, or through its president. When it did so in a decision formulating the once for all revelation it was endowed with the charisma called 'infallibility'. On the Anglican side there was no claim to be the unique embodiment of the Church. Anglicans shared with Roman Catholics the same fundamental doctrines, papal authority excepted. A Roman primacy of service was acceptable but the decrees of Vatican I and the application of the petrine texts to the bishops of Rome were not. Indefectibility was preferred to infallibility, the Church being granted continual correction, safeguarded from final departure from the truth by the Spirit. The proposed text of the Lambeth Conference of 1968

was quoted to the effect that it was fitting that the bishop of Rome should preside over the whole College of Bishops. Hesitations remained over the pragmatic exercise of papal authority but the papal office could be not only a sign of unity but a guarantee of diversity.

The sub-commission spoke with one voice again to note the primacy of Scripture as a possible basis of a hierarchy of truths. Even differences in the interpretation of papal authority might not necessarily be a barrier to communion as an interim stage towards union.

The decision was taken at Venice that it would be in the interest of Anglican/Roman Catholic relations to publish all three sub-commission drafts, in order to show the stage the Commission's work had reached and to invite comments and criticism. After the agreement of the respective authorities, this was done simultaneously in 'Theology', the 'Clergy Review' and 'One in Christ,' during February 1971.

While a full discussion of the question of 'Church and Authority' had been postponed since the Venice meeting of 1970, the issues raised by it were never very far away from the surface in the discussions on the doctrine of the Eucharist and Ministry. Furthermore the methodology of the Commission had been established, a methodology which began by an examination of the present faith of the two traditions. The Commission had also learnt more of the value of the theological concepts of *koinonia* and *episcopate*. These would be invaluable tools in the unravelling of the most difficult of the problems dividing the two traditions: papal primacy and infallibility.

In 1974 no less than 30 papers and memoranda were circulated, from individuals, sub-commissions and national commissions, as background material in preparation for the assault on 'Church and Authority'. The English Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission offered a paper on 'Infallibility and Indefectibility'; the former seen as an aspect of the latter. The South African Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission prepared material on the 'Authority of the Bible' and the 'Redemptive Authority of Christ'. An Oxford sub-commission convened by Dr. Halliburton and Fr. Yarnold, SJ., submitted work on 'Ecclesiology in the light of Vatican II'. The Church was seen as a "mystery" as fully present in its local manifestation as in the assembly of local churches in communions. Though the bishop of a local church could not act without reference to other local churches, this did not mean that the unity of local churches implied a uniformity of devotion, liturgy or theology.

Individual papers, by no means prepared exclusively by members of the Commission, covered a further wide area. This included the treatment of Scripture and ecumenical councils in Anglican thought, the dogmatic decrees on Revelation (*Dei Verbi*) and the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) of the Second Vatican Council and Magisterium in the Early Church, schism, the Petrine texts, and *koinonia* as a basis of ecclesiology.

Amongst individual papers those by Fr. Herbert Ryan, SJ and Fr. Jean Tillard, OP were of particular significance. Fr. Ryan had been asked at Canterbury to write on the dogmatic decree on the Church ('Pastor Eternus') of the First Vatican Council's ascription of an "ordinary, truly episcopal and immediate power of jurisdiction" to the pope. This was then re-interpreted as essentially affirming that the question of a primacy of jurisdiction was to be answered in terms of the example of Peter. A final speculation was added as to how this might be embodied in a reunited Church, the model of "compulsory arbitration" being suggested as valuable. Fr. Tillard's paper was concerned with the *sensus fidelium*, which was not to be understood in terms of popular faith or devotion, nor reduced to conceptual categories. It was rather to be understood as the Word received and lived in the Church. The Magisterium was not exempt from participation in this process; its function, through 'osmosis', was to serve the purpose of the Word by drawing out the objective content of the insights of the People of God.

The Commission also received the March 1974 Joint Statement of the United States Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue 'Papal Primacy and the Universal Church'. This spoke of the possibility, in a united Church, of the recognition of a "Petrine function" of the bishop of Rome in relation to the unity of the whole Church.

The sixth meeting of the Commission took place at Rocco di Papa, Grottaferrata in August-September 1974. The Commission divided itself into three sub-commissions. The first sub-commission, under the chairmanship of Fr. Yarnold, was to deal with 'New Testament and Authority'; the second, under Bishop Vogel, 'Ecclesiology and *Koinonia*'; the third under Dean Chadwick, 'Infallibility and Indefectibility'. At the end of the meeting, and after the cross-fertilization of comments in full session, the sub-commission produced three (incomplete) working papers.

The first sub-commission began with an extended preface defining the nature of authority. It then went on to speak of Christian authority in terms of the absolute claim of God upon man, instancing this from the Old Testament, but more particularly the perfect example of God's call and man's response in Jesus Christ. Though his obedience and exaltation, Christ had been made Lord of the Church. The Spirit was seen as giving particular gifts for the building up of the Church and the discernment to recognise them. From the beginning it was also the Church's responsibility to discern the mind of Christ, fidelity to whom required obedience to the apostolic tradition and the necessity of its identification in the written records which became the New Testament. Scripture was therefore recognised as both authoritative and normative. Its contemporary interpretation was the continuing responsibility of the whole community through the interaction of teachers, those in pastoral authority and the *sensus fidelium*.

The second sub-commission began with the assertion that the Holy Spirit constituted the *koinonia*, equipped the community for mission and safeguarded its faithfulness to the truth. Authentic Christian life disclosed the authoritative claim of Christ on man. Particular authority was given by the Spirit through ordination for the building up of the Body of Christ. The bishop's pastoral authority entailed the power of intervention for the sake of the community; however, all ministerial authority was to be exercised in mutual responsibility and interdependence. Even so the perception of the mind of Christ did not pertain exclusively to the ordained ministry but rather to an interaction of all the members of the Church. There was a discernment of the insights of the whole community on the part of the ordained ministry and a response to, and assessment of, this discernment by the community.

The third sub-commission gave their working paper subtitles, beginning with 'Permanence in the Truth.' There was recognition that the Church was constantly called to penitence and reform under the Word but that the Spirit ensured that the Church would never cease to the sign of salvation. There had been and might be, situations where the Church's chief pastors, in interaction with the whole community, were obliged to give definitive answers to decisive questions. Such definitive answers required the gift of discernment, as did their reception. There followed a treatment of 'Unity and Diversity' which repeated the Venice suggestion that the papal office might not only be a sign of the former but also a guarantee of the latter. Then came the sub-commission's historical reflection on 'The Roman Primacy'. The Gnostic crisis led to a Catholic stress on the testimony of the apostolic sees; among them a special position was occupied by the Church of Rome through its relation to the apostles Peter and Paul. In later centuries the principal basis of the primacy was this recognition of Rome as the 'apostolic see' *par excellence*. The further development of the primacy based upon the claim of the Roman bishops to be the successors of the apostle Peter, on the basis of the Petrine texts, was subsequently rejected by the churches of the Reformation. Anglicans were asked what was the maximum exercise and interpretation of the Roman primacy they would find acceptable and Roman Catholics the minimum. The fundamental question was that of the basis of any common recognition of the Roman primacy. The Anglicans suggested as an answer a view of the primacy as arising *divina providencia*. There followed a note on the difficulties concerning papal primacy and infallibility as Anglicans saw them which ended by asking whether a primacy *de jure divino* was sufficiently high in the "hierarchy of truths" to prevent unity. Complementary to this were two Roman Catholic questions addressed to Anglicans. The first asked whether there was an authority in the Church which, in order to ensure permanence in the truth, could take binding decisions. The second asked

for reaction to the statement that the supreme authority in the Church resided in the episcopal college, and could exercise its authority either collectively or through its president.

After discussion on the work of the three sub-commissions it was decided that four further papers were required. Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed to ask the South African Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission to prepare material on authority in the New Testament, Fr. Tillard agreed to investigate primacy, Dean Chadwick infallibility, and Fr. Duprey to ask Professor G. Alberigo (of the University of Bologna) to submit a study on the theology of jurisdiction. It was also agreed to hold an informal meeting at the turn of the year to reflect upon existing material, and to revise and consolidate the work of Grottaferrata (in particular the working papers of the first and second sub-commissions which possessed a continuity of style and methodology with the two previous Agreed Statements). The Commission further agreed to hold a formal sub-commission meeting, in conjunction with the steering committee, in June of the following year to continue the work begun at Grottaferrata. It was felt that a serious treatment of the local church and its bishop was essential if the question of councils, primacy and infallibility was to be seen in perspective. This interim meeting would, hopefully, be able to offer the full Commission a composite and extended draft dealing with the question of authority up to, but not including, the question of primacy and infallibility, thus leaving the next meeting of the full Commission to grasp this nettle.

In the December of 1974 the informal meeting to consolidate the material of the previous autumn duly took place at the home of Bishop Alan Clark at Poringland, Norwich. There thus emerged a document of four paragraphs incorporating the major insights and concerns of subcommission one of the Grottaferrata meeting (but excluding its prefatory definition of authority). The Poringland draft spoke of the Lordship of Christ, the authority of Scripture, the authority of the ordained ministry and the inadequacy of all human authority. These themes will be recognised as those of paras. 1, 2, 5 and 7 of the present document and the actual text of the Poringland draft is indeed substantially to be found in all but paragraph 5.

In the following June the more formal sub-commission/steering committee met in London to attempt a continuation of the extant material. The work of the South African ARC on 'Authority in the New Testament' had been circulated by this time, as had a memorandum on 'The Nature and Exercise of Authority in the Church: Notes on the implications of Anglican formularies and theology' by Bishop Henry McAdoo. At this St. Katharine's meeting (the group met at the Royal Foundation of St. Katharine, London,) the Poringland draft was taken as a beginning. Nevertheless important paragraphs on the au-

hority of the Christian community vis à vis the world, the authority within the Church of holiness and special gifts, and of the *sensus fidelium* were interpolated and the Poringland paragraph on the authority of the ordained ministry replaced. (The paragraph on holiness and special gifts was entirely new but the remainder of this material owed not a little to the draft of the second sub-commission at Grottaferrata.) Finally the logic of the document was taken further by the addition of two paragraphs concerning the *koinonia* among local churches (reflecting the work of the Oxford sub-commission of 1974) and its expression in councils and collegiality. Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of Venice have their origin at this meeting, by the end of which there was a draft of nine paragraphs substantially identical to those finally accepted as Venice 1-9. During the course of this meeting too the outline and shape and logic of the treatment of authority eventually seen at Venice began to emerge with some degree of clarity. This pattern is now seen in a more developed form in the section and paragraph headings in the Venice Statement.

The Commission met in full at Oxford during August-September 1975 with the St. Katharine's draft before it, and the papers requested at Grottaferrata. Professor Alberigo's study of jurisdiction made the point that the term was far from univocal; its origin was to be found in the pastoral and sacramental realm. Fr. Tillard contributed a stimulating paper entitled "The Horizon of the 'Primacy' of the Bishop of Rome". The First Vatican Council's clear teaching that the truly episcopal jurisdiction of the pope in no way conflicted with the jurisdiction of the local bishop was seen as having fundamental significance. There was an equivocation in the use of the term *potestas ordinaria*. An understanding of primacy had to begin with the local rather than universal Church. For the ministry of the local bishop to be authentically Catholic, both in relation to his own Church and the universal Church, communion with the *centrum unitatis* was necessary. Thus the unique episcopal function of the *prôtos* of the episcopal college was to guarantee the catholicity of all the local churches. Dean Chadwick's memorandum 'Truth and Authority delineated truth in terms of the salvation of man in Christ. The organs of authority were primarily the Scriptures, the creeds, the liturgy, the ministry, and the common consensus of all believers. The functioning of authority in the early church was to be seen in synodical and conciliar activity, culminating in general councils duly received by the church and the great sees of apostolic foundation, pre-eminently Rome. (The petrine texts were however never universally accepted as the basis of this primacy). A consequence of the modern definition of infallibility might well be the diminution of "ordinary magisterium". The Anglican tradition agreed with Rome that the Church could not err fundamentally, but thought of indefectibility rather than infallibility, and of a multiple authority. Infallibility needed to be disentangled and

demythologised; it affirmed the objective character of divine truth and a gift enabling the bishop of Rome, under certain strict conditions, to speak in such a way as not to formulate positive truth in a way that would be permanently disastrous.

The Commission scrutinised the St. Katharine's document but refrained from a detailed revision, as it was not yet complete. There was also considerable discussion of the major papers on primacy and infallibility. It was resolved that the Commission should work in two groups: one under the chairmanship of Bishop McAdoo to pursue the question of infallibility with the theme 'Truth'; the other under the chairmanship of Bishop Clark to do the same for primacy with the theme 'Unity'. The 'Unity' sub-commission was asked to continue the line of thinking of the St. Katharine's draft, though its membership was not coterminous with that group.

The 'Unity' sub-commission added three paragraphs to the St. Katharine's draft. These dealt with the emergence of primacy as a particular form of *episcopate*, the responsibility of the primate and the context of the particular primacy of Rome, and the historical pre-eminence of the see of Rome and its ancient and modern theological interpretation. This material is substantially identified with Venice paragraphs 10, 11 and 12.

The 'Truth' sub-commission envisaged their material as following that of the eventual work of the 'Unity' group which was itself to continue the St. Katharine's draft. After reference to the full Commission at various stages, a 'Truth' document of twelve paragraphs emerged. It was declared that the Church would endure and have the continual duty of guarding and proclaiming the saving truth of Christ. In formulating the Church's faith, the Scriptures and their summary in the creeds were basic, together with the testimony of prayer and worship, preaching, councils and the consensus of the faithful. The Church had the task of interpreting the Gospel in contemporary terms and looking back through the tradition to the witness to Christ in the Scriptures. Such renewal and reformation was itself historically dated, and yet the Church had so committed itself to some formulations that they had become an integral part of its faith. This did not imply, however, that churches would be free from error. The formation of the canon of the New Testament indicated the Church's awareness of its ability to make permanent judgements, the test of which was reception. Anglicans and Roman Catholics had used different language to designate irrevocable positions: 'fundamentals' and '*de fide*' doctrines. In spite of the wider field of the latter, there was deep agreement and much in common. The "hierarchy of truths" indicated that some '*de fide*' doctrines were closer to the christological centre of the faith than others, and further theological investigation was required here in relation to the Marian dogmas and papal authority. Before the separation of East and West the bishop of Rome was seen as bearing a special

responsibility in the universal Church in regard to the ratification of general councils. But in a disunited Church this role, which implied a power of judgement, in abnormal circumstances even without a council, was not clearly seen. The Roman Catholic Church taught that such an exercise of authority was legitimate in view of his headship of the episcopal college, but only in the light of the *sensus fidelium*, in consultation with brother bishops, and in conformity to Scripture. It was not a matter of personal inspiration but protection from error by the Holy Spirit. Anglicans still had grave difficulties concerning such an exercise of authority but the affirmation of the objective character of divine truth was a common reality. The work of the sub-commission was much indebted to Dean Chadwick's paper. This material was later re-worked but forms the basis of Venice 15 and 16.

At the conclusion of the Oxford meeting it was felt that both sub-commissions had reached the very brink of the problem of primacy and infallibility. As well as detailed discussion of the drafts, there was an extended debate on the work for the coming year, both sub-commissions having offered schemas for further work. Two areas needed further clarification: Anglican ecclesiology and papal primacy, and the significance of such a primacy as an object of faith. Professor Eugene Fairweather accepted a Canadian responsibility for the former question and Fr. Tavad the latter. It was decided that the three documents before the Commission (the St. Katharine's, 'Unity', and 'Truth' drafts) should be examined with a view to their being put together as a composite whole. The 'Unity' draft followed logically from the St. Katharine's draft in any case, but the style and method of the 'Truth' draft differed significantly from both. A suggestion of an informal meeting similar to the one held the previous year, was accepted. Also, following the pattern of the previous year, it was decided to hold a larger and more formal sub-commission meeting, in conjunction with the steering committee, in the early summer. It was hoped that this gathering could take the Commission over the brink by continuing the work of the two Oxford sub-commissions and offer its next plenary meeting a complete draft on authority.

During February 1976 a small group met (at Poringland again) to attempt the first of the tasks requested at the Oxford meeting: the welding of the 'Truth' material on to the St. Katharine's/'Unity' document. To achieve homogeneity of style it was felt right to continue the logic of the St. Katharine's/'Unity' material but to do so in the light of the 'Truth' document and to incorporate the latter's insights. (A member of the 'Truth' sub-commission was included in the group at Poringland.) The result was a continuation of six paragraphs, which described the exercise of authority in matters of faith in the *koinonia* of the churches. The continuation first emphasised the general point of the centrality of *koinonia* in truth. There followed two paragraphs leading on from this

to an understanding of tradition as 'memory' and the prophetic interpretation of the unchanging truth in contemporary terms. Here there was a direct dependence on themes (and to a lesser degree the actual text) of the earlier 'Truth' draft. Next came a statement of the consequential commitment of the Church to decisions of permanent value and again 'Truth' themes and material were incorporated. The logic then led to the particular historical responsibility of the bishop of Rome in this process, both in the endorsement of councils and in personal intervention. Finally there was a treatment of the safeguards of truth in the interaction of the *sensus fidelium* and the bishops (in respect of their responsibility for discernment) which gave ecumenical councils a unique quality and authority. The work of the Poringland sub-commission can now be substantially seen in Venice paragraphs 13, 15, 16, 17. Though there was a paragraph corresponding to Venice 18, this was later to be almost completely redrafted.

The sub-commission/steering committee met at Hengrave Hall, Bury St. Edmunds, during the following June with the intention of attempting to draft provisional material which would complete the Poringland document. First of all, however, there was some revision of the extant material in the light of comment and criticism from other members of the Commission and in particular Bishop McAdoo, Bishop Vogel and Fr. Tavad. Three new paragraphs were then added concerning primatial authority, its collegial context and its interaction with conciliar authority. Material from these paragraphs can be seen as Venice 20, 21 and 22. Finally a concluding paragraph was drafted, spelling out the implications of the whole schema, which ran coherently from what is now Venice 1-22 though major revision was indeed still to take place.

The Venice meeting of August/September 1976 was finally to produce the Agreed Statement 'Authority in the Church'. Papers were received from Dr. Eric Jay through the Canadian Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission and from Fr. Tavad. Dr. Jay's paper outlined historical Anglican (theoretical) acceptancy of a Roman Primacy. Fr. Tavad's paper argued against regarding Primacy and Infallibility as objects of faith. The Hengrave draft was, however, the principal basis of the Commission's discussions. It was decided to concentrate on the newer material which had been less worked over by the whole Commission, that is to say the material which now stands as Venice paragraphs 13-23.

There was considerable re-drafting. A sub-commission re-introduced certain themes from the Oxford 'Truth' Sub-Commission, resulting in a fuller treatment of 'The expression of truth', 'The communication of truth' and 'Conciliar authority' (paras. 14, 15 and 16) and the Hengrave order was somewhat rearranged. Venice paragraph 14 represents inserted Oxford material which had no place in the Hengrave draft at all. The Hengrave draft was also seen

to be inadequate in its treatment of the indefectibility of the Church and of Ecumenical Councils and the present paragraphs 18 and 19 represent a major re-writing of the earlier material. Another sub-commission worked on this material in no less than three redrafts of the Hengrave material all of which was scrutinized and criticised by the full Commission as work proceeded. In constructing the present Venice paragraph 18 two particular concerns were stressed: the danger of obscuring the ordinary authority of the Church by concentration on extra-ordinary situations; the Spirit's maintenance of the Church in the truth, in spite of acknowledged error in official teaching, through the interaction of bishops and people. A Hengrave footnote on the Anglican understanding of a balanced authority was also moved to this point. The Hengrave material was then considerably expanded into a separate paragraph now seen as 19, and to which another footnote was added. Like other parts of this text this paragraph was intended to be read as a whole. The Commission wanted to avoid two extremes: that an ecumenical definition had no authority prior to reception; and that, on the contrary, a Council owed nothing to reception. The Commission did not define the nature of an ecumenical Council, but made clear that the unique authority it spoke of could only be ascribed to those councils designated ecumenical.

A further sub-commission re-wrote the Hengrave material on 'The exercise of primate authority,' 'Primate authority and diversity' and 'The balance of authority' now seen as 20, 21 and 22. Although the Hengrave draft had a conclusion this was not substantially taken up by yet another sub-commission which drafted the material now seen as Venice paragraph 23 'Universal primacy' and the subsequent paragraphs 24-26. Paragraph 23 was thought to sum up carefully the drift of the whole Agreed Statement. Paragraph 24 was introduced to give some recognition to the traditional emotive problems the Roman Primacy gave rise to for Anglicans. It also indicates reasons for thinking the problems less serious than has been thought previously. Paragraph 25 says something of the method of the Commission and the final paragraph asks for a positive assessment of the three Agreed Statements and a consequent moving to the next stage towards unity. At the same time as the theological drafting two editors worked through the text of the whole Agreed Statement with a view to the eradication of verbal and grammatical infelicities and the achievement of a homogeneity of style. The Statement was unanimously agreed and the texts of the Co-Chairmen's Preface approved.

It was recognised than in ARCIC's Final Report something more would have to be said about the problems raised in paragraph 24, and that at that stage the Commission would try to elaborate those aspects of the Statement which proved to be less clear or less adequate than was originally thought.

Following the publication of the Venice Statement on 'Authority in the Church' (1976), two events happened, both of which had bearing on the relations between the two Communion and on the work of the International Commission.

d. *The 'Common Declaration' (1977) of Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Donald Coggan of Canterbury.*

The first of these was the meeting between Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Vatican on April 28th, 1977. In the course of his greeting to the Archbishop and his party, the Pope said: "The history of relations between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion has been marked by the staunch witness of such men as Charles Brent, Lord Halifax, William Temple and George Bell among the Anglicans; and Abbé Portal, Dom Lambert Beauduin, Cardinal Mercier and Cardinal Bea among the Catholics. The pace of this movement has quickened marvellously in recent years, so that these words of hope 'The Anglican Church united not absorbed' are no longer a mere dream".¹³ These words, clinched by the use of the title of Beauduin's paper at Malines a half century before, seemed to sum up the not inconsiderable change in the climate since that time.

In his reply, the Archbishop referred to this growing warmth in Anglican/Roman Catholic relations demonstrated by the visits of Archbishop Fisher to Pope John XXIII and of his own predecessor, Archbishop Ramsey in 1966, from which the impetus for the serious dialogue had chiefly derived. The Archbishop specifically mentioned the three Agreed Statements and the work of the Commission, and he invited Pope Paul to send observers to the Lambeth Conference of 1978.

After protracted and private discussions, the Pope and the Archbishop signed on the next day their 'Common Declaration'.

Those who see a *detection of themes* as the most important element in the evaluation of relationships which span a couple of centuries, will find it significant that certain themes re-emerge in this latest document. Among them is that of convergence which, as we have seen, had to fight its way into theological respectability but now appears to have received the accolade of a Pope and a Primate (Common Declaration, 3). Furthermore, there is the emphasis on the common trinitarian faith, the common baptism, the sharing in the Scriptures, Creeds, and Chalcedonian definition, together with the common inheritance in patristics and spirituality (2). Significantly again, this is simply lifted from the 'Malta Report, (3), just as the use of the term "serious dialogue" refers back to the 'Common Declaration' of 1966. Mixed marriage

13. All quotations referring to this visit are from 'Pilgrim for Unity' (C.T.S. and S.P.C.K., London 1977), unless otherwise noted.

ges appear once more, and still as an obstacle (6) and this is disappointing since this blockage (which in its acute and juristic aspect is of twentieth-century origin) could be removed more easily than any other. Reference is also made to the fact that "serious obstacles remain both of the past and recent origin" (9). The last words are taken to mean that the ordination of women to the priesthood in some Anglican Provinces has introduced a new hold-up in possible movement towards unity. The debate on this goes on, with both sides receiving support within the Anglican Communion, and the matter was the subject of an irenic resolution (11) at the Lambeth Conference of 1978. While disagreement stopped short of division it is clear that the matter will not just go away, even for the Roman Catholic Church. The respectful presentation of the case by Sister Theresa Kane during the visit of Pope John Paul II to the United States in 1979 was only the tip of this particular iceberg in the American situation. No doubt, such visits on such a scale do not allow for the possibility of real dialogue with the result that, while America heard the Pope, the Pope did not really have the opportunity of hearing America.

The 'Common Declaration' of 1977 made specific mention of the work of ARCIC and took a small but real step forward when, referring to the Windsor, Canterbury and Venice Statements, it said: 'We now recommend that the work it has begun be pursued, through the procedures appropriate to our respective Communion, so that both of them may be led along the path towards unity.'

The moment will shortly come when the respective Authorities must evaluate the conclusions.'(4).

This process has been going on in the responses received by the Commission from many Roman Catholic episcopal conferences. These have been generally favourable though numerous matters for comment and criticism have been raised. Anglican General Synods around the world have likewise considered the statements and while criticising various points have all concluded that the documents are consonant with the faith of the Church and constitute ground for a closer inter-Church relationship. The Lambeth Conference endorsed this standpoint in 1978. Nevertheless, response on a global scale on behalf of both Communion is the necessary next step and one which may not be long delayed.

Finally, the 'Common Declaration' (9) raised the matter of intercommunion, having pointed out that our Christian witness to the world is hindered by the fact that "between us communion remains imperfect" though our divisions "do not close all roads we may travel together". Noting that there is a desire for a closer relationship on the part of many, the Declaration looks ahead to a time of movement: "Many in both Communion are asking themselves whether they have a common faith sufficient to be translated into communion of life, worship and mission. Only

the communions themselves through their pastoral authorities can give that answer".

The question was put to the Churches by the Archbishop of Canterbury when, during the visit to Rome, he preached at the American church, St. Paul's within-the-Walls, and asked "Has not the time now arrived when we have reached such a measure of agreement on so many of the fundamentals of the Gospel that a relationship of shared communion can be encouraged by the leadership of both our Churches?".

That question and the shape of an answer to it are the real agenda for the separated Churches as we enter the eighties of the twentieth century.

e. The Lambeth Conference of 1978

The second event which had its bearing on Anglican/Roman Catholic relations and on the work of ARCIC was of course the eleventh Lambeth Conference held at Canterbury in 1978. Resolutions 33 and 34 dealt specifically with the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission and with Anglican-Roman Catholic marriages respectively.¹⁴ Resolution 33 deserves quotation in full because, having commended ARCIC's work to the active consideration of the whole Communion and having invited the Commission to provide "further explication of the Agreed Statements in consideration of responses received by them", it avers that:

- a) in them "we can recognise the faith of our Church," and
- b) that they provide a basis for a changed inter-Church relationship, and
- c) recalls the Malta Report's concept of unity by stages.

The Resolution reads as follows:

"The Conference:

1. Welcomes the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission which was set up jointly by the Lambeth Conference of 1968 and by the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity;

2. recognizes in the three Agreed Statements of this Commission a solid achievement, one in which we can recognize the faith of our Church, and hopes that they will provide a basis for sacramental sharing between our two Communion if and when the finished Statements are approved by the respective authorities of our Communion;

3. invites ARCIC to provide further explication of the Agreed Statements in consideration of responses received by them;

4. commends to the appropriate authorities in each Communion further consideration of the implications of the Agreed Statements in the light of the

14. The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978 (C10, London 1978) pp. 49-51.

report of the Joint Preparatory Commission (the Malta Report received by the Lambeth Conference 1968—see p. 134 of its report), with a view to bringing about a closer sharing between our two Communions in life, worship and mission;

5. asks the Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council to bring this resolution to the attention of the various synods of the Anglican Communion for discussion and action;

6. asks that in any continuing Commission, the Church of the South and the East be adequately represented”.

The other Resolution, No. 34, welcomes the report of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission on ‘The Theology of Marriage and its Application to Mixed marriages’ (1975). It commented on the measure of agreement achieved and it endorsed two recommendations of the Commission designed to improve the existing unsatisfactory state of affairs. The Conference commented also on the variations of practice in different regions. The Anglican Chairman of the Commission, Archbishop Simms of Armagh, proposed the resolution, but the Conference desired its strengthening and added the final paragraph: “The problems associated with marriage between members of our two Communions continue to hinder inter-Church relations and progress towards unity. While we recognize that there has been an improved situation in some places as a result of the *Motu Proprio*, the general principles underlying the Roman Catholic position are unacceptable to Anglicans. Equality of conscience as between partners in respect of all aspects of their marriage (and in particular with regard to the baptism and religious upbringing of children) is something to be affirmed both for its own sake and for the sake, of an improved relationship between the Churches”.

During the Conference there occurred the death of Pope Paul VI who, with Archbishop Michael Ramsey, had inaugurated the serious dialogue. The Roman Catholic observers were invited to celebrate a Requiem in the plenary hall at which two of the lessons were read by Bishop Howe and Archbishop Simms of Armagh. The invitation and a full attendance of members evoked a warm response of gratitude from the observers. The Bishop of London represented the Archbishop of Canterbury at the funeral in Rome.

His successor, John Paul I, as Patriarch of Venice, had acted as host to the Commission during one of its meetings, and on the occasion of another visit of the Commission was the guest of the members and he took an active interest in ARCIC’s work. At his funeral, coming with tragic suddenness so soon after his installation, the Bishop of London was present as personal representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury who also invited the Anglican Co-Chairman of ARCIC, Archbishop McAdoo of Dublin, to represent the world-wide Anglican Communion. The Pope’s successor, Pope John Paul II, during his visit

to Ireland in 1979, met the leaders of the other Christian Churches in Dublin. Quoting from his address to the members of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in the previous November, he assured those present in the course of his address: “Let no one ever doubt the commitment of the Catholic Church and of the Apostolic See of Rome to the pursuit of the unity of Christians”.

The same year saw the retirement of Archbishop Donald Coggan of Canterbury, who had indeed been a “pilgrim for unity”, and the arrival of his successor, Archbishop Robert Runcie, whose work for Christian unity has been in the sphere of Anglican-Orthodox relations, as the 102nd Archbishop of Canterbury.

f. *The publication of ‘Elucidations’ (Salisbury 1979)*

In June 1979, true to its undertaking to provide its correspondents with a provisional reply to criticisms of ‘Eucharistic Doctrine’ and ‘Ministry and Ordination’, ARCIC published *Elucidations* (SPCK and CTS, London 1979). Thus, the request of the Lambeth Conference, embodied in Resolution 33, was met in part and a similar response to criticisms of ‘Authority in the Church’ was projected. It is worth noting that the Preface states that “These *Elucidations*, agreed at Salisbury in January 1979, express the unanimous view of the Commission on the intention and meaning of the documents. The former should therefore be taken in conjunction with the two Agreed Statements as expressing the mind of the Commission on these two fundamental questions”. In view of the criticism sometimes voiced about ARCIC’s agreed statements that the documents are deliberately ambiguous in order to cover divergent interpretations this prefatory sentence has its own value and importance (*Elucidations* 4). The document is therefore both a companion to Windsor (1971) and Canterbury (1973) and a further explication of both.

Amongst the matters dealt with are the meaning of substantial agreement (1), anamnesis and sacrifice (5), Christ’s presence in the Eucharist (6), gift and reception (7), reservation (8), priesthood (12), the sacramentality of ordination (13) and the ordination of women (15). The clarification embodied in these paragraphs should go a long way to allaying legitimate fears on either side by spelling out, in reference to queries, the meaning of the statements at various points. For example, the use of the term *anamnesis* is justified by its scriptural origin (1 Cor. 11:24-5, Luke 22:19), its early patristic use (Justin Martyr) and its continuous appearance thereafter in the eucharistic prayers of East and West down to the present time (Eucharistic Prayer I in the Roman Missal; The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and the Anglican Series 3, and cp. its use by the Council of Trent and the Anglican Catechism). The Commission’s comment was to the effect that “the traditional understanding of sacramental reality, in which the once-for-all event of salvation becomes effective in the present through

the action of the Holy Spirit, is well expressed by the word *anamnesis*. We accept this use of the word which seems to do full justice to the semitic background. Furthermore, it enables us to affirm a strong conviction of sacramental realism and to reject mere symbolism. However, the selection of this word by the Commission does not mean that our common eucharistic faith may not be expressed in other terms".(5).

Again, in response to those who are anxious lest the word may conceal the theory of a repeated immolation or refer also to an eternal sacrifice in heaven (3), the document, after itemising the Christian use of the word 'Sacrifice', concludes that "there is therefore one historical, unrepeatably offered once for all by Christ and accepted once for all by the Father. In the celebration of the memorial, Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people with himself in a sacramental way so that the Church enters into the movement of his self-offering. In consequence, even though the Church is active in this celebration, this adds nothing to the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross, because the action is itself the fruit of this sacrifice" (5). Further examples of this valuable process of elucidating the meaning of the 'Agreed Statement' may be briefly noted. There is the comment on Windsor's phrase that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ (Eucharistic Doctrine, 10). The relevant section in 'Elucidations' (6) contains the following comment "*Becoming* does not here imply material change. Nor does liturgical use of the word imply that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in such a way that in the eucharistic celebration his presence is limited to the consecrated elements. It does not imply that Christ becomes present in the eucharist in the same manner that he was present in his earthly life. It does not imply that this *becoming* follows the physical laws of this world. What is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses realities of this world to convey the reality of the new creation: bread for this life becomes the bread of eternal life". Again, there is in (7) the assertion that the meaning of the eucharist is impoverished by an exclusive emphasis either on the presence in the elements or on the reception by faith: "In the past acute difficulties have arisen when one or other of these emphases has become almost exclusive. In the opinion of the Commission neither emphasis is incompatible with eucharistic faith, provided that the complementary movement emphasised by the other position is not denied. Eucharistic doctrine must hold together these two movements since in the eucharist, the sacrament of the New Covenant, Christ gives himself to his people so that they may receive him through faith".

Similarly, the commentary on the Canterbury statement on 'Ministry and Ordination' (1973) takes up a number of points raised by the Commission's correspondents in such matters as the place of the priesthood of the whole people of God in the document,

the sacramentality of ordination, ministerial origins and the analogical application of the word 'priesthood' to the people of God and to the ordained ministry: "There are two distinct realities which relate, each in its own way, to the high priesthood of Christ, the unique priesthood of the new covenant, which is their source and model". These considerations should be borne in mind throughout para. 13, and in particular they indicate the significance of the statement that the ordained ministry "is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit".

In view of suggestions by some concerning this quotation from 'Canterbury' (13) it is important for perspective to recall that precisely the same thing was said in the Les Dombes agreement between Roman Catholics and Protestants (1973): "Ordination, the sign of a difference of charisma between the pastoral ministry and the priesthood of the baptised, far from separating ministers from God's people and making them a clerical caste, identifies them more fully with the life of the church". Likewise in the Lutheran/Roman Catholic statement (1970) the same view is echoed. It is "a special order of Ministry, in the Church and "has a special role within the ministry of the people of God" as distinct from the general ministry.¹⁵

On the difficulty raised by the ordination of women, 'Elucidations' (15), notes that where this has taken place "the bishops concerned believe that their action implies no departure from the traditional doctrine of the ordained ministry (as expounded, for instance, in the Agreed Statement)". The Commission recognises that this has created an obstacle for the Roman Catholic Church, and confines itself to saying that "the principles upon which its doctrinal agreement rests are not affected by such ordinations; for it was concerned with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question who can or cannot be ordained."

As we recall that the overall context of the 'Agreed statements' is the 'Malta Report', the final paragraph of 'Elucidations' needs to be quoted in full showing as it does the objective of the work of the Commission: "In answer to the questions concerning the Agreed Statements for mutual recognition of ministry, the Commission has affirmed that a consensus has been reached that places the questions in a new context (cf. Ministry and Ordination, para. 17). It believes that our agreement on the essentials of eucharistic faith with regard to the sacramental presence of Christ and the sacrificial dimension of the eucharist, and on the nature and purpose of priesthood, ordination and apostolic succession, is the new context in which the question should now be discussed.

15. For references see Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry (ed. H.R. McADOO, London 1975), p. 13.

This calls for a reappraisal of the verdict on Anglican Orders in 'Apostolic Curae' (1896).

"Mutual recognition presupposes acceptance of the apostolicity of each other's ministry. The Commission believes that its Agreements have demonstrated a consensus in faith on eucharist and ministry which has brought closer the possibility of such acceptance. It hopes that its own conviction will be shared by the members of both our Communion; but mutual recognition can only be achieved by the decision of our authorities. It has been our mandate to offer them the basis upon which they may make this decision."

Quietly but firmly, as the work begins to draw towards its term, the Commission appointed by both Communion is putting it up to the people who are the Church, to their pastoral authorities and their institutional procedures, and asking that the twentieth century should see dialogue actually leading to movement.

g. *The Final Report*¹⁶

The Commission resumed its discussion of authority at the Casa Cardinale Piazza Madonna dell' Orto, Venice, 28 August-6 September 1979. It had before it preliminary work on the four serious problems left unresolved at the conclusion of *Authority in the Church I* from a sub-commission which had met at Verulam House, St. Albans a year earlier, 5-9 June 1978. It also had before it position papers by members which had been prepared in time for this sub-commission: a joint Anglican-Roman Catholic paper on the Petrine texts from the USA, an Anglican paper on the Spirit's abiding in the Church with a Roman Catholic response, joint notes on the problem of *jus divinum*, and a substantial Roman Catholic paper on the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome. Two drafters had also prepared material to continue the earlier Statement. The Commission itself divided into four sub-commissions at Venice and four tentative drafts on the above subjects emerged.

The twelfth meeting again took place in Venice at the Casa Cardinale Piazza, 26 August-4 September 1980. The drafts from the previous meeting were criticized and refined. Material on the Petrine texts, *jus divinum* and jurisdiction was all but completed, but the draft on infallibility was unfinished. On 4 September the Commission was received in audience by Pope John Paul II at Castelgandolfo.

The final meeting of the Commission took place at St. George's House, Windsor Castle, 25 August-3 September 1981. A draft introduction had been prepared over a year before by a sub-commission which had met at the Southwark Diocesan Training Centre, Wychcroft, Redhill 7-11 January 1980. This draft expounded the Commission's ecclesiology.

Work had also begun in the same year on a response to criticisms of the first Statement on Authority by a sub-commission at the Cenacle Retreat and Conference Centre, Burnham, Slough, 22-26 June 1980. At a large sub-commission in Liverpool at St. Katharine's College, 15-19 December 1980, the draft material on infallibility left unfinished at the previous full meeting in Venice was completed. The St. Katharine's sub-commission also began revising the response to criticisms on Authority drafted at Burnham. A final sub-commission met at St Agnes' Retreat House, Bristol, 9-13 June 1981 and revised the introductory draft on the Church prepared at Wychcroft, stressing the Commission's use of *koinonia*, and completing the revision of the draft response to criticisms on authority. The final meeting at Windsor had therefore a full set of draft texts for scrutiny, criticism and revision. For the first part of the meeting the Commission worked in five sub-commissions on Petrine texts, *jus divinum*, jurisdiction, infallibility, and an authority elucidation. For the second part the Commission worked as a whole, except the infallibility sub-commission, putting together all the drafts, revising the Introduction, and accepting the Preface. Towards the close of the final meeting all the new texts were unanimously agreed. On 1 September the Commission was received at Lambeth Palace by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie. The permission of both authorities was given for publication of the Final Report in January 1982.

The Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), meeting in Newcastle upon Tyne in September 1981, commended the Final Report of the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission to the Churches of the Anglican Communion for study and asked the Provinces to respond in terms of two related questions. The questions, originally posed to the two Churches by the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC in letters to the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury, were as follows:

"We ask whether the Agreed Statements on Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church (I and II), together with the Elucidations are consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans.

"We also ask whether the Final Report offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith".¹⁷

Similar questions have also been addressed to Roman Catholic Episcopal Conferences.

h. *The Visit of Pope John Paul II to Britain.*

From May 28th to June 2nd 1982 Pope John Paul II visited England, Scotland and Wales. At a historic

16. This account is taken from the Appendix on Meetings of the Commission on pp. 104-5 of Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission: The Final Report CTS/SPCK 1982.

17. ACC-5. Report of Fifth Meeting Newcastle upon Tyne 1981, pp. 39-40.

ceremony on May 28th in Canterbury Cathedral he said:¹⁸

I appeal to you in this holy place, all my fellow Christians, and especially, the members of the Church of England and the members of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, to accept the commitment to which Archbishop Runcie and I pledge ourselves anew before you today. This commitment is that of praying and working for reconciliation and ecclesial unity according to the mind and heart of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

And at the conclusion of the ceremony Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie, signed the following Common Declaration:¹⁹

1. In the Cathedral Church of Christ at Canterbury the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury have met on the eve of Pentecost to offer thanks to God for the progress that has been made in the work of reconciliation between our Communions. Together with leaders of other Christian Churches and Communities we have listened to the Word of God: together we have recalled our one baptism and renewed the promises then made; together we have acknowledged the witness given by those whose faith has led them to surrender the precious gift of life itself in the service of others, both in the past and in modern times.

2. The bond of our common baptism into Christ led our predecessors to inaugurate a serious dialogue between our Churches, a dialogue founded on the Gospels and the ancient common traditions, a dialogue which has as its goal the unity for which Christ prayed to his Father "so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me" (Jn 17:23). In 1966, our predecessors Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey made a Common Declaration announcing their intention to inaugurate a serious dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion which would "include not only theological matters such as Scripture, Tradition and Liturgy, but also matters of practical difficulty felt on either side" (Common Declaration, par. 6). After this dialogue had already produced three statements on Eucharist, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church, Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Donald Coggan, in their Common Declaration in 1977, took the occasion to encourage the completion of the dialogue on these three important questions so that the Commission's conclusions might be evaluated by the respective Authorities through procedures appropriate to each Communion. The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has now completed the task assigned to it with the publica-

tion of its Final Report, and as our two Communions proceed with the necessary evaluation, we join in thanking the members of the Commission for their dedication, scholarship and integrity in a long and demanding task undertaken for love of Christ and for the unity of his Church.

3. The completion of this Commission's work bids us look to the next stage of our common pilgrimage in faith and hope towards the unity for which we long. We are agreed that it is now time to set up a new international Commission. Its task will be to continue the work already begun: to examine, especially in the light of our respective judgments on the Final Report, the outstanding doctrinal differences which still separate us, with a view towards their eventual resolution: to study all that hinders the mutual recognition of the ministries of our Communions; and to recommend what practical steps will be necessary when, on the basis of our unity in faith, we are able to proceed to the restoration of full communion. We are well aware that this new Commission's task will not be easy, but we are encouraged by our reliance on the grace of God and by all that we have seen of the power of that grace in the ecumenical movement of our time.

4. While this necessary work of theological clarification continues, it must be accompanied by the zealous work and fervent prayer of Roman Catholics and Anglicans throughout the world as they seek to grow in mutual understanding, fraternal love and common witness to the Gospel. Once more, then, we call on the bishops, clergy and faithful people of both our Communions in every country, diocese and parish in which our faithful live side by side. We urge them all to pray for this work and to adopt every possible means of furthering it through their collaboration in deepening their allegiance to Christ and in witnessing to him before the world. Only by such collaboration and prayer can the memory of the past enmities be healed and our past antagonisms overcome.

5. Our aim is not limited to the union of our two Communions alone, to the exclusion of other Christians, but rather extends to the fulfilment of God's will for the visible unity of all his people. Both in our present dialogue, and in those engaged in by other Christians among themselves and with us, we recognize in the agreements we are able to reach, as well as in the difficulties which we encounter, a renewed challenge to abandon ourselves completely to the truth of the Gospel. Hence we are happy to make this Declaration today in the welcome presence of so many fellow Christians whose Churches and Communities are already partners with us in prayer and work for the unity of all.

6. With them we wish to serve the cause of peace, of human freedom and human dignity, so that God may indeed be glorified in all his creatures. With them

18. *The Pope in Britain: Collected Homilies and Speeches*, St. Paul Publications 1982, p. 95.

19. *Ibid.* pp. 97-99.

we greet in the name of God all men of good will, both those who believe in him and those who are still searching for him.

7. This holy place reminds us of the vision of Pope Gregory in sending St Augustine as an apostle to England, full of zeal for the preaching of the Gospel and the shepherding of the flock. On this eve of Pentecost, we turn again in prayer to Jesus, the Good Shepherd, who promised to ask the Father to give us another Advocate to be with us for ever, the Spirit of truth (cf. Jn. 14: 16), to lead us to the full unity to which he calls us. Confident in the power of this same Holy Spirit, we commit ourselves anew to the task of working for unity with firm faith, renewed hope and ever deeper love.

i. Conclusion

What then can be said by way of conclusion at this stage when possible and actual development still lies veiled in the future? For two hundred and fifty years certain themes have been at once both the key to understanding the problems of Anglican/Roman Catholic relations and the substance of the problems themselves. Some themes have been modified in their divisive effects by a growing process of mutual questioning and answering and by changing climates in theology and inter-Church attitudes. Others have been hardened by dogmatic formulations and by differing emphases in ecclesiology. Some have yielded to convergence while others seem to remain intractable. But in the face of full agreement in some central areas of doctrine and of substantial agreement in others, the separated Churches will sooner or later have to evaluate formally the recommendations of their officially-appointed Commission and decide whether its work is of a sufficiently serious calibre to warrant forward steps on an institutional basis. Recognising a new and unprecedented situation, they must ask what degree of communion fits this situation and by what steps can it be inaugurated, for as Karl Rahner has pointed out, the initiative must now pass from the theologians to the office-holders. Only history will tell whether or not the present enterprise, launched by the Common Declaration of a Pope and a Primate, will have advanced the "communion of sister-churches". But comparing the present state of affairs with that of ten years ago, not to mention that of Halifax's and Portal's generation, who can assert what the situation will be a decade hence? In the meantime there is the sustaining hope of those who, like Archbishop Laud, could not see catholicity in a "narrow conclave" and who sought "to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church, confined to no age, time or place; not knowing any bounds but that faith which was once (and but once for all) delivered to the saints".²⁰

20. From the preface to William Laud's 'A Relation of the Conference between William Land and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit' (1639).

3. The dialogue between Orthodox and Anglicans 1973-84

a) From Oxford to Moscow (1973-76)

As long ago as 1962 the Oecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I described the visit to Constantinople of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Michael Ramsey, as "the beginning of a new spiritual spring that may lead to...greater rapprochement and the closer collaboration of all churches."¹ That visit produced an agreement between the two church leaders to set up a Joint Anglican/Orthodox Commission, which after a necessarily lengthy preparatory phase of separate meetings,² held its first full meeting in Oxford in 1973. His All-Holiness did not live to see the opening of these Joint Anglican/Orthodox Doctrinal Discussions, but all those present there were conscious that this was the fruit of Patriarch Athenagoras's work for Anglican/Orthodox unity, and his vision of the common chalice from which we might receive "in faith, in love and fear of God the Body and Blood of our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ".³ There was a measure of optimism on both sides and the Orthodox Chairman, Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira, hoped for a real 'break-through' before long.⁴ The "spiritual spring" in Anglican/Orthodox dialogue moved towards summer. The Oxford meeting of participants representing the whole Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion discussed the Anglican concept of Comprehensiveness, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the redemptive work of Christ. Replies were also given to four questions which the Orthodox had raised about the Anglicans' understanding of unity in Faith, the implications of intercommunion with other churches, decision-making in the Anglican Communion, and the Thirty-Nine Articles.

It was then agreed that for the next two years the Commission should split into three separate joint sub-commissions to prepare reports for the next full Commission meeting.

The first sub-commission met in Crete and in Truro and prepared a series of short 'theses' on Inspiration and Revelation in the Holy Scripture and on 'The Knowledge of God'. The second sub-commission met in Romania and at St Albans and produced a statement on 'The Authority of the Councils' which included sections on Scripture and the Councils, the *Filioque*, the Seventh Council, and on Infallibility and Indefectibility. The third sub-commission met in New York and in London and drew up an agreed

1. Colin Davey, *Anglican/Orthodox Relations during the Patriarchate of His All-Holiness Athenagoras I (1948-1972) in "Athenagoras I"* p. 417.

2. Kallistos Ware and Colin Davey (edd) *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement (SFCK 1977)* pp. 24-33.

3. Colin Davey op. cit. pp. 421-2.

4. K.T. Ware in *Sobernost* 4:2 (1982) p. 220.

statement on 'The Church as a Eucharistic Community' and on 'The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist'.

The Statements, principles, and theses of the three sub-commissions were then presented to the full meeting of the Commission in Moscow in July 1976, where they were scrutinized, amended, and agreed for publication.⁵

The Moscow Agreed Statement was the first-fruits of this new series of Anglican/Orthodox conversations. It was "over a limited area"; it included a particular recommendation that "the *Filioque* clause should not be included in the Creed"; and it was also the product of "a deepening of fellowship between us, nourished by our experience of sharing as far as possible in the liturgical and spiritual traditions of our several members" which emphasised "the interdependence of theology, spirituality and a common life together".

(b) *From Moscow to Lambeth (1976-78)*

At the end of the Moscow Conference plans were made not only for the publication of the Agreed Statement and the promotion of local Anglican/Orthodox contacts between church people, but also for the next phase of the Commission's work, during which the three sub-commissions would study the following subjects:

1. The Church and the Churches
2. The Communion of Saints and the Departed
3. Ministry and Priesthood⁷.

It was also agreed that, for practical reasons and to help co-ordination between the sub-commissions, they should all meet in the same place each year and conclude each conference with a meeting of the full Commission to report progress and to discuss any other matters relevant to its work.

The Commission duly met in Cambridge in 1977, and its sub-commissions began their separate tasks. At the meeting in Full Commission, however, a 'thunderstorm' broke out, presaging the onset of 'winter' in Anglican/Orthodox relations. What happened was that Bishop John Howe, the Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council, spoke to the members about the extent to which women had already been ordained to the priesthood in some of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion. The Orthodox present suddenly realised that this was no longer a matter for further discussion before decisions would be taken (as in the Church of England, which had not yet pronounced on this issue—and the fact that people so-

metimes imagine that the Church of England is the Anglican Church as a whole, which it is not, probably confused things) but a matter of fact in Hong Kong, Canada, and the USA. Because of this, the Full Commission agreed to devote the main part of its 1978 meeting to this subject. As the communiqué issued at Cambridge explained:

"In view of the events which have taken place, the Orthodox members ask themselves how it will be possible to continue the dialogue, and what meaning the dialogue will have in these circumstances. The Anglican members believe that in the present situation the dialogue is more important and necessary than ever". The 1978 meeting would take place "before the Lambeth Conference, in order, by expounding the Orthodox position, to enable their Anglican Brethren to come to what, in their view would be a proper appreciation of the subject. For the Orthodox the future of the Dialogue would depend on the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference".⁸

The full Commission met at the Monastery of Pendeli, Athens, in July 1978. It was a tense and difficult meeting. Its report began by reaffirming the resolution passed in Moscow in 1976 on the *Filioque* and asked "the bishops of the Lambeth Conference to issue a clear recommendation that the *Filioque* be omitted from the text of the Creed by all the member churches of the Anglican Communion".

It then set out the Orthodox position on the ordination of women to the priesthood which it described as "an innovation, lacking any basis whatever in Holy Tradition" and as "a violation of the apostolic faith and order of the church" "not as part of the creative continuity of Tradition." "By ordaining women Anglicans would sever themselves from continuity in apostolic faith and spiritual life". They added "it is obvious that, if the dialogue continues, its character would be drastically changed".⁹ The Anglicans' diversity of views on the issue were then added, indicating that some see it as "a grave deformation of the Church's traditional faith and order", others see it as "a proper extension and development of the Church's traditional ministry, and a necessary and prophetic response to the changing circumstances in which some Churches are placed". Others again see no absolute objection, but "believe the time was not opportune, nor the method appropriate for such action".¹⁰ The joint conclusion to the report stated: "we value our Dialogue together and we are encouraged that our Churches and their leaders, as well as the members of our Commission, hope that it may continue under conditions acceptable to both sides".¹¹

Following the 1978 Lambeth Conference's Reso-

5. Ware and Davey op. cit. pp. 34-6, and pp. 37-91 for a very full account of the detailed discussions at the Moscow Conference, together with the official communiqué and the Agreed Statement itself.

6. Ibid. pp. 37 (Communiqué) 88 (Statement) and 2 (Preface).

7. Ibid. p. 78 for details.

8. Communiqué from Cambridge meeting of A/OJDD.

9. Athens Report paras. III, 4,5,6.

10. Ibid paras. IV 1-2.

11. Ibid para. V.

lution 21 on the ordination of women¹², the Orthodox Co-Chairman of A/OJDD, Archbishop Athenagoras, expressed his view that "the theological dialogue will continue, although now simply as an academic and informative exercise, and no longer as an ecclesial endeavour aiming at the union of the two churches". He later recommended that Orthodox professors rather than bishops should take part in the dialogue as an indication of its changed status and purpose. However, as the Bishop of St Albans discovered during his visits to the Orthodox Churches in the spring of 1979, other Orthodox felt there was no need to change the standing of the talks and wished the dialogue to be resumed in order, as the Lambeth Conference 1978 Resolution 35:2 put it, "to explore the fundamental questions of doctrinal agreement and disagreement in our Churches".¹³ This view prevailed, and in July 1979 the Steering Committee of A/OJDD met and agreed that the full Commission should continue its work in July 1980. "The ultimate aim remains the unity of the Churches" it affirmed. But "the method may need to change in order to emphasise the pastoral and practical dimensions of the subjects of theological discussions". It concluded: "Our conversations are concerned with the search for a unity in faith. They are not negotiations for immediate full communion. When this is understood the discovery of differences on various matters, though distressing, will be seen as a necessary step on the long road toward that unity which God wills for His Church".

c) From Llandaff to Dublin (1980-1984)

During his visit to the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople in 1982, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, "spoke with gratitude of His All-Holiness's encouragement to continue the dialogue particularly when facing difficulties, which had led to the 'second spring' which these official conversations were now experiencing".¹⁴ The Commission resumed its work at St Michael's College, Llandaff, in July 1980, and welcomed as its new Co-Chairmen Bishop Henry Hill of Ontario, Canada (following the appointment of the Bishop of St. Albans as Archbishop of Canterbury) and Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain (following the death of his predecessor Archbishop Athenagoras). The Commission approved a report on 'The Communion of Saints and the Departed', and continued work on 'The Church and the Churches' and on the *Filioque* Clause in the Creed. This was continued and extended at subsequent meetings at the Orthodox Patriarchal Centre at Chambésy in Geneva in 1981, and at Canterbury in 1982 where the first sub-commission focused on 'The Mystery of the Church', the second sub-commission on 'Participation in the Grace of the

Holy Trinity and Christian Holiness', and the third sub-commission on 'Tradition, Christian Worship, and the Maintenance of the Christian Faith'. Following the Commission's meeting at Odessa in the Soviet Union in 1983, where particular attention was given to new material on Primacy (Seniority); Witness, Evangelism, and Service; and on Prayer and Icons, as well as continuing discussion of topics already on the agenda, the 1984 meeting at Bellinter near Dublin has had the task of finalising an agreed Report and Statement on 'The Mystery of the Church', 'The Grace of the Holy Trinity' and on 'Worship and Tradition'¹⁵.

d) Conclusion

After the difficulties of the fairly recent past, the Anglican/Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission has re-established itself and has now developed a productive and satisfactory way of working. There is a freshness and liveliness brought into the Commission by the presence of so many new members both Anglican and Orthodox; there is also the continuity and wealth of experience provided by older and longer-serving members. There is a prayerfulness which permeates its whole work, and which has brought the Commission to a new stage of fellowship with Christ. Also, some of the pressures of the past have gone. The solution of problems (such as the ordination of women) is not made a condition of continuing the dialogue. Nor are we trying to produce too quickly materials that might be used as the basis for early decisions to enter a new stage of relationships between our Churches. Instead, the Commission is freer to explore together and understand better the faith we hold and ways in which we express it. It is also noteworthy that far more consideration has been given to prayer and spirituality than is usual in inter-church encounters of this type. If we accept that Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue is still in the *first* stage of exploring each other's faith and seeking co-operation in mission and service,¹⁶ then it can perhaps be seen that much good work is being done by this particular bilateral conversation to help bridge the ancient divide between the Eastern and Western Churches.

During the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Constantinople in 1982, Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, the Orthodox Co-Chairman of A/OJDD, said "there is positive progress towards the first stage of common prayer and co-operation".

Members of the Commission are convinced that its work contributes greatly to "the mission and peace of the Churches after the ancient division of East

12. The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978 pp. 45-7.

13. *Ibid.* p. 51.

14. Communiqué para. 4 Episkopsis No. 278 1.9.82 p. 2.

15. Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984, SPCK 1984; published in Greek with an introduction by Protopresbyter G. Dragas in *Ekklesia kai Theologia* (1984) pp. 895-962.

16. See ACC 1981 Consultation: Unity by Stages, Section III (a).

and West” and to the Church’s ministry of reconciliation and peace “in the midst of world political tensions and their resulting pressures...¹⁷

International Anglican/Orthodox Dialogue both draws from and seeks to promote local Anglican/Orthodox dialogue, remembering that the latter’s task is not to duplicate but to make known International Agreements and to help in the pastoral relationships between the people of the two churches.

Anglican/Orthodox discussions take place in the context of Anglican/Roman Catholic, Orthodox/

Roman Catholic and other bilateral and multilateral conversations. Each draws from and contributes to the other, even if the other two mentioned above aim more directly to provide the theological grounds for further steps towards unity between the churches than Anglican/Orthodox dialogue can claim to do.

Nevertheless we are convinced that these discussions have a further part to play in East-West relations, in inter-church relations and in theological explorations from which we all benefit.

17. “Steps towards Unity” – Report of the ACC Preparatory Group on Ecumenical Affairs, Woking, February 1984.