

The Uniate Model and Anglican Ministry

by Edward P. Echlin, S.J.

386

Anglicans and Roman Catholics are exploring the Uniate analogy as a model for reunion of their Churches.¹ In this paper we propose to discuss briefly the development of the Uniate analogy and, thereafter, to suggest a way for Roman recognition of Anglican ministry.

Proponents of the Uniate model point to an impressive precedent in Gregory the Great's commission to Augustine in 597. They argue that Gregory favoured a distinctive patrimony for the Church of the Angles. Obviously this precedent should not be pressed too far. Subsequent Popes, such as Vitalian and Gregory VII, were less favourable to pluralism and more inclined to uniformity than was the first Gregory.² Nevertheless, Gregory's commission to Augustine of Canterbury does provide a useful precedent that might well be endorsed today.

'My brother, you are familiar with the usage of the Roman Church, in which you were brought up. But if you have found customs, whether in the Roman, Gallican, or any other Churches that may be more acceptable to God, I wish you to make a careful selection of them, and teach the Church of the English, which is still young in the Faith, whatever you can profitably learn from the various Churches. For things should not be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Therefore select from each of the Churches whatever things are devout, religious and right; and when you have arranged them into a unified rite, let the minds of the English grow accustomed to it.'³

The pallium given to Augustine by Gregory connoted recognition of a Roman primacy, a recognition that continued for nearly a millenium. Since the Reformation the Archbishop of Canterbury has served as a pastoral centre of unity for the Church of England and, later, for the world-wide Anglican communion. 'The whole Anglican Communion is united in an intense loyalty, all the more intense because undefined, toward the See of Canterbury, and this is reflected in deep respect for the occupant for the time being of the throne of St Augustine.'⁴

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Uniate model was explored at the Malines conversations. Before leaving for Belgium the Anglican representative had announced prophetically that 'the Uniate discipline is capable of further application, and its precedents

¹Eric Mascall, 'The Pope's Important Offer', *The Tablet*, 12th December, 1970, pp. 1201-1202.

²R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*, London, 1970, pp. 104-133.

³Venerable Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, I, 27, 2.

⁴Stephen Neile, *Anglicanism*, Baltimore, 1965, p. 430.

suggest further possibilities'.¹ In March, 1923, the analogy between the See of Canterbury and a Uniate patriarchate was indeed discussed, but in December of that year the conversations turned inconclusively to papal jurisdiction. In May, 1925, Cardinal Mercier read a paper, written anonymously, by Dom Lambert Beauduin, which proposed 'unity without absorption' with the Archbishop of Canterbury analogous to a Western patriarch. Beauduin's proposal and Mercier's presentation were not sufficiently refined—and the proposal received a mixed reception. When Mercier died in 1926 the discussion of the Uniate model and the conversation themselves were halted.² But seeds were planted which would germinate until the turning-point in Christian history which was Vatican II.

Vatican II reflected an unprecedented Roman Catholic openness to unity without uniformity. When referring to separated Eastern Churches the Council made clear that the distinctive patrimony of these Churches would be respected when full communion was restored. 'For many centuries, the Churches of the East and the West went their own ways, though a brotherly communion of faith and sacramental life bound them together.'³ The Council goes on to assert that diversity—in customs, observances, and government—adds to the mission of the Church and is a prerequisite for the restoration of unity.⁴

After the Council 'the restoration of unity' became a real possibility more swiftly than anyone at St Peter's had dreamed. In 1970 Cardinal Jan Willebrands delivered his remarkable '*typos*' talk in England, in which he proposed the model of a typology of Churches wherein there is 'unity in diversity and diversity in unity'.

'Where there is a long coherent tradition, commanding men's love and loyalty, creating and sustaining a harmonious and organic whole of complementary elements, each of which supports and strengthens the other, you have the reality of a *typos*.'

The complementary elements of a particular *typos* include a characteristic theological method (e.g. biblical and historical), liturgical expression, and spiritual-devotional heritage. When different *typoi* coexist in full communion the unique elements of each take their place in an enriched Catholic unity.

¹*The Tablet*, 31, January 1970, p. 98.

²Lord Halifax, *Conversations at Malines*, London, 1927. Halifax unwittingly contributed to Beauduin's subsequent sufferings by unilaterally publishing the papers. In his 'martyrdom' Beauduin differed from some subsequent Roman Catholic outlaws in that Beauduin was not vindicated until *after* his death, appropriately enough by the Pope's proposal of a model strikingly similar to Beauduin's at the canonization of the forty martyrs! Rome still makes martyrs daily—witness the tortuous delay over the inevitable discipline of optional celibacy—and here the Anglican 'patrimony' of comprehensive tolerance and Christian freedom can (to paraphrase Vatican II) provide 'a treasure from which the Roman Church of the West can amply draw'.

³Decree on Ecumenism, No. 14. 'Fidem et disciplinam' I have not translated 'belief and discipline' (Abbott) 'but faith and order'.

⁴*Ibid.*, No. 16. Cf. also 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church', III, 13 and 23; 'Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy', Nos. 37–41; and 'Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World', 4, 5, 44, 58, 62.

'If a typology of Churches, a diversity in unity and unity in diversity, multiplies the possibilities of identifying and celebrating the presence of God in the world; if it brings nearer the hope of providing an imaginative framework within which Christian witness can transform human consciousness for today, then it has all the justification it needs.'¹

Thereafter Bishop Christopher Butler in an article in *The Tablet*, which in an important editorial had come out for the Uniate model, proposed reunion in which the Archbishop of Canterbury would be analogous to a Western patriarch.² The key paragraph in Butler's article was the following:

'But if we are being honest and if we are faithful to the meaning of ecumenism as spelt out by the Council, what in fact do we expect other than some sort of co-existence, in full ecclesial communion with one another, of the Catholic Western Rite, as it exists today in this country under our present Catholic hierarchy, and an "English Rite" with its own bishops, liturgy, and theological tradition? Both Rites would acknowledge the primacy of the successor of St Peter, but each—presumably—would have its own "patriarch" or the equivalent. The Bishop of Rome would be the Patriarch of the traditional Western Rite, and the Archbishop of Canterbury the "patriarch" of the English Rite—unless, indeed, that Rite took a leaf out of the book of recent developments among ourselves, and preferred a conference of bishops under an elected president to a patriarch in the ancient sense.'³

Butler subsequently argued that co-existence of parallel hierarchies was not an ultimate goal but that we should hope for a future plenitude of unity with one hierarchy. The value of Butler's proposal is that it provides both Churches with a practical model for concrete reunion and no longer leaves dialogue in a vacuum.

'Given doctrinal agreement and the restoration of visible unity on the sort of terms that I have outlined, one would hope that there would be a gradual drawing together of the two united though still distinct groups, and at some future time a further step might be feasible. I recognize that to have two such Churches living side by side, united in doctrine and in recognition of the supreme authority of the Pope, yet having in many ways a separate existence, would still fall far short of the complete oneness, especially at the level of the parishes, which would be ideal. . . . The imperfect nature of this solution would, I hope, be gradually borne in on all of us, and at some future date it might be both

¹Cardinal Jan Willebrands, 'Moving Towards a Typology of Churches', *The Catholic Mind*, April, 1970, p. 40.

²Butler had mentioned the Uniate analogy in a sermon and at the first international Anglican-Roman Catholic meeting at Windsor Castle. *The Tablet*, which in 1925 had opposed the Uniate analogy, came out in its favour in a lead editorial, 'United Not Absorbed', 31st January, 1970, p. 90. Butler's article was partially in response to the lively reaction to this editorial.

³Christopher Butler, 'United Not Absorbed', *The Tablet*, 7th March, 1970, p. 221.

natural and relatively easy to complete the fusion and achieve a fully united body under a single set of bishops. But this would be something for history to work out for us.¹

On 25th October, 1970, in the peroration of his allocution at the canonization of the forty martyrs, Pope Paul VI appeared to endorse the Uniate model for reunion of Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Significant for our purpose is the Pope's reference to future 'communion of priesthood and of rule', an apparent reference to eventual recognition of Anglican ministry. The Pope's dramatic peroration, written in his own hand, has had far-reaching consequences.

'May the blood of these martyrs be able to heal the great wound inflicted upon God's Church by reason of the separation of the Anglican Church from the Catholic Church. Is it not one—these martyrs say to us—the Church founded by Christ? Is not this their witness? Their devotion to their nation gives us the assurance that on the day when—God willing—the unity of the faith and of Christian life is restored, no offence will be inflicted on the honour and sovereignty of a great country such as England. There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and the worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church when the Roman Catholic Church—this humble "Servant of the Servants of God"—is able to embrace her ever beloved Sister in the one authentic communion of the family of Christ: a communion of origin and of faith, a communion of priesthood and of rule, a communion of the Saints in the freedom and love of the Spirit of Jesus.'²

Commenting on these remarkable words, Christopher Butler said: 'It seems probable that the Pope in fact had in mind the co-existence of both structures within the bonds of a single communion in an arrangement to which the co-existence of the Latin rite and the Uniate rites would afford some distant analogy.' Butler again expressed the hope that initial co-existence would be an intermediate stage. 'While I accept that a Uniate stage might be necessary, I hope that it would only be a temporary affair, and that eventually—after perhaps some centuries—the desire of one or other of the two rites to be preserved would cease.'³

Eric Mascall reflects the reaction of many Anglicans when he asserts that both communions should explore the implication of the Pope's 'offer'. Mascall adds that, eventually at least, parallel hierarchies should give way to one unified episcopate.

'I think parishes of "Roman" and "Anglican" rite might continue to exist side by side, though I should expect the present tendencies to liturgical assimilation to be enhanced. And, although I think

¹Text in *One in Christ*, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 122; cf. 'Bishop Butler Proposes a Model for Reunion of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches', *The Listener*, 2nd April, 1970, pp. 441–442.

²Pope Paul VI, 'In solenni Canonizatione', AAS, LXII, November–December, 1970, pp. 752–753; cf. 'The Forty Martyrs', *One in Christ*, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 113.

³Christopher Butler, 'An Approach to Anglicans', *The Tablet*, 14th November, 1970, pp. 1098–1099.

Bishop Butler thinks in terms of parallel hierarchies, I would myself hope that there might be a unified episcopate, so that all the parishes in a given area might be under the same bishop, whichever rite they belonged to. This seems to me to be theologically of great importance, though I would not make it an absolute essential.¹

As these words are written theologians of both Churches, especially in England, are seriously exploring the Uniate model.² One thing seems certain: if communion on distant Uniate analogy is effected there will be, at least for some years, two parallel hierarchies co-existing in full communion. This inevitable co-existence, even if it is a preliminary stage (and unlike Butler and Mascall I am not certain it will or should be envisioned as only a *preliminary* stage),³ necessitates recognition by Rome of Anglican ministry. Admittedly there remain some outstanding problems calling for discussion, such as the Mariological definitions, primacy and infallibility and, what is perhaps at the root of all our differences, basic agreement by both Churches on the historical relativity of doctrinal and structural formulations and a legitimate apostolic pluralism in theological reinterpretations.⁴ What concerns us in the remainder of this paper is the possibility of mutual recognition of ministry. Once this is granted by both Churches—if it is granted on the basis of the Church's freedom to order and re-order its ministry and on the basis of the legitimacy of an apostolic pluralism of ministries—we believe the other obstacles to reunion will appear in their veridical, albeit often unrecognized, insignificance.

In promoting Roman recognition of the 'validity' of Anglican ministry I am seconding the understanding of 'validity' proposed by John Coventry.⁵ Although Coventry's approach to validity has not always been the understanding of Roman Catholics it is rapidly gaining ground among theologians.⁶ Validity, therefore, means that the Church guarantees the effectiveness of orders and, in the case at hand, the presence of Christ in his Church at the eucharist. In declaring orders (and sacraments) invalid the Church does not and cannot guarantee they are ineffective. To do so would presume that all salvific grace is channelled through the structure of the Roman Catholic Church. Rather, in declaring orders 'absolutely null and

¹Eric Mascall, 'The Pope's Important Offer', *The Tablet*, 12th December, 1970, p. 1202; cf. Mascall, 'Is Organic Union Desirable?', *Theology*, December, 1970, pp. 558–559.

²Cf. John Macquarrie, 'Is Organic Union Desirable?', *Theology*, October, 1970, pp. 437–444; John Macquarrie, George Yule, 'Is Organic Union Desirable?', *Theology*, February, 1971, pp. 75–77; Lord Fisher of Lambeth, 'Organic Union', *Theology*, March, 1971, pp. 124–125.

³Cf. Macquarrie, 'Is Organic Union Desirable?', *Theology*, October, 1970, pp. 440–442.

⁴Wolfhart Pannenberg, 'What is a Dogmatic Statement?', *Basic Questions in Theology*, Vol. I, Philadelphia, 1970, pp. 181–210; Avery Dulles, 'Church Teaching and Historical Relativity', in Wolfhart Pannenberg *et al.*, *Spirit, Faith, and Church*, Philadelphia, 1970, pp. 60–80.

⁵John Coventry, 'Anglican Orders: Re-Assessing the Debate', *New Blackfriars*, January, 1971, pp. 38–40.

⁶Aelred Burrows, 'Anglican Orders, the Present Position', *The Ampleforth Journal*, 23 (1969), pp. 358–360.

utterly void' the Roman Catholic Church withholds its guarantee of the effectiveness of these orders; but it cannot say apodictically that orders are ineffective. Indeed, Vatican II implicitly admitted some effectiveness to Anglican orders when it referred to non-Roman orders as suffering a *defectum*. To say orders are defective is to concede they have *some* reality, and to say separated communities have not preserved 'the genuine and total reality of the eucharistic mystery' (*genuinam et integram substantiam mysterii eucharistici non seruisse*) is to concede that their eucharists preserve *some* reality.¹

It may be argued, therefore, that Rome has taken a long step toward full recognition of Anglican ministry. But before wider recognition can follow it seems imperative for Anglicans and Roman Catholics together to clarify their understanding of ministry, priesthood, and sacramental effectiveness. Such clarification will be forthcoming when both Churches acknowledge that pluralism of emphasis on different aspects of a mystery are complementary and not contradictory. Within Anglicanism—and today within Roman Catholicism—there are different emphases on the meaning of presbyterate and eucharist.

This pluralism of emphases on the *mysterium fidei* has a long history. At least from the time of I Clement,² a document from the twilight of the apostolic age, there has been in the Church an awareness that the ministry and eucharist are united with the unique sacrifice of Christ, the unique high priest (Heb. 9, 6–7; 10, 12–14), and are therefore, in some mysterious way, sacrificial. Clement's original adumbrations of the ministry as a priesthood and the eucharist as sacrificial are inchoate and implicit (I Clem. 44, 6). But the pre-Nicene fathers consistently and, it seems, *universally* connected the eucharist with the sacrifice of Christ, the unique high priest,³ as did the later Fathers, the compilers, and the great scholastics.⁴ The emphasis of the scholastics was on the mystery of the *real presence* of Christ in the eucharist, which was a commemoration and representation but not a repetition of Calvary.⁵ However, in the Counter-Reformation it was the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist which was emphasized by Rome. It should be noted, however, that even Thomas Cranmer, who protested vigorously against the popular superstition of 'a second sacrifice' in the eucharist, acknowledged therein 'a sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, our praise and thanksgiving', and acknowledged that the eucharist was a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice.⁶ I am not denying that Cranmer and the

¹Decree on Ecumenism', No. 22.

²I Clement, Letter to Corinthians, *The Apostolic Fathers*, K. Lake, ed. and trans., N.Y., 1919, pp. 70–85.

³Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Westminster, 1945, pp. 252–254.

⁴Cf. John Damascene, 'The Orthodox Faith', in *Saint John of Damascus Writings*, F. Chase, ed. and trans., N.Y., 1968, pp. 385–460; St Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.*, III, q. 83. Cf. also A. McDevitt, 'The Episcopate as an Order and Sacrament on the Eve of the High Scholastic Period', *Franciscan Studies*, 20, 1960, pp. 130–148.

⁵Cf. for example St Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.*, III, q. 83 et passim.

⁶Edward P. Echlin, *The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective*, N.Y., 1968, pp. 25–63.

reformers went too far in their reaction against 'the late medieval mass system', the 'popular theology' of their day, and the weak defence by Roman Catholics of the sacrificial nature of the eucharist. Far from it! I *am* arguing that the time is at hand, through our fraternal sharing of insights, when both 'evangelicals' and 'Catholics' can recognize a legitimate pluralism in *contemporary* emphases on ministry and eucharist. Such pluralism of emphases (and perspectives) is not contradictory but complementary and apostolic.¹ Through fraternal discussion we should soon reach agreement on what we mean by the presbyterate. As John Coventry has written, 'Any official act of Rome would come better when the fraternal discussion had already been completed, simply to give outward expression to a foregone conclusion'.²

Theologians are aware that 'apostolic succession' is succession in baptism, life, doctrine, mission and faith, that the succession is in the whole Church, that the historic episcopate gradually developed as sign and agent of this succession, that the Church remains free to re-order its ministry to meet contemporary needs, that within the primitive Church there was a time when a pluralism of ministries co-existed in full communion, and that since the sixteenth century a pluralism of ministries exists once again. We submit that this primitive apostolic pluralism and its resurgence in the sixteenth century is of paramount importance for the resolution of the question of Anglican orders.

Some caution seems necessary in assessing the pluralism in the apostolic Church, specifically in the loosely structured Pauline Churches.³ The Church about which we are best informed is Paul's Corinth and we are prepared to argue that there was for a time a very loose structure there. Nevertheless our argument for the absence of presbyteral ordering at Corinth is from silence and should be used with caution.

When writing to the Church at Corinth Paul does not address presbyters, rather, he addresses the whole Church. But Paul himself, a *bona fide* if late born apostle (Gal. 1, 1; 1, 16), exerted strong leadership. Moreover he adverts to other 'apostles' and to 'administrators' among the gifted persons in Corinth (1 Cor. 12, 28). Corinth therefore was not without leadership. At Thessalonika there were persons in the community who were 'over you in the Lord' (1 Thess. 5, 12; cf. Rom. 12, 8; 1 Tim. 5, 17). At Paul's esteemed Philippi (Phil. 3, 12) there were *episkopoi* and *diakonoi*

¹In the United States a joint commission of Anglicans and Roman Catholics has agreed that the eucharist no longer divides them. Cf. *The Journal of the General Convention* (1967) of the Episcopal Church. Cf. Camillus Hay, 'Intercommunion: a Roman Catholic Approach', *One in Christ*, 4, 1969, pp. 361–363.

²Coventry, 'Anglican Orders', *New Blackfriars*, January 1971, p. 40.

³I am indebted to Myles Bourke for much that follows, including his attention to the evidence for leadership even at Corinth. Cf. Bourke, 'Presidential Address', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 30, 1968, esp. pp. 501–502.

(1, 1), and at Ephesus there were pastor-teachers, a multiple charism apparently enjoyed by the same persons (Eph. 4, 11; cf. Acts 14, 23; 20, 17).

Nevertheless it does seem that at Paul's Corinth there was a loosely structured ordering in the Spirit in which each had his gift for the common good. 'God has placed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then working of miracles, then gifts of healing, helpfulness, administration, speaking in various tongues' (1 Cor. 12, 28). The 'apostles', whom Paul lists first, were unique to the apostolic Church.¹ We observe that Paul places the gift of 'administration' ('guiding' and 'directing' in secular and Septuagint Greek) next to last. If a presbyteral order existed at early Corinth it is difficult to believe that Paul would not have mentioned it (cf. 1 Cor. 10, 16; 11). Yet Paul's Corinth was recognized as apostolic by, and was in communion with, Philippi where there were *episkopoi* and with Jerusalem where there were the twelve, James, and presbyters (Acts 6, 1–6; 15). Of equal significance is the fact that the Roman Catholic Church has always recognized Corinth, Philippi, Jerusalem, and the churches of the pastorals as fully apostolic with 'valid' ministries and eucharists. There is, therefore, not only a pluralism of ministries within the original design and a pluralism of these ministries with the churches of the pastorals but also a pluralism of the ministries included in the canon with Roman ministry today.

The guardian-presbyters of the pastorals succeeded missionary apostles like Paul in such functions as preserving the apostolic gospel (2 Tim. 1, 13), teaching (2 Tim. 2, 24) and governing (1 Tim. 5, 5). These guardian-presbyters were local officers whereas the missionary apostles, including Peter, had been mobile and innovative. It is significant for our purposes that not all guardian-presbyters (e.g. at later Corinth) are clearly traceable to apostolic delegation or ordination. Although Paul may have appointed presbyters to succeed him in most, if not all, of his churches we cannot demonstrate that all guardian-presbyters and therefore the bishops and priests who succeeded them descend directly from an apostle. They may in fact have been 'ordained' by those not themselves ordained; or their ordering may have proceeded through recognition by their communities of those who functioned as their ministers. The pastorals testify to ordination of delegates at Ephesus and Crete through imposition of hands (1 Tim. 4, 14; 2 Tim. 1, 6). These delegates were commissioned to appoint successors (Tit. 1, 5; 1 Tim. 5, 22), but ordination is an institutionalized form of recognition by a community of those who function as their ministers. Recognition by a Church of its ministers, with or without complete episcopal ordering, is of vital significance for Roman recognition of Anglican ordinations.²

¹R. Schnackenburg, 'Apostolicity: The Present Position of Studies', *One in Christ*, 6, 1970, pp. 243–273.

²Raymond E. Brown, *Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections*, N.Y., 1970, p. 84. Cf. also David N. Power, *Ministers of Christ and His Church*, London, 1969, p. 23.

The inclusion of different Church orders in the Canon represented a recognition by the early Church of a pluralism in apostolic ministry. Moreover, differently ordered ministries co-existed at the same time in full communion—a co-existence of mutually recognized parallel hierarchies. Since the Reformation there has been a resurgence of pluralism in the ministry. There are episcopally ordered ministries recognized as in ‘apostolic succession’ by Rome, there are episcopal ministries which Rome finds defective, and there are non-episcopal ministries. We profess that the triadic ministry, as we see it emerging in the pastorals, developed under the Spirit’s guidance, and is to date the best form for continuance of apostolic proclamation and mission. Nevertheless, we believe there is precedent in the primitive Church for Roman recognition of Anglican (and non-episcopal) ministry.

The sacrificial nature of the eucharist and the idea of sacrificial priesthood were central in the sixteenth-century fragmentation into differing Church orders. Yet in the New Testament there is no *explicit* testimony that the twelve, Paul, or his surrogates presided at the eucharist.¹ There was in fact a pluralism of officers at the eucharist and a pluralism of awareness of the relation of the eucharist to Christ’s sacrifice. In referring to the cup which ‘we bless’ (1 Cor. 10, 16) Paul almost certainly includes himself, but according to Luke prophets and teachers performed liturgical offices at Antioch (Acts 13, 2). The Didache indicates that *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* replaced prophets and teachers at the liturgy only with considerable difficulty. ‘Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons, for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers.’² In 1 Clement (c. 96) we observe that with the destruction of the temple, the division of Christianity from Judaism, and the inchoate recognition that the eucharist was united to Christ’s unique sacrifice, *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* were ‘offering’ even in Corinth. ‘Our sin is not small if we eject those who have blamelessly and holily offered the sacrifice of the episcopate.’³ From the first-century Church we conclude that originally there was a pluralism of officers at the eucharist, that some of these officers were not ordained by an apostle or his delegate, that possibly some were not formally ordained at all, that there was a pluralism of emphases on the eucharistic mystery, and that this pluralism of ministries and eucharists were acknowledged by the universal Church as ‘valid’.

There is some evidence that a pluralism of ministries, ordering, and liturgical presidency lasted for a considerable time. Ignatius of

¹Hans von Campenhausen may overstate the freedom at Corinth when he asserts: ‘Responsible presidents to see to this matter cannot therefore have been available’, in *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the first three centuries*, London, 1969, p. 66.

²Didache 15, 1; cf. 14. There is no doubt about the importance of prophets and teachers in the Didache. Like Pauline ministers, they are to be supported by the congregation. In fact the Didache awards them the ‘first fruits’. Cf. 13.

³1 Clement XLIV, 4; cf. XLI, 1.

Antioch (c. 107) clearly testifies to the datum of a triadic ministry in Syria and Asia Minor, but in his letter to Rome he does *not* address any one person there as bishop. Nor does he insist on ordinations or (as does Irenaeus) ‘apostolic succession’. In fact it is the *presbyters* that Ignatius compares to the apostles. If there was a mono-episcopate at Rome would not Ignatius have addressed or at least mentioned the bishop there? And if ordination and direct descent from an apostle were so important would not as staunch an episcopalist as Ignatius have mentioned them?¹

For Ignatius: ‘Let that be considered a valid eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop or by one whom he appoints.’² Moreover, the triadic ministry was for Ignatius necessary for a Church rightly to be called a Church. ‘Likewise let all respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as the bishop is also a type of the Father, and the presbyters as the Council of God and the apostles. Without these the name of Church is not rightly given.’ (Χωρίς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.)³ Yet the author of *Hermes*, who testified to the Roman scene near the time of Ignatius writes of *episkopoi* in the plural and seems to be familiar with a considerably looser structure than the churches in Syria and Asia Minor.

‘The stones which are square and white and fit into their joints are the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons who walked according to the magistracy of God, and served the elect of God in holiness and reverence as bishops and teachers and deacons; some of them are fallen asleep and some are still alive.’⁴

As late as 150, Justin of Rome does not make it clear whether a monarchical bishop or one of a presbyteral college presided at the Roman eucharist: ‘When the president has celebrated the eucharist they whom we call deacons permit each one present to partake of the eucharistic bread and wine and water and convey it also to the absentees.’⁵ Well into the second century there seems to have been ‘unity in diversity and diversity in unity’ wherein different communities within apostolic succession recognized ministers who were ordered differently from ministers in their sister churches.

Conclusion

Since the sixteenth century there has been a pluralism of ministries once again. The Anglican Church which during Vatican II enjoyed ‘a special place’ is today acknowledged by Rome as ‘her ever beloved

¹It would take us beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the polemics of Ambrosiaster and Jerome, but it is noteworthy that Jerome firmly testified to presbyteral ordering of the Alexandrian bishopric well into the third century. Cf. St Jerome, ‘Epist. ad Evangelum’, PL 22: 1192–1195.

²St Ignatius, Letter to Smyrneans, VIII, 2.

³St Ignatius, Letter to Trallians, III, 1.

⁴The Shepherd of Hermes, Vols. III, 5, 1. Cf. Jean Colson, *Les Fonctions ecclésiastiques aux deux premiers siècles*, Paris, 1956, pp. 251–256.

⁵St Justin Martyr, ‘First Apology’, *Saint Justin Martyr*, Thomas Falls, ed., N.Y., 1948, p. 105.

sister' (Paul VI). As Anglicans and Roman Catholics refine the Uniate model and resolve doctrinal differences the possibility of mutual recognition of ministry is in sight.¹

But I wish to conclude on a note of urgency. Theologians and bishops can no longer afford the luxury of interminable considerations and hesitations. The human family, enmeshed in urbanized industrialization, is woefully divided. And nature itself has begun to lash back lethally at motor-car societies which have overreached themselves in ravishing their environment. The united witness of Christians is urgently needed to reconcile humanity with itself and with the earth. Anglicans and Roman Catholics must get on with resolving the question of Anglican orders so that God's people can go forth in unity to guard even heathen things. I close therefore with some sage words of a Lutheran brother: 'There is no divine privilege for theologians and officials to indefinitely extend their considerations and hesitations before the average Christian might be able to live according to his confession in one universal Church.'²

¹I have also argued this case elsewhere. Cf. Edward P. Echlin, 'Anglican Orders, a Case for Validity', *The Anglican Theological Review*, April 1970, pp. 67-76; and 'The Validity of Anglican Orders', *The Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Spring, 1970, pp. 266-281.

²Wolfhart Pannenberg *et al.*, *Spirit, Faith and Church*, Philadelphia, 1970, p. 31.

South Africa: Dialogue or Disaster

by Edmund Hill, O.P.

Perhaps it would be as well to start with the reminder that it is impossible to analyse South African politics in terms of political Right and Left, and quite misleading to try. Neither the United Party nor even the Progressive Party are really to the left of the Nationalist Party in any meaningful way. A case of sorts could be made out for saying that in some respects it is well to the left of the opposition parties, and certainly its policies are far less shy of radical solutions. But as I say, these terms do not really apply in South Africa, where we are living in a different set of dimensions from Europe or America.

The two basic drives that power the Nationalist Party are intense Afrikaner nationalism and White colour prejudice. The two are distinct in principle, and there are Afrikaner nationalists of sensibility who take pride in the nationalism and genuinely abjure and deplore the prejudice. But they are few, and in the soul of the average nationalist the two drives are almost identical, or at least serve to boost and intensify each other. One might say, rather