

THE APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH-ASSESSMENT AND CRITIQUE.

The Lutheran-Roman Catholic international dialogue has carried on continuously since 1966, a record rivalled only by the near contemporary dialogues of the Roman Catholic Church with Anglicans (ARCIC) and Methodists (MRCIC). It has been strongly backed by the US national Lutheran-Catholic dialogue which has now completed ten impressively detailed and researched documents. Many of the insights from that national dialogue, frequently regarded as the most outstanding of all the many national bilateral dialogues, have been fed into the international dialogue. In addition to this, important ecclesiological work undertaken by the Lutheran World Federation has also enriched the conversation which has also been marked by the boldness of many of its propositions, particularly those made in the report *Facing Unity* (1985).

Much that has been said in the ongoing bilateral dialogue has a relevance that reaches well beyond the immediate partners concerned both of whom are, of course, in dialogue with other partners. I intend in this paper to examine the most recent study document of the international dialogue, the *Apostolicity of the Church* and to do so with reference to two other relevant near contemporary documents which have clearly had some influence of the report. These are the report *The Church as Koinonia of Salvation, Its Structures and Ministries* (2004), the tenth report of the US dialogue commission and the recent LWF Lund statement on *Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church* (2007). I also intend to refer to some relevant insights from my own Methodist tradition and its very fruitful dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church. The Ecumenical Movement is one and indivisible and we have much to learn from and perhaps to contribute to each others' dialogues. Methodism stands in a particularly interesting relationship with both the Roman Catholic and Lutheran traditions, sharing with Roman Catholics a strong doctrine of Christian holiness and with Lutherans a strong stress on the gratuitousness of grace for undeserving sinners. Methodism also shares with Roman Catholics an emphasis on the interdependent, *connexional* nature of the Church Universal. The *Joint Declaration on Justification* of Lutherans and Roman Catholics in 1999 won warm approval within Methodism which felt it consistent with our traditional understanding of the Scripture Way of Salvation. Accordingly, in 2006, the World Methodist Council formally associated itself with the Joint Declaration.

The main report is divided into four sections, entitled respectively The Apostolicity of the Church-New Testament Foundations, The Apostolic Gospel and the Apostolicity of the Church, Apostolic Succession and Ordained Ministry and Church Teaching that Remains in the Truth, this last addressing what in some respects is the thorniest problem of all. The first section rehearses what in general are the widely accepted conclusions of modern scholars across the confessional boundaries concerning the nature of ministry as emerging within New Testament times and evidenced within the canon itself. The other three sections set out clearly traditional Roman Catholic and Lutheran teaching on the topics concerned with particular emphasis upon more modern developments, especially those that have allowed a degree of rapprochement. Continuing differences are recorded and faced.

New Testament Foundations.

The first section need not detain us long. It emphasises a fact put rather more succinctly in EMAC that the early Church was never without leaders¹. It stresses both the foundational role

¹ *Episcopal Ministry within the Apostolicity of the Church*, (hereafter EMAC), para 6.

of the apostles and the clear evidence from the pastoral epistles of a concern for faithful continuation of the essence of their work after their departure, a concern that inevitably related to the commissioning of faithful successors. A particularly important point is made in para 25 with its emphasis upon the role of the apostles as being both foundational and formative.

‘It implies a responsibility for setting a norm that may subsequently be further explored developed and applied but not abandoned and distorted’. The apostle is both example and tradition bearer. Successor ministries are bound to follow in the wake of this example, a point stressed later in the report when it is stressed that succession to the apostles is not just a matter of continuity in function and office but in manner of apostolic life.

‘In the New Testament, ‘apostolic succession’ takes place within the horizon of following Jesus Christ... Understood in this way, ‘apostolic succession’ maintains the uniqueness proper to the ministry of the apostles while mediating it, within the horizon of the following of Jesus Christ, to an ongoing ministry for building up the church on the foundation of Jesus Christ which the apostles once laid’².

The Lutheran World Federation document on episcopacy reinforces this with a quotation from Luther.

‘Now if the apostles, evangelists and prophets are no longer living, others must have replaced them and will replace them until the end of the world, for the Church shall last until the end of the world, and so apostles, evangelists and prophets must therefore remain, no matter what their name, to promote God’s word and work’³.

This section on Apostolicity notes the ambiguity of the word apostle, particularly as used by Paul, sometimes confined to the witnesses of the resurrection, whose function of course is untransmissible per se, but also sometimes used apparently in a wider context to mean roving missionaries who had not necessarily been witnesses to the resurrection. It notes that, later, the term became confined to the Eleven and to other exceptional witnesses of the resurrection, Paul included. It does not record that, into the sub-apostolic period, the term continued to be used of travelling missionaries. The significance of this was recognised by the Wesleyan ecclesiologist, Benjamin Gregory who recognised that there was both a distinction and yet a close relationship between the original foundational apostles and those who were called later to travel for the gospel. He referred to the latter as apostles in a secondary, yet still grand sense and as essential continuators of the work of the apostles⁴. Linked to Gregory’s British Methodist emphasis is that of the sister Methodist Episcopal Church (USA) which constantly stressed the hardships endured in their travelling ministry by its early bishops whose function in the frontier era was one both of pioneering initiation and of supervision of the travelling elders under their authority⁵.

² *Apostolicity*, para 183, which refers to 2 Tim 3:10 with its reference to Timothy’s observation of Paul’s teaching and example ‘my steadfastness, my persecutions and sufferings’.

³ EMAC, para 25.

⁴ Gregory, B. *Handbook of Scriptural Church Principles*, 1888, pp 82-4.

⁵ See e.g. Richey, R.E. and Frank, Thomas, *Episcopacy in the Methodist Tradition. Perspectives and Proposals*, Nashville, 2004. Francis Asbury (1745-1816), the first Methodist bishop in America, addresses his elders ‘My loving and confidential sons in the Gospel, great grace be upon you. God’s glory cover your assembly and direct your action and deliberations for the apostolic order and establishment of the Church of God in holy succession till the end of time’.

Finally, this section stresses the significance of the transmission of the apostolic legacy and the means whereby this is done through the laying on of hands and prayer in respect of those who have that particular responsibility within the Church. It is stressed that the 'depositum fidei also comprises a depositum vitae, inviting the community to imitate the apostolic life in its spiritual discipline and practices.' The ambiguity of the New Testament evidence concerning the relationship between spiritual gifts and the laying on of hands is stressed. Acts 8 seems to imply that the laying on of hands is in recognition of gifts already bestowed whereas 'Paul' in the pastoral epistles clearly sees a charism as being given in and through the laying on of hands. It might be held, as it is in traditional Methodist teaching, that ordination is carried out for those in whom the gifts and graces for the work are already discerned whilst simultaneously affirming that the invocation of the Spirit upon the ordinand places him or her in a new relationship with the people of God, a relationship for which a strengthening of the Spirit is undoubtedly given in answer to prayer.

The Apostolic Gospel and the Apostolicity of the Church.

The second section of the report deals with the apostolicity of the Gospel and the Church. It highlights the extent to which the two communions have come from originally opposed positions towards a common rapprochement in their understanding of the core of the Gospel. The traditional Lutheran understanding of the core of the gospel is set out alongside the Lutheran acceptance that though the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation retained much that was of the Gospel, including the Scriptures, the basic sacraments and the Word, this basic core was distorted by three errors. These were, firstly, making God's favour dependent upon good works, secondly, centring the Lord's Supper on sacrifice offered to propitiate God (rather presumably than on Christ's self-gift to us through the Supper) and, lastly, the papal hierarchy's claiming the right to add new articles to the faith and impose practices bidding in conscience.

The Lutherans argue that, at the Reformation they had correctly 'reconfigured' the central elements of the apostolic tradition, 'centring church life on Scripture and its exposition in preaching, by the administration and daily remembrance of baptism, by the common celebration of the Lord's Supper, by pastoral exercise of the keys to deal with sin, and by reaffirming ministry as an office of communicating the gospel' These had enabled 'the centre of the holy gospel'...forgiveness and salvation given freely by God's grace, for Christ's sake, received by faith alone', once again to stand out clearly⁶.

Later in this section, the Lutherans acknowledge that developments at and since Vatican II, both in Roman Catholic thinking and in the achievement of the joint dialogue, have narrowed the gap between the two churches and, by implication, have lessened the distortion on the Catholic side as perceived by Lutherans. Nevertheless, though they now acknowledge the basic apostolicity of the Roman Catholic Church, they still 'find some doctrines and practices that are in tension with this reality', though the nature of these doctrines and practices is not spelt out⁷. One may add, in terms of the three major original distortions of apostolicity alleged by Lutherans at the time of the Reformation and until recently, that the reservation about good works has now been settled by the Joint Declaration and the reservations over the Catholic sacrificial doctrine of the eucharist have largely been settled in earlier dialogues⁸. The major

⁶ Apostolicity, para 128.

⁷ Ibid, para 142.

⁸ Thus, Facing Unity states 'A great deal of progress towards a common understanding and celebration of the eucharist has been made to has been made in recent years... it proved possible to reconcile positions with regard

continuing reservations presumably apply largely in the sphere of papal activity in doctrinal definition and imposition of practices binding on conscience, though here also there will have been progress in terms of the post-Vatican II emphasis upon the magisterium as *serving* the Word of God and certainly not being placed above it.

The riposte of the Roman Catholic members of the Commission to the Lutheran contentions stresses that the apostolic legacy is more than the ‘external word’ (stressed by the Lutherans) of the gospel, it is also ‘interior, planted by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers’⁹, a point which is consistent with the testimony of 1 John 2:20 in which the apostle tells the people of his churches that they have an anointing from the Holy Spirit and know all things. This text is the ultimate source alike of the Catholic conviction of the *sensus fidei* and the *consensus fidelium* and an analogous understanding expressed in the hymnody of the Wesleys¹⁰.

The Roman Catholics argue that ‘in the churches they founded the apostles communicated the gospel, thereby communicating the *dona divina*, (‘divine gifts’) to believers by the ensemble of ‘the spoken word of their preaching, by the example they gave, by the institutions they established as they themselves had received’. They argue that ‘what was handed on by the apostles comprises everything that serves to make the people of God live their lives in holiness and increase their faith’. They argue that ‘the patrimony of the apostolic tradition is multifaceted and vital being closely linked with the corporate reality of the community’. In sum, the apostolic tradition is a many sided *depositum vitae* (deposit of life)¹¹.

In a sub-section entitled *Diversity and its Reconciliation*, the Commission expresses the hope that reconciliation in these matters may come through a common acceptance of a differentiated consensus on apostolicity. It would seem to me that such a consensus should indeed be attainable if due respect is paid to the legitimacy of the two starting points outlined. There is clearly agreement that ‘the gospel is central and decisive in the apostolic heritage’, that the apostolic legacy is a manifold and multi faceted heritage and that the key elements of the apostolic heritage as discerned by Luther are acknowledged as fundamental by the Roman Catholic Church today.

A stronger pneumatology may help towards a fuller reconciliation. The classical Lutheran emphasis was on saving work of Christ and its communication through the *viva vox* in the Church of Scripture and preaching, being powerfully articulated also in the gospel sacraments. According to Harding Meyer, a key breakthrough in the conversations leading to the Joint Declaration came with the mutual acknowledgement of the work of the Spirit in the life of believers. Consideration of a theologoumenon of John Wesley may help here. In commenting upon the common life of the apostolic church in Jerusalem immediately after Pentecost and, in particular, upon the sharing of goods in common, Wesley asserts,

‘How came they so to act, seeing that we know of no positive command so to do. I answer, there needed no outward command: The command was written upon their hearts and

to the understanding of the eucharist that had previously been thought to be in conflict and that were therefore seen as divisive (sacrifice of the mass, eucharistic presence): many of the remaining differences are within the common sphere, thus depriving them of their divisive force’

⁹ *Ibid*, para 103.

¹⁰ Cf the Vatican Decree *Lumen Gentium*, para 12 and the hymns of the Wesleys e.g. *Wesleyan Hymn Book* (1877 edn) no 537, with its reference to ‘thy gifts we render back to Thee/ in ceaseless songs of praise’. *Hymns and Psalms* (the current British Methodist hymnal) 1984, nos 374, 753.

¹¹ *Apostolicity*, paras 113,114.

necessarily resulted from the degree of love which they enjoyed. Observe! ‘They were of one heart and one soul’¹².

The Apostolic Tradition is the creation of the Holy Spirit within the Church, partly through his office of bringing to mind all that Christ taught but also through his ministry of shedding the love of God abroad in the hearts of the faithful, inspiring them not only to use the *instituted* means of grace as commanded in Scripture but also, under the continuing guidance and inspiration of the Spirit, to develop *new* practices that enable the faithful to grow in grace. In every generation, the Spirit inspires within the Church many saints who, duly endowed with various charisms, initiate many *prudential* means of grace that is to say spiritual practices which, while lacking *direct* scriptural mandate and authority, nevertheless enable the faithful to live out with ever greater thoroughness and catholic reach to all humankind the mission of the Church as sign, instrument and foretaste of the Kingdom. The sixth quinquennium of the Roman Catholic-Methodist dialogue in its report on revelation and faith, *The Word of Life* (1996) pointed to three meanings of faith, the *fides quae creditur*, the factual doctrinal content of what is believed, the *fides qua creditur*, the active responding, trusting faith inspired by the Holy Spirit by which it is believed, and the *fruitfulness of faith*, that is the accumulated treasury of styles of devotion to and service of Christ and neighbour by which the Church has been built up over the ages. Examples within the Roman Catholic tradition would include the many rich traditions of monastic and religious life, popular traditions such as the cult of the Sacred Heart and the use of the rosary. Within Methodism, they would include such traditions as the class meeting, the Covenant service and the Wesleyan corpus of hymnody.

Lutherans and Roman Catholics must come to see their respective emphases as complementary rather than conflicting. The Universal Church will always stand in need of remembrance of the Lutheran recall to the absolute centrality of the utter gratuitousness of God’s grace in Christ, that there can be no boasting save in his work and that, as Augustine taught, even in the greatest achievements of the saints, (that are, to use the terminology of Charles Wesley but the triumphs of his grace) it is God who crowns his own gifts. At the same time, the Church needs always to remember that there is no limit to the power of the Spirit to save to the uttermost (even if most of us do remain *simul iustus et peccator* right to the end of this life). In the words of the Methodist Covenant service, we ‘rejoice in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit...Who waits to do for us exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think’¹³.

Can a Methodist have the cheek to end by reminding you of two verses from Charles Wesley that seem to me to encapsulate the agreement that was at the heart of the Joint Declaration?

‘Joyful from mine own works to cease
Glad to fulfil all righteousness’¹⁴.

As this section states, reconciliation will come about through a shared reception of the apostolic gospel (which will involve for both churches a *re-reception* of insights they may previously have under-stressed). The participants in the process leading to the *Joint Declaration* emphasised the importance of reading Scripture together.

¹² John Wesley in his sermon ‘The Mystery of Iniquity’, cited in Jennings, T. *Good News to the Poor*, 1990, p.112.

¹³ 1936 version in *Book of Offices*, 1936, p. 123.

¹⁴ Hymns and Psalms, no 788.

One remaining point from this section requires comment and that is the statement in para 122 to the effect that the apostolicity of the Lutheran Communion, though genuine, differs from that of the Catholic Church. This is explained in terms of a Roman Catholic recognition of the ‘many elements of truth and sanctification’ present in the Lutheran churches balanced by the lack of integration of these elements ‘by a united and collegial episcopal ministry in communion with the successor of Peter’ which ‘continues in a unique way the ministry of the apostles’. The full explanation of this in terms of fully authentic apostolic ministry is left for consideration in the two remaining sections but one must, nevertheless, ask the question as to whether apostolicity may not be maintained by varying structures of ministry. The LWF itself is a communion of churches that recognise the full mutual apostolicity of each other despite the fact that some have episcopal ministries claiming to be in the apostolic succession whilst others do not. The very fact of mutual recognition of the same essential faith within a sister church variably structured prompts this question which, in a different ecclesial context, was asked by the Orthodox Bishop Kallistos Ware after he had encountered and recognised the same trinitarian faith that Orthodoxy professes in a non-episcopal church and asked himself whether it was possible that the one faith of the Church might be authentically traditioned, preserved and handed on within differing ministerial structures¹⁵. If, as is recorded in this report, there is agreement in the central message of the Gospel between the two churches what must that then say about the ministry of each in the eyes of the other?

When we turn to Scripture, we find an occasion when our Lord warned the disciples that those outside of their company were not necessarily against him and them¹⁶. In Acts, we learn of the visit of Peter and John to churches that had been founded independently of apostolic initiative as a result of the ‘scattering abroad’ of ordinary disciples after the first persecution in Jerusalem. The comment of Gregory is that the apostles ‘lost no time in recognising and connecting them’¹⁷. Is there a duty within the ministry of the successors of the apostles of recognition of the one faith in other communities; if so, what would it imply for mutual ecclesial and ministerial inter-changeability? Perhaps Roman Catholics should ponder on the teaching of the late John Paul II, who talked of the Holy Spirit as making surprising discoveries possible?¹⁸

Apostolic Succession and Ordained Ministry.

This section deals with one of the thorniest of all ecumenical issues, the recognition of ministries. Two key points are at issue, the first being whether there can be any differentiated consensus concerning the one special ministry of the gospel and the possibility of its being differently, but in both cases validly, structured in the two communions¹⁹. The second question relates to the extent to which the Roman Catholic Church can now recognise the Lutheran ministry as authentically apostolic. This second question has also been discussed in considerable detail in the US dialogue and it is interesting to compare the conclusions of the two dialogues on the question.

¹⁵ Kallistos Ware in Davey, C. (ed) *Returning Pilgrims*, 1994, p.30.

¹⁶ Luke 9:38.

¹⁷ Gregory, B, *The Holy Catholic Church*, 1873, p. 50.

¹⁸ *Ut Unum Sint*, paras 15, 28,28.

¹⁹ para 168 ‘Can the one office of ministry manifest itself in different structures? What belongs to its substance and what belongs to the structures of it which are, within certain limits variable?’.

Traditionally, Lutherans have been suspicious of any concept of a ministerial priesthood in any way differentiated from the priesthood in Christ common to all the faithful. Para 167 approaches the issue by saying that as *hearers* and *recipients* of the gospel all are equal but that as co-workers with God some are specially called to the ordained ministry. Both churches have to clarify the relationship between the universal or common priesthood of all the baptised and the special ministry conferred by ordination. One may add that, to a degree this relationship has been clarified on the Roman Catholic side by the statement in Vatican II that the priesthood of the ordained presbyters and bishops is not just an extension of the common priesthood but differs from it in kind, albeit that the two priesthoods are related, both by only existing in virtue of the incorporation into Christ, the sole priest of the new Covenant, effected sacramentally and in virtue of the effect that all ministry is orientated to the equipping of the saints²⁰.

It seems to me that this question can be further explored in connection with the distinction referred to in para 167. All Christians without distinction have access to the Father through the Son in the Spirit and may boldly approach the Father in prayer whether for themselves or others. Not all Christians are called to the same role in the public representation of the Church and the preaching of the Gospel. Some are solemnly set aside in order that they may be the sign that the whole Church lives by the listening to the Gospel as a word that she does not enunciate but which is spoken to her by God through human beings in a human manner, this being a point upon which both communions are agreed. The authority of the ministry is a reminder to the Church, and particularly to individual congregations within it, that they do not possess the Gospel but that it always comes to them from beyond. There is a paradox at the heart of the Christian ministry in that it both arises within the Church and yet is also gift of the Spirit to the Church. Put differently, ordained ministers are both part of the common priesthood, yet also, as under-shepherds to the Great Shepherd, have a responsibility for its oversight that comes from God and which it is only definitively taken up on a life-long basis when the Church, through its existing ministers, invokes the blessing of the Spirit on them for precisely that ministry²¹.

The Commission accept that this one ministry must constantly refer back to the one foundational apostolic ministry that was laid once and for all. It is accepted that succession in it involves succession not just in function but in *style* of apostolic life. It is asserted that only in love are any or all of the charisms given to the Church effective in building it up. This implies the importance of the relationship established and lived out between the ministry and the faithful at large. A consideration of the proper nature of this relationality might have enhanced the dialogue at this point, it being a key gain of modern ecumenical thinking that all ministry is necessarily relational²².

²⁰ Ephesians 4, v. 13. As Vatican II asserts, the special ministry of the ordained is orientated towards the service of the royal priesthood of the faithful. The Vatican II distinction was also affirmed in ARCIC with its reference to the priesthood of the ordained as 'belonging to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit'.

²¹ Sources for this statement in the Methodist theological tradition are *Nature of the Christian Church*, 1937, p. 27 (cited in *Statements of the Methodist Church on Faith and Order, vol 1*). 1984. Jackson, T, *Christian Presbyters*, 1850 and the British Methodist Conference statements on ordination, 1960, 1974 in *Statements*, op. cit, pp 124-131, 132-145.

²² Thus see e.g. *Nature and Mission of the Christian Church*, 2005 (draft text of the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC, paras 86 and 90. 'the responsibility of those called to exercise oversight cannot be fulfilled without the collaboration, support and assent of the whole community'. (para 90). See also the key work of John Zizioulas.

Section 3.3. explores the significance of the common heritage of both churches in the patristic era and the Middle Ages. This has an additional significance in the fact that, as has been particularly stressed in the US dialogue, there was a strong current of opinion throughout both periods, particularly exemplified in the teaching of St Jerome, that the orders of presbyter and bishop were essentially the same, distinguished only by the wider degree of jurisdiction assigned to bishops. In the early stages of the Reformation, this view was still widely prevalent and influential. It has also been discovered that prior the Reformation there were occasional examples of ordinations to the presbyterate being carried out by presbyters and apparently being accepted as valid, thus calling into question any assertion that the orders conferred by presbyters who sided with the reformers were *per se* invalid²³.

Section 3.4 examines in close detail the understanding of ordained ministry among the Lutheran reformers and at the Council of Trent. The Lutherans clearly believed that the pastoral ministry was of divine institution in the Church. They did not, unlike some other reformers, object to episcopacy *per se* and even accepted that the normal minister of ordination should be a bishop. However, they also believed that in an emergency, when bishops would not side with the Gospel, presbyters could take their place; indeed, in extreme circumstances, congregations could act on their own, the new ministers whom they called being accounted validly ordained²⁴.

Melancthon recognised that the emergence of a regional ministry of supervision of the ordinary presbyters of the Church had been essential. ‘And if there were no bishops, one would have to create them’, a point that is accepted by modern Lutherans at least to the extent that in their churches there are always some ministers with wider regional oversight whether or not they are actually called bishops. We might usefully note here that some of the Anglican Caroline divines recognised this fact, most notably Laud who held that the German Lutherans had the *substance* if not the *name* of episcopacy²⁵. The US dialogue makes further play of this fact when it sets out the practical similarities between Lutheran and Roman Catholic ordering of the church at local and regional levels.

The understanding of the ministry at the Council of Trent is then discussed, due attention being given to the way in which it was slanted by reaction against the reformers, particularly in the matter of emphasising the sacrificial nature of priesthood. An interesting point is made in para 230, where attention is given to the fact that the ‘inner structure of ordained ministry’ is determined by ‘divine appointment’ rather than ‘by divine right’, the former being considered a weaker statement and one which ‘cannot exclude a certain degree of historical contingency’. In the light of the fact that ARCIC also argues for the providentially guided evolution of the threefold ministry rather than its direct appointment by Christ, one wonders what room this may leave for a re-evaluation of both the historical contingency that led the early Church to adopt the three fold order and the precise conditions, whether in terms of necessary loyalty to the gospel or missionary exigency, that led to its later abandonment in many Lutheran and other churches²⁶.

²³ of course, this was not the only reason why they were disputed. There was also the question of whether the reformers, including those in England and Sweden where episcopal ordinations continued, had so changed the understanding of priesthood and episcopacy as to render their *intention* invalid.

²⁴ *Apostolicity*, para 205.

²⁵ See e.g. Avis, P. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 2002, p. 136.

²⁶ ARCIC, *The Final Report*, Statement on Ministry and Ordination (1973), para 13.

It is clear from more recent developments in both churches that gaps have been narrowed. Lutherans now emphasise that that a particular ministry is required in order that the general priesthood of all the faithful may be realised in every day life²⁷. This statement falls short of talking of a particular ministerial priesthood, though it is quite clear that Lutherans ascribe at least a degree of sacramentality to ordination which is defined both as prayer for the Holy Spirit and as involving the reliable promise of the support of the Spirit. It is also stressed that ordination is for service in the *whole* Church, that it is for lifelong service and that a bishop is its normal minister²⁸.

A further stress is placed upon the fact that regional ministers are required as focal enablers of communion.

‘It is not sufficient simply to affirm each worshipping congregation’s link with the universal church; the link requires a deliberate and institutionalized structure if it is not to wither away and damage the unity between the congregations. These spiritual bonds must be discerned and fostered by a ministry and the people especially called to it’²⁹.

The Lutherans recognise a challenge to develop episcopal collegiality at the level of the entire Communion³⁰. Finally, they recognise the historic episcopate as a sign but not guarantee of apostolicity, though they stress that it is a sign that commits the whole Church, bishops in particular to work for apostolicity. They quote the Porvoo Common Statement to this effect, an agreement that has already allowed most of the episcopally ordered Scandinavian and Baltic Lutheran churches to enter into communion with the British and Irish Anglican churches³¹.

The Roman Catholics give an account of developments at and since Vatican II. They stress the great emphasis placed on the episcopate at the Council and its teaching role. They emphasise the positive aspects of Vatican II teaching of the priesthood of the faithful. ‘The faithful indeed, by virtue of their royal priesthood share in the offering of the eucharist.’ It is stressed that the roles of preaching, eucharistic presidency and leadership are ascribed to bishops and presbyters alike. This brings Roman Catholics closer to the Lutheran emphasis on the one ministry as involving a *bundle* of duties³².

In their conclusions to this section, the Commission state that the two churches are now agreed that the Church is apostolic on the basis of the Gospel and faithfulness to it. They are agreed that ordained ministry is essential to the Church, that it was instituted by God and that, through the power of the Spirit, it contributes to the Church’s being and remaining apostolic. Ministers enter the ministry through ordination. Both churches accept that a differentiation of the ministry into a more local and a more regional office arises out of the intention and task of the ministry to be a ministry of unity in faith³³.

²⁷ *Apostolicity*, para 255.

²⁸ *Ibid*, paras 261, 267.

²⁹ *Ibid*, para 262.

³⁰ *Ibid*, para 268.

³¹ *Ibid*, para 269

³² And, indeed, the one that prevails in the Methodist tradition. It could be argued that the rather exclusive emphasis upon eucharistic presidency in contrast to preaching and pastoral care in the Roman catholic tradition between the high Middle Ages and Vatican II disturbed the balance (Lutherans might say balanced configuration) of the understanding of presbyteral ministry.

³³ *Apostolicity*, paras 270-280. It is also stressed that, in the church of the first three centuries, most bishops ruled over a congregation of the faithful no larger, indeed often smaller, than that of a modern parish. The emergence

They record however, some continuing differences, most notably the Roman Catholic conviction that the emergence of the three-fold order in the primitive Church was providential and must be seen as irreversible. Lutherans, by contrast, argue that, at the Reformation, in most cases, they had to choose between episcopal ministry and loyalty to the apostolic gospel and naturally chose the latter as fundamental. The Roman Catholics argue that apostolic succession in episcopal office is essential. The Commission also notes a tension between the Lutheran understanding of local church as congregation and the Roman Catholic understanding of it as diocese under its bishop³⁴. This point undoubtedly needs further theological exploration which might be helped by a common dialogue of both traditions with the Methodist ‘connexional’ emphasis which sees the church as an interdependent web of connections at every level, thus making sense of such structures and national Catholic bishops’ conferences and national Lutheran churches for which it is difficult to give a full ecclesiological rationale if one can only talk in terms of local and Universal Church without attributing a real ecclesiological significance to other intermediate levels of relationship such as ecclesiastical province in the Roman Catholic tradition or national conference in the Methodist one.

Para 283 adds a nuance to this that seems to contradict Roman Catholic recognition of the full apostolicity of the ministries of the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox churches. It states that ‘it is also Catholic doctrine that in Lutheran churches the sacramental sign of ordination is not fully present because those who ordain do not act in communion with the Catholic episcopal college’. It is true, of course, that the Roman Catholic Church has talked of the Orthodox churches as being wounded on account of their lack of communion with Peter but they are still recognised as true local churches in the catholic sense with true bishops and priests.

Finally, the Commission bring ecumenical perspectives to bear on the issues. They recognise that the agreement in the *Joint Declaration* on ‘the measure and touchstone of Christian faith’ creates a new situation in which the traditional views of each others’ ministries cannot remain unchanged. The complexity of views held on ministerial structure at the time of the Reformation needs to be taken more fully into account. The question of recognition of para-episcopal ministries that provenly safeguard apostolic doctrine needs to be tackled. They ask whether a differentiated consensus on the doctrine of the ministry is possible³⁵.

In commenting, I would suggest that there are aspects of this section that could have been developed more fully, particularly taking into account relevant statements of Vatican II and the recent work of the US dialogue and the LWF statement on episcopacy. The international Commission refer to the relevance of the statement in *Unitatis Redintegratio* concerning other churches to the effect that ‘the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation³⁶. They continue

‘If the consensus of bishops is the definitive sign of apostolicity of their doctrine, then Catholics cannot exclude these other *episkopoi* from the circle of those whose consensus is according to the Catholic view the sign of the apostolicity of doctrine’

of the modern style parish under the normal presidency of a presbyter from the fourth century onwards changed the situation radically.

³⁴ Paras 284ff.

³⁵ Ibid, para 292.

³⁶ UR 3 in para 291 of *Apostolicity*.

By a similar token, they could also probe the implications of the statement in Unitatis Redintegratio that ‘because of the lack of the sacrament of orders they (i.e. the reformation churches in general, not just Lutherans) have not preserved the genuine and total reality of the eucharistic mystery’. The first point to be noted is the exact meaning of lack (Latin defectus). It is strongly stressed in the US dialogue that this should be translated as *deficiency* rather than being understood to mean a *complete absence*. On the basis of such an understanding and an acceptance that the catholicity of *any* (my italics) church is impaired by lack of communion with others, it should, in the opinion of the US dialogue Commission, lead to at least a *partial* mutual recognition of ministries³⁷.

The second point to be noted is that the Decree talks of a failure to preserve the total reality of the eucharistic mystery rather than, as would have been the case before the Council, the total invalidity of such eucharists. Indeed the positive point is affirmed that ‘when they commemorate the Lord’s Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and they await His coming in glory’. Thus, it is clear that Vatican II accepts that the Lord’s Supper as celebrated in the reformation churches retains the genuinely eschatological orientation of the sacrament, a point particularly valued in the eastern Christian and Wesleyan traditions³⁸. What it lacks is unclear. The question is particularly poignant for Anglicans who feel that they have preserved a valid episcopal succession and for Lutherans who have, more thoroughly than any other major western tradition apart from the Roman Catholic, consistently upheld a belief that Christ, in his unique resurrection presence is, through the ministry of the Holy Spirit, present in the totality of his self-gift not just as host but also as food³⁹. My personal opinion is that the Roman Catholic Church owes a clarification of the exact meaning of the somewhat ambiguous statements of Vatican II on these matters to its Anglican and Protestant partners as a whole. In the light of a statement attributed to him, the present Holy Father might himself clarify. The US dialogue quote his correspondence with the Bavarian Lutheran bishop

‘I count among the most important results of the ecumenical dialogues the insight that the issue of the eucharist cannot be narrowed to the problem of validity. Even a theology orientated to the concept of succession, such as that which holds in the Catholic and in the Orthodox Church, need not in any way deny the salvation granting presence of the Lord in a Lutheran Lord’s Supper’⁴⁰.

In the light of this, one is tempted to ask what distinction there can be, granted its ‘salvific efficacy’, between such a Lord’s Supper and the eucharist of the Universal Church as understood in the Roman Catholic tradition.

Koinonia of Salvation makes several other valuable suggestions including on universal ministry, a topic rather overlooked by the international Commission in this report. It usefully shows how similar the structures of the two churches are at local (parish/congregation) and regional (diocesan) level while challenging Lutherans to ‘explore whether the worldwide koinonia of the church calls for a worldwide minister of unity and what form such a ministry

³⁷ *Church as Koinonia of Salvation*, Section VII A ‘Towards a Recognition of the Reality and Woundedness of our Ministries and Churches’, paras 95-113.

³⁸ See e.g. the teaching of St Maximus the Confessor on the eucharist as ‘the memorial of the things to come’ and that of the Wesleys in their *Hymns on the Lord’s Supper*, 1745, a teaching reflected in the modern British Methodist eucharistic liturgies.

³⁹ The key factor restraining Lutheran communion in the pre-ecumenical era with Anglicans and Reformed alike was a doubt as to whether they held a proper doctrine of the eucharistic presence.

⁴⁰ In 1993 with Bishop Johannes Hanselmann, cited in *Koinonia* op cit, para 107.

might take to be truly evangelical' (conversely, it challenges Catholics to consider how the petrine ministry might be reformed to make clearer its 'subjection to the gospel in service to the *koinonia* of salvation'⁴¹. It further 'recommends that our churches recognise our common understanding of the interdependent structures of church life and ministry... reflected in a shared sense of the single sacrament of Order or the one office of ministry. The differences between us in emphasis and terminology need not be church dividing even though they challenge each church to overcome imbalances in its own tradition'⁴². It further helps the debate on the question of the one ministry by referring to the Roman Catholic emphasis upon the 'the unitary nature of the sacrament of order as mitigating differences between the two churches on the distinction between presbyter/pastor and bishop'⁴³.

The LWF Statement on episcopacy also makes a valuable contribution to the discussion. It accepts that episcopal ministry is a distinct form of the one pastoral ministry. It emphasises that it must be exercised not only collegially, including together with the ordained ministers of congregations, but also communally 'in an integral relationship with the different constituencies of the church and their bodies of authority at all levels, promoting communal participation in the discernment of the gospel'. Bishops must work with synodical structures with which they share (my italics) governance. This statement accords with primitive practice, at least in terms of consultation with the presbyterium, with the modern ecumenical consensus as recorded in BEM and with the practice of other reformation churches that have an episcopate⁴⁴. It is vital that it be stated as the reformation churches are witnesses to the importance of the active involvement in the governance of the Church and even Vatican II recorded the importance of consulting the laity especially in spheres where they have proven expertise⁴⁵. Finally, the Statement stresses that valuable as the sign of the episcopal succession is in testifying to apostolicity, its absence does not mean that there has necessarily been a loss of apostolic faith⁴⁶.

Church Teaching that Remains in the Truth.

This final section of the report is also the longest and addresses particularly difficult and significant questions. Its achievement is significant; however, one also feels that it rather skates over some issues.

It follows the method of preceding sections. The approaches of the pre-reformation Church, primitive and medieval, to the questions of biblical canon, interpretation and teaching authority are analysed and discussed. This is followed by an exposition of the Lutheran and Roman Catholic approaches to Scripture and teaching authority during and subsequent to the Reformation era. Finally, two sets of conclusions are given. Firstly, three key points of consensus are adumbrated. These are followed by points on which it is believed a

⁴¹ For the lower level structures see, *Koinonia*, part I, section 2, and for universal ministry suggestions see paras 115-120.

⁴² *Ibid*, para 96.

⁴³ *Koinonia*, para 223.

⁴⁴ EMAC, paras 45-52. Cyprian always argued that he never acted without consulting his presbyterium. The Church of England has described itself as episcopally led and synodically governed, a statement that has been questioned by some Anglicans but is nevertheless worth pondering in this situation.

⁴⁵ Cf Decree on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) para 37 'Let the sacred pastors recognise and promote the dignity as well as the responsibility of the layman in the Church. Let them willingly make use of his prudent advice'

⁴⁶ EMAC, para 58.

differentiated consensus could be reached since the divergences recorded on these are seen as such that they need no longer be church dividing.

In the first section, some interesting points are made from early and medieval tradition. The significance of the early forms of the rule of faith is set out. Irenaeus is cited as saying that the rule of faith corresponds with the salvation wrought in the believers' hearts by the Holy Spirit, a point that has since been strongly affirmed in the Methodist theological tradition⁴⁷. St Thomas Aquinas is also cited as stressing that 'the act of the believer does not reach its term in the formula but in the reality expressed which related also to an emphasis upon orthopraxy as the necessary concomitant of orthodoxy'⁴⁸. The interesting point is made that it was only at the very end of the Middle Ages in the context of reaction to Marsilius of Padua and Wycliff that the novelty emerged of deriving the authority of Scripture from the Church which fixed the canon⁴⁹.

In the next section, Luther's immense devotion to Scripture is stressed, particularly his view of its transformative power in the person of faith. 'Now the strength of Scripture is this, that it is not changed into the one who studies it but that it transforms the one who loves it into itself and its own strengths'⁵⁰. Doctrine has to be 'pure Scripture. It is the Spirit who opens hearts to the truth. However, he makes use of correct doctrine and the right administration of the sacraments in leading us to God's word. Christian teaching is always directly or indirectly interpretation of Holy Scripture'.

At the very end of this section, the significant point is made that while Lutherans see the classic locus of teaching as being within the congregation, they also accept, following the logic of the demands of Confessio Augustana 7 that there is a duty of mutual consultation between churches on doctrinal issues. Examples are given of the way in which the LWF has sought to maintain mutual accountability for the purity of doctrine through such consultation⁵¹.

The Roman Catholic section emphasises that Catholics accept 'the inherent power of the biblical word to impose itself on us as norm and guide'⁵². It emphasises that the magisterium does not judge Scripture but only interpretations of it; even then, it does not attribute to itself a monopoly in this, but has regard for other sources of truth in what is defied as a many sided enterprise, the other sources including the witness of the fathers, of the liturgies, of the saints of the past, of the consensus fidelium and, in more modern times, the work of expert exegetes and other scholars. It is interesting to note here some similarity with the plural set of sources acknowledged by the Anglican bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 1948. Roman Catholics record that they are reticent about the idea of Scripture interpreting itself but that they accept its efficacious power. In accepting this last point, they come very close to the traditional Protestant emphasis on the sacramental power of the Word as mediated by the Spirit. 'This grounds the conviction, held in common with the Reformation that the Spirit –inspired biblical text has its own efficacy in conveying revealed truth that informs minds and hearts'⁵³.

⁴⁷ *Apostolicity*, para 322.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, para 326.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, para 353.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, para 365

⁵¹ *Ibid*, paras 387, 388.

⁵² *Ibid*, para 401, justified in terms of Vatican I (para 397) and Vatican II (399)

⁵³ *Ibid*, para 409.

This has perhaps never been put better than in a verse of Charles Wesley which I like to read or sing before the gospel in a service⁵⁴.

Come, divine interpreter
Bring us eyes thy book to read,
Ears the mystic words to hear,
Words which did from thee proceed,
Words that endless bliss impart,
Kept in an obedient heart.'

Considerable attention is given to the development of the magisterium in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but it is stressed that it is not superior to the Word of God and that it only teaches what is handed on to it. The importance of the fundamental sensus fidelium and consensus fidelium as the backdrop to all articulation of teaching is strongly reinforced. Para 420 stresses that 'the people unfailingly adhere to this faith, penetrate it more deeply through right judgement and apply it more fully in daily life', a point that coheres with the Wesleyan emphases already alluded to. It is also emphasised that magisterial formulations do not communicate the truth in final fullness and that better formulations of the truth may ultimately supersede them⁵⁵.

In the final summary, three points of complete agreement are recorded. They are, firstly, 'that our new life is solely due to the forgiving and renewing mercy that God imparts as a gift and that we receive in faith'. Next comes the relation of Gospel and Church. 'By this, the risen Lord shows himself alive and active to save as the Church continues to proclaim him in word and sacrament'. Finally, 'the Scriptures are the source, rule, guideline and criterion for the correctness and purity of the Church's proclamation...by the biblical canon, the Church does not constitute but recognises the authority of the prophetic and apostolic scriptures⁵⁶.

There then follow reflections on the Canon, Scripture and Tradition and the Church's teaching office. On the first, Roman Catholics and Lutherans traditionally differed over the authority to be attributed to the Apocrypha. Lutherans now accept that their traditional reluctance to attribute any authority to the latter needs to be revisited in the light of three considerations, firstly that, during New Testament times, the canon of the Old Testament was not yet fixed, secondly that the Septuagint was the Holy Scripture of the early Church and thirdly that limiting the Old Testament to the Hebrew canon leaves a huge gap in the tradition process between the Old and new Testaments making it difficult to grasp the New Testament in its unity with the Old. It is argued that, in the light of their agreement over the source of the Bible's canonical status, differences over the extent of the canon are not such as to warrant continued ecclesial division.

On Scripture and Tradition, it is agreed that Scripture was written from within a process of Tradition and 'is orientated towards a process of being interpreted on the context of ecclesial tradition'.⁵⁷ The differently nuanced Roman Catholic and Lutheran views of Tradition are set out. Roman Catholics argue that the transmission of the Gospel gives rise to valid expressions, such as creeds, as 'summaries and clarifications of the Gospel'. Roman Catholics do not see them as floating free from biblical moorings and indeed reaffirm the patristic and

⁵⁴ *Hymns and Psalms*, no 468.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, paras 419-428

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, paras 432-4.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, para 442.

medieval view that Scripture contains all revealed truth. Lutherans accept traditions which are edifying and do not conflict with the Word of God, though they must not be *imposed* as necessary; they add that they regard the creeds as *not* being human traditions since they are so securely grounded in Scripture.

At this point, both communions might be helped by the Methodist assertion that many of the special traditions that emerged as a result of the creative missionary work of the Wesleys and their associates nevertheless echoed and resembled traditions that they found within the life of the apostolic and sub-apostolic churches. Thus, Methodists would justify the development of the class meeting and the connexional system on the grounds that though there were no exact primitive precedents nevertheless they rested, in the first case upon Paul's many injunctions to mutual fellowship and support and later primitive embodiments of this principle, in the second upon that ecclesial interdependence and mutual support that is recorded in the New Testament and particularly in the Pauline epistles⁵⁸.

Finally, it is agreed that the teaching office is essential for the Church. It is differently structured or configured in the two communions but Lutherans accept that more emphasis is needed upon a super-regional teaching office. Both churches accept that 'there is a network of several instances of witness to God's word which constitutes the essential context within which those exercising the teaching office must carry out their responsibilities⁵⁹. Both churches agree that such an office is essential to maintaining the Church in the truth of the gospel of Christ.

This section is a remarkable achievement. Nevertheless, one feels that some issues are rather skated over. There is reference to the Antiochian on the primacy of the literal interpretation of the word of God, but little is said about the typological exegesis which has been so important in some doctrinal development within the Roman Catholic tradition, perhaps particularly notably in marian doctrine. The hermeneutical process by which Ezekiel 44:2 is interpreted as a proof text for the doctrines of the perpetual virginity and the Immaculate Conception needs addressing

A not unrelated issue is the question of the continuing validity of doctrinal definitions made in times of separation. Many Roman Catholic scholars would want to make a distinction between the authority attributed to the doctrinal definitions of the early Councils of the Church and those that took place after the great Schism of the eleventh century. No less a person than the current Holy Father is on record as saying that the Orthodox would only have to accept as binding doctrinal definitions preceding that schism. The question of whether doctrines can be defined as a result of the development of popular piety within one churchly body rather than the need to exclude an error threatening the fundamentals of faith needs examining⁶⁰.

By extension, one wonders about the position with regard also to Lutherans since the Joint Declaration and in the additional light of this report. If the two communions are

⁵⁸ Thus, Wesley himself, commenting on the Methodist innovations in *A Plain Account of the People Called Methodists*, 1748, states 'though generally they found, in looking back, something in Christian antiquity likewise, very nearly parallel thereto'. See also Gregory, op cit pp 217ff. for a long list of antecedents of the class meeting in the life of the early Church.

⁵⁹ *Apostolicity*, para 457.

⁶⁰ Here again I am thinking of the marian definitions of 1854 and 1950. the extent to which a church can 'canonise' devotional prudential means of grace and regard them as binding on the Universal Church requires more ecumenical exploration than it has yet received.

acknowledged to be at one on the most fundamental basic doctrine of the faith and if they come to a mutual acceptance of each other's apostolicity, what is the status of other doctrinal status made by *either* church since the 1520's. They can be regarded as carrying an impressive weight of authority but can they be seen as binding on all the faithful of Christ?

Conclusion.

Overall, this is an impressive dialogue document and will be of value not merely to the two partners immediately concerned but in all the other dialogues between the Roman Catholic Church and the reformation and post-reformation churches. All the latter will be glad to see the stress upon the absolute centrality and primacy of the Gospel of free grace for undeserving sinners as the indispensable context for considering all ecclesiological and ministerial issues.

Two key challenges now need to be faced, one by Lutherans and other reformation churches and one by Roman Catholics. The challenge to the former is to re-receive the sign of the episcopal succession as a sign continuously esteemed and found effective in ensuring the communion of the Church across time as well as geographical space. If it was once necessary to abandon it in order to secure loyalty to the true Gospel, may it not now be necessary to re-receive it in pursuit of the equally divine imperative of unity⁶¹?

Some Lutherans have found it difficult to envisage such a step and have felt, particularly in Germany and in sections of American Lutheranism that its re-reception would compromise the purity of their trust in free grace alone. This, however, is to confuse God's design in justification of the *individual* with his *design* in the corporate life of the Church, his fatherly freedom in embracing the prodigal with his desire to 'unite all things in Christ'. Many Methodists and Reformed have felt a similar difficulty but to them also is commended the thinking of this report, the example of those Lutherans who have retained or re-received the sign without any disloyalty to their understanding of free grace and the example of those Anglicans who treasure alike the heritage of the reformers and the episcopal succession.

To Roman Catholics comes the challenge of finding new ways of acting upon their discernment of the true apostolicity of the Lutherans and, indeed, other reformation churches. The late Pope John Paul II stressed the way in which the Holy Spirit makes surprising discoveries possible. Biblical pneumatology, especially in the Acts of the Apostles, show the Spirit as constantly moving the Church on, opening the eyes of its leaders to new developments and discoveries alike⁶². One can develop from it, as did the Wesleyan ecclesiologist Benjamin Gregory, a theology of an apostolic duty of recognition and connection, based on the paradigm of the first visit of Peter and John to those churches that had been founded during first persecution in Jerusalem by ordinary disciples rather the apostles (the latter having been in goal). Gregory comments that they lost no time in 'recognising and connecting' them⁶³. One may argue that it is an apostolic duty, even a petrine one, to lead the Church in such recognition and action. Indeed, Jean-Marie Tillard asserts that the Pauline element in the special dual apostolicity of the Roman church that founds its unique authority, 'attests the unforeseeable action of God'⁶⁴.

⁶¹ A point that I have explored in detail in the paper I gave at the Bose conference on The Holy Spirit and Christian Unity. See Donnelly, D. et al (eds) *The Holy Spirit, the Churches and Christian Unity*, (2005), pp 199-223.

⁶² E.g. Acts 10-11, 15.

⁶³ Gregory, op cit, pp. 41,50.

⁶⁴ Tillard, J-M *L'Eglise Locale*, (1995), p. 540.

Relevant also perhaps are the observations made by Burkhard in his book *Apostolicity, Then and Now*, that both Irenaeus and Tertullian regarded the apostolicity of a church as dependent not on a local episcopal succession as such but on the congruity of its faith with one of the norm churches of definite apostolic foundation⁶⁵. This would seem to imply that if Rome can recognise the faith of another church as congruent in essentials with its own, there can be no remaining barrier to an acceptance of its full churchly status

Precisely what steps will be necessary in this context remain to be discerned. Maybe as is hinted in the recent report of the Catholic-Methodist dialogue, it will involve a 'fresh creative act of reconciliation which acknowledges the manifold yet unified activity of the Holy Spirit throughout the ages', involving 'a joint act of obedience to the sovereign word of God'⁶⁶. Maybe consideration of the current emphasis upon the epicletic nature of all sacramental acts, ordination included, will help us in this context. Can there be such a thing as an invocation of the Spirit for his gifts in ministry that is not answered, such being the logical consequence of any legalistic concept of validity and invalidity?

The Roman Catholic Church is also reminded that from the very beginning of the dialogue, the commissions concerned have asked for questions of ecclesial and ministerial recognition to be addressed. As early as the Malta Report of 1972, we read

'Therefore, the Catholic members request the appropriate authorities in the Roman Catholic Church to consider whether the ecumenical urgency flowing from Christ's will does not demand that the Roman Catholic Church examine seriously the question of recognition of the Lutheran ministerial office'⁶⁷.

Both churches need to bite on these challenges both to honour the work that successive dialogues have achieved and, infinitely more importantly, to respond to Jesus' own prayer and wish 'that they all may be one'.

David Carter.

⁶⁵ Burkhard is an American Jesuit. The norm churches he refers to are those of Philippi, Corinth, Thessalonica and Rome. See his book, pp. 27-8.

⁶⁶ *The Grace Given You in Christ*, 2006, para 144.

⁶⁷ The Malta Report, 1972, para 63.