

TOWARDS AN ANGLICAN COVENANT

Paul McPartlan

1. 'We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him' (Rom 8:28). The Anglican Communion is currently facing grave issues of structural unity at the same time as it seeks to clarify its teaching on important sacramental and moral issues. The two sets of issues (structural and doctrinal) are intimately related, in that the Church as a pilgrim people is bound to encounter new challenges and unforeseen questions on its journey in history, and therefore must have an adequate mechanism for coping with them and finding acceptable solutions which, far from placing the community under stress actually consolidate its unity. Serious issues will inevitably test the structures, and it would surely be an unlikely luxury to be able to work out the structures prior to addressing any major problems. It is far more likely that problems will precipitate work to establish adequate structures, and St Paul assures us in the quote above that that process and its end-result can be blessed if the work is done in the love that is the gift of the Spirit.
2. This has been the pattern of the life of the Church ever since the earliest centuries, and there are almost countless historical precedents that might be looked to for guidance and help in the present situation. The fourth century was a particularly turbulent period of doctrinal crisis and structural upheaval. Henry Chadwick writes:

'It was the misfortune of the fourth-century Church that it became engrossed in a theological controversy at the same time as it was working out its institutional organisation. The doctrinal disagreements quickly became inextricably associated with matters of order, discipline and authority. Above all, they became bound up with the gradually growing tension between the Greek East and the Latin West.'¹

As indicated above, I would suggest that what was indeed obviously a 'misfortune' from one point of view, can also be seen as perhaps providential from another. By its very name, the Anglican Communion proclaims its awareness that God's gift to us is a participation in the communion life of the Trinity. Now, as well as being a communion in space, as it were, uniting Christians across the world today, the Church is also a communion in time, and tradition is the fellowship of Christians through the ages, by means of which those who face problems today can be helped in charity by those who have gone before us marked with the sign of faith. From the many important legacies of

¹ Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, revised ed., 1993), p.133. Part of this quotation was used in the Report submitted to the Lambeth Commission by an ad hoc subcommission of IARCCUM, 'Ecclesiological Reflections on the Current Situation in the Anglican Communion in the Light of ARCIC' (June 8th, 2004), n.5 (in a section of the report devoted to 'The Church's Life in the 4th Century'). I shall refer to this text as 'IARCCUM Report'.

the 4th century, I would like to consider one particular canon from that century that is playing a prominent role in ecclesial and ecumenical reflection today, and that I would like to suggest can be helpful in the process of preparing an Anglican Covenant.

3. The quotation from Henry Chadwick valuably highlights the fact that already in the fourth century, long before the famous events of 1054, there were tensions between the Greek East and the Latin West precisely with regard to the structure of the Church and the manner of resolving doctrinal and disciplinary disputes. One of the most hopeful ecclesial events of recent times has been the resumption of formal dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, aimed at the restoration of full communion. The first meeting of the reconstituted international commission for theological dialogue between the two churches was held at Belgrade in September 2006, and was swiftly followed by Pope Benedict's highly successful visit to Turkey, and in particular to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. The dialogue has reached the crucial stage of considering the interrelated topics of authority, conciliarity and primacy in the Church. It would surely be helpful for the Anglican Communion, which has been in fruitful dialogue for decades with both of these churches individually, to bear the Roman Catholic-Orthodox (RC-O) dialogue in mind as it (the Anglican Communion) moves towards an internal covenant that will adequately accommodate considerations of authority, conciliarity and primacy in the polity of the Communion. Two particular reasons stand out:
 - a) First, the RC-O dialogue is naturally seeking to draw on the period of the undivided Church in its reflections. That period belongs to the heritage of us all, including Anglicans, and offers principles that have stood the test of time subsequently. Principles that come to prominence in the dialogue because of their relevance for today, may well be relevant also for the Anglican Covenant.
 - b) Second, the more there are common threads running through the decisions that Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans make both individually and together in this privileged ecumenical time, the more we shall implicitly be weaving the fabric of ever-greater unity.
4. It is not at all surprising that the Anglican Communion, which because of a variety of factors has seen a rapidly increasing number of provinces in the past century, should be grappling with the crucial issue of how to coordinate the life of such a diverse and burgeoning family of Christians. The Communion has progressively provided itself with four instruments of unity, namely the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Primates' Meeting. A clear recognition that the Christian Church needs both primacy and conciliarity in its structures of authority is evident in the list of these instruments, yet these instruments as presently constituted have not proved sufficient to deal with the present crisis. Precisely because these instruments already embody recognition of the crucial principles of primacy and conciliarity, the way forward lies not in abandoning them for other instruments, but in developing them to serve more adequately. The lack of an explicit body of canon law specifically pertaining to the Communion as such has also been keenly felt. *The Windsor Report* (TWR) strongly supported moves towards furnishing the Communion at least with a body of canonical principles (TWR, n.114), and such a *corpus* would indeed seem

to have a vital role to play as an additional instrument of unity. However, TWR's most prominent proposals focus upon the Archbishop of Canterbury himself and aim at strengthening his primatial role (TWR, nn.105-112). Given the origins of the Church of England and hence of the Anglican Communion, it is natural that there should be an instinctive caution with regard to a primacy pertaining to the Communion as a whole, yet the need for a stronger focal primacy has become plain.

5. *Mutatis mutandis*, there is great caution regarding universal primacy among the Orthodox Churches, yet a constructive dialogue on primacy, including universal primacy, has begun among Orthodox and Roman Catholics. The latter, of course, are known for a universal primacy so strong that it has risked eclipsing conciliarity. After the definitions of papal primacy and infallibility at Vatican I (1869-70), it gradually became widely presumed that the era of councils was now over. Pope John XXIII caused a major stir by the very fact of summoning another council. At its heart, appropriately, was a definition of the collegiality and collegial responsibility of the bishops:

‘The order of bishops is the successor of the college of the apostles in their role as teachers and pastors, and in it the apostolic college is perpetuated. Together with their head, the Supreme Pontiff, and never apart from him, they have supreme and full authority over the universal Church.’²

The most significant thing about Vatican II (1962-65) was that it actually happened. The conciliar experience ‘reopened the chapter in the Church’s book of conciliar life’.³

6. The third agreed statement of the international Roman Catholic-Orthodox dialogue stated that it was in the perspective of ‘communion among local churches that the question could be addressed of primacy in the Church in general and in particular, the primacy of the bishop of Rome’. Moreover, it invoked a fourth century canon, namely Apostolic Canon 34, to indicate a way forward: ‘according to canon 34 of the Apostolic Canons, belonging to the canonical tradition of our churches, the first among the bishops only takes a decision in agreement with the other bishops and the latter take no important decision without the agreement of the first’.⁴ This canon would likewise, I presume, be counted as belonging to the canonical tradition of the Anglican Communion. It may be of great benefit to the Communion at this time, as it is certainly offering assistance in the context of RC-O dialogue. It is also perhaps worth mentioning that, although the Orthodox do not favour the concept of Canon Law, an awareness of the *Canons* is crucial

² Vatican II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, n.22.

³ Yves Congar, ‘A Last Look at the Council’ in Alberic Stacpoole (ed.), *Vatican II by those who were there* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), pp.337-58, here at p.341.

⁴ ‘The Sacrament of Order in the Sacramental Structure of the Church with Particular Reference to the Importance of Apostolic Succession for the Sanctification and Unity of the People of God’ (1988), in John Borelli & John H.Erickson (eds.), *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue* (Crestwood/Washington DC: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press/United States Catholic Conference, 1996), nn.55, 53, respectively (on p.142).

to Orthodox ecclesial life. Canons do not have to be viewed purely as matters of *law*.

7. The value of Apostolic Canon 34 for RC-O dialogue has been strongly advocated by Metropolitan John Zizioulas of Pergamon, the Orthodox Co-President of the international RC-O dialogue (the Catholic Co-President being Cardinal Walter Kasper). Recently, Metropolitan John went so far as to state: ‘This canon can be the golden rule of the theology of primacy.’⁵ The full version of the canon is as follows:

‘The bishops of every nation (region = ἔθνος) ought to know who is the first one (πρῶτος) among them, and to esteem him as their head, and not to do any great thing without his consent; but every one to manage the affairs that belong to his own diocese and the territory subject to it. But let him (i.e. the first one) not do anything without the consent of all the other (bishops); for it is by this means that there will be unanimity, and God will be glorified through Christ in the Holy Spirit.’⁶

Zizioulas regards the Trinitarian doxology at the end of the canon as highly significant. It indicates that this manner of relating between what he calls the ‘one’ and the ‘many’ has its prototype in God, and is the pattern that the earthly Church must necessarily adopt if it is truly participating in the life of God. In other words, communion is not a vague or formless reality. It has a definite *shape*, namely that of the one and the many. This fact is of great importance for the shaping and structure of a Trinitarian, communal Church. In the Trinity, the Father is the *one*, the central, anchoring Person, of whom the Son is begotten and from whom the Spirit proceeds. There are no Son and Spirit without the Father, but equally there is no Father without the Son and the Spirit. There is full reciprocity between the one and the many. This pattern then applies to *Christology*, to the *Eucharist*, and to the *Church*, which regularly *receives communion* in the celebration of the Eucharist.⁷ Zizioulas continues: ‘the one-and-the-many idea which runs through the entire doctrine of the Church leads directly to the ministry of primacy’. Primacy is the reflection of the ‘one’ in the structure and life of the Church. He adds: ‘It also indicates the conditions which are necessary for primacy to be ecclesologically justifiable and

⁵ Ioannis Zizioulas, ‘Recent Discussions on Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology’, in Cardinal Walter Kasper (ed.), *The Petrine Ministry* (Mahwah NJ: Newman Press, 2006), pp.231-46, here at p. 243.

⁶ John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), pp.135-36, n.24. There was a reference to this canon in IARCCUM Report, n.8.

⁷ Cf Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon, ‘Primacy in the Church: An Orthodox Approach’, in James F. Puglisi (ed.), *Petrine Ministry and the Unity of the Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), pp.115-25, here at pp.118-19. Also, *Being as Communion*, pp.135-37. On Zizioulas, see Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (1993; new ed., Fairfax VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2006), esp. pp.203-211.

sound.’⁸ It is important to note that, although Canon 34 originally applies at the *regional* level, Zizioulas sees in it a principle that must logically apply at *all* levels in the Church, *local* (the bishop in his local church), *regional* (e.g. the primate or patriarch among the bishops of an area), and *universal* (the universal primate among the primates or patriarchs). ‘A universal *primus* exercising his primacy in such a way is not only “useful” to the Church but an ecclesiological necessity in a unified Church.’⁹

8. The Russian Orthodox, Nicolas Lossky, indicates that Zizioulas speaks ‘for all of us [Orthodox]’ with regard to the ecclesiology of communion, and he also highlights the original use of Canon 34 to refer to primacy at *all* levels in the Church by Father Alexander Schmemmann.¹⁰ Two nuanced quotations from Schmemmann may serve to indicate the kind of (universal) primacy he would see as required by the Church. ‘[P]rimacy in the Church is not “supreme power”, this notion being incompatible with the nature of the Church as Body of Christ. But neither is primacy a mere “chairmanship” if one understands this term in its modern, parliamentary and democratic connotations.’¹¹

‘Primacy *is* power, but as power it is not different from the power of a bishop in each church. It is not a *higher power* but indeed the same power, only expressed, manifested, realized by one. The primate *can* speak for all because the Church is one and because the power he exercises is the power of each bishop and of all bishops. And he *must* speak for all because this very unity and agreement require, in order to be efficient, a special organ of expression, a mouth, a voice. Primacy is thus a necessity because therein is the expression and manifestation of the unity of the churches as being the unity of *the* Church. And it is important to remember that the primate, as we know him from our canonical tradition, is always the bishop of a local church and not a “bishop at large”, and that primacy belongs to him precisely because of his status in his own church.’¹²

⁸ *Ibid.*, p.121.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p.125. Cf also Metropolitan John of Pergamon, ‘The Church as Communion: A Presentation on the World Conference Theme’, in Thomas F. Best and Gunther Gassmann (eds.), *On the way to Fuller Koinonia* (Faith and Order Paper no.166; Geneva: WCC, 1994), pp.103-111, here at p.108; on pp.106-107, Zizioulas says that ‘the careful balance between the “one” and the “many” in the structure of the community is to be discovered behind all canonical provisions in the early church’.

¹⁰ Nicolas Lossky, ‘Conciliarity-Primacy in a Russian Orthodox Perspective’, in Puglisi (ed.), *Petrine Ministry*, pp.127-135, here at p. 131.

¹¹ Alexander Schmemmann, ‘The Idea Of Primacy In Orthodox Ecclesiology’, in John Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter* (Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1992; first edition published in 1963), pp.145-71, here at p.164; see p.161 for Apostolic Canon 34.

¹² *Ibid.*, p.165; cf Metropolitan John, ‘The Church as Communion’, p.108.

9. I would respectfully propose that Schmemmann's description of primacy (which it is fascinating to compare with the formulation of Vatican I) may be useful to the Anglican Communion at the present time on several counts.
- a) First, it offers a frank, confident and unapologetic case for a real primacy, not just at the regional level, but also at the universal level. Schmemmann's words resonate at many points with the needs, desires and priorities of the Anglican Communion at this time. They also, I suggest, prompt a query about something stated in TWR. 'Like the other Instruments of Unity, ... the Primates' Meeting has refused to acknowledge anything more than a consultative and advisory authority' (TWR, n.104). By its phrasing, this statement presumably includes reference to the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury also. Schmemmann's primate has more than just a 'consultative and advisory authority', and his primacy certainly goes beyond what is often presumed to apply in Orthodoxy, namely a 'primacy of honour' (the phrase which is applied in TWR, Appendix Two, Art.24, to the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury).¹³
- b) Second, Schmemmann emphasises, as does Zizioulas even more strongly, that primacy and synodality (or conciliarity) go *together* and are not alternatives. There is no synod without a primate, and no primate without a synod; that is the point of Canon 34.¹⁴ *The Windsor Report* is rather tentative in its promotion of the idea of a real primacy for the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Communion as a whole, as if there is a weakness humanly and perhaps even theologically in the fact that, unlike the other instruments of unity, 'he alone is an individual, and not conciliar in nature'. He will thus need to be 'supported by appropriate mechanisms to ensure that he does not feel exposed and left to act entirely alone' (TWR, nn.111-112). What seems to be absent here is the fundamental perception of the ontological interdependence of the one and the many that Schmemmann and Zizioulas take for granted. Their primate *is* 'conciliar in nature'.
- c) Third, Schmemmann, and Zizioulas after him, are highly critical of the distortion of Orthodox ecclesiology by religious nationalism and autocephaly. 'All these "autocephalies" are absolutely equal among themselves, and this equality excludes any universal centre or primacy.' The result, they say, is a Church 'naturalised' and 'reduced', conformed to the world and not to Christ.¹⁵ This criticism mirrors the concern that *The Windsor Report* expresses regarding an excessive provincial autonomy which tends towards independence and resists the 'mutual interdependence' that ought to characterise a communion life rooted in God (e.g. TWR, nn.46, 49, 51, 66, 72-86). Schmemmann and Zizioulas indicate that universal primacy, rightly understood, is a proper and ancient institution to counter such a distortion.

¹³ Cf Zizioulas, 'Recent Discussions', p.253: 'There seems, in fact, not to exist, even in the Orthodox Church, "a simple primacy of honour"'.

¹⁴ Cf Schmemmann, 'The Idea of Primacy', pp.160-61; also Zizioulas, 'Recent Discussions', pp.237, 243.

¹⁵ Schmemmann, 'The Idea of Primacy', pp.166-67; cf Zizioulas, 'Recent Discussions', p.241.

- d) Before moving on, it is important to clarify that the Archbishop of Canterbury is not, of course, the universal primate that both Schmemmann and Zizioulas have in mind in their writings on this subject. The universal primate they are considering is the Bishop of Rome. Both Anglicans and Roman Catholics have likewise agreed that '[t]he only see which makes any claim to universal primacy and which has exercised and still exercises such *episcopate* is the see of Rome',¹⁶ and that 'a universal primacy will be needed in a reunited Church and should appropriately be the primacy of the bishop of Rome'.¹⁷ I do not for one moment wish to call into question these affirmations of ARCIC, rather the opposite. My application here of the thought of Schmemmann and Zizioulas regarding universal primacy to the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury is by analogy. The Archbishop's position is one that falls somewhere in between the original regional level of Canon 34 (the level of the provinces with their primates) and the universal level to which Schmemmann and Zizioulas extend the principle of the canon, with the universal primacy of Rome in view. It is precisely the *principle* of the canon that I am applying to the Archbishop's role, with the idea that, if Orthodox, Catholics and Anglicans all allow their structures to be shaped by the same principle (of the one and the many), then there will be an increasing 'family resemblance' between them, and it ought eventually to be easier to align and integrate those structures in one overall visible communion (cf above, 3(b)).
10. The idea of the 'interdependence' of churches in the Anglican Communion is of huge importance, and there is benefit in unpacking it both theologically and practically. Appendix Two of *The Windsor Report* ('Proposal for the Anglican Covenant') helpfully relates interdependence to the mystery of the Body of Christ and speaks of 'mutual reciprocity' between member churches (Art. 4). It then goes deeper still, and explores the dynamics of life in communion by saying that each church 'is constituted in, exists in and receives fulness of life in its relations to the other member churches' (Art. 7.2); each church is 'completed in, through and by its relations with other member churches' (Art. 8.1). The mystery being evoked in these descriptions of relationship is nothing less than the mystery of the Trinity itself, in which the communion life of the Body of Christ is ultimately rooted. The Appendix correctly applies to the member churches of the Communion the pattern of relations that exists between the divine Persons. We may go further, and aptly speak of a *perichoresis* or 'mutual interiority' between the churches, and indeed between each member church and the Communion as a whole.¹⁸ What this ultimately means is that the bonds of communion that unite the member churches with one another and with the Archbishop of Canterbury as primate of the Communion are not *external* bonds, added to the autonomous lives of the respective churches *from outside*, but rather *internal* bonds that go to, and spring from, the heart of each autonomous

¹⁶ ARCIC, *Authority in the Church I* (1976), n.23.

¹⁷ ARCIC, *Authority in the Church II* (1981), n.9.

¹⁸ Cf Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Considered as Communion* (1992), n.13.

church itself, and form part of its own internal integrity.¹⁹ These bonds form part of the very *constitution* and self-definition of each member church. Two particular consequences may immediately be identified:

- a) The constitutions and canons of the member churches ought to reflect the fact that Communion membership is part of their self-definition, and should not give the impression that those churches are fully constituted prior to or aside from communion with the other churches and with the primate of the Communion. In other words, member churches should not be defined purely in themselves, e.g. by their adherence to preaching the word, celebrating the sacraments, professing the creed, being in apostolic succession and committed to mission, etc., and then just ‘happen’, as it were, also to be members of the Communion. That would reduce the Communion simply to a society. In short, the Covenant needs to be *internalised* by each member church, and taken into its heart.
 - b) TWR states that the instruments of unity exercise no jurisdiction *over* the autonomous member churches (Art. 24). However, it must be clarified that that does not mean they have no authority with regard to member churches. This is a delicate but vital point. The idea of ‘jurisdiction over’ corresponds to the idea that bonds of communion (with other churches and likewise with the instruments of unity, including the primate of the Communion) are *external* to member churches. Problematically, our Western minds immediately think of the word ‘over’ as the sequel to that of ‘authority’. All authority is presumed to be authority *over*, and not to be serious unless it is *juridical*. Thus, if ‘jurisdiction over’ member churches is eschewed by the instruments of unity (as arguably it should be),²⁰ the danger is that those instruments are not regarded as having any *real* authority. It is therefore extremely important that learning about ‘authority in communion’ (i.e. as pertaining to the instruments of unity) accompanies the process of learning about ‘autonomy in communion’, the concept that TWR wishes to promote (e.g. Art. 21). ‘Authority in communion’ is the authority that an instrument has *within* the Communion precisely because of the internal dynamics of the life of communion; if anything it is *weightier* than mere ‘jurisdiction over’. Appreciation of that fact needs to be nurtured.
11. The above reflections resonate in many ways with the valuable reflections contained in the consultation paper of the Joint Standing Committee, *Towards an Anglican Covenant* (hereafter, JSC), and in the IATDC text, *Responding to a proposal of a covenant* (hereafter, IATDC). Both texts look to what a growing communion realistically needs in terms of structures to manage the conflicts and even crises that will inevitably arise on its journey as a pilgrim people (JSC, nn.10-11; IATDC, 3.1, 4.1, 4.5). Both texts see the covenant as part of an organic development of the Communion as it seeks now to

¹⁹ Cf *ibid.*, n.13, where, from a Roman Catholic standpoint, the CDF states: ‘The ministry of the successor of Peter is a necessary expression of that fundamental *mutual interiority* between universal Church and particular Church’ (*ibid.*, n.13).

²⁰ Cf Schmemmann, ‘The Idea of Primacy’, pp.165-68; Zizioulas, ‘Primacy in the Church’, p.124.

articulate, heal, strengthen and develop the very ‘bonds of affection’ that already unite it (JSC, nn.1, 6-7; IATDC, 1.11, 6.1). As I have above, JSC emphasises the *educational* value of a covenant (nn.9, 17). I would add the following specific comments:

- a) JSC asks whether the covenant might be short, like the Bonn Agreement or the Lambeth-Chicago Quadrilateral (n.17). I would remark that the Bonn Agreement as stated falls short of what is required here, and that the recent crisis itself shows the inadequacy of the Quadrilateral as a covenantal formula in itself. The covenant must essentially include a mechanism for dealing with problems, a strong and satisfactory account of the *process* that will be followed. Appendix Two of TWR (Arts. 23-27, but note my reservations above - in 9(a) & 10(b) - about Art.24) seems to tackle this aspect well.
 - b) The somewhat delicate issue of the status and authority of the Lambeth Conference is indicated in both texts (JSC, n.17; IATDC, 4.4). Whether the Lambeth Conference can and should continue to be simply an ‘informal gathering of bishops’ (IATDC, 4.4) is a moot point. TWR, Appendix Two, Art.24, says something stronger, namely that the Lambeth Conference expresses ‘episcopal collegiality worldwide’ and that it gathers for ‘common counsel, consultation and encouragement and to provide direction to the whole Communion’. Episcopal collegiality was understood by Vatican II to entail leadership of the Church (see above, n.5), and the history of the early Church shows the vital role of discernment and leadership played both by regional councils (cf provincial synods) and by ecumenical councils. Obviously, the Lambeth Conference is not an ‘ecumenical council’ (cf the caveats expressed above, in 9(d)). Nevertheless, it is an extremely significant gathering of, in principle, all the bishops of the Communion, with their primates and the focal primate, the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was natural in the early Church for bishops to gather to resolve together issues of major importance, and for them to make binding decisions in council. Does the status of the Lambeth Conference now need clarification and perhaps enhancement?
 - c) Neither JSC nor IATDC particularly highlights the specific value of the Primates’ Meeting as an instrument of unity, but, ecclesiologically speaking, the recent development of this instrument would seem to be an extremely positive move, very much in accord with the principle of Apostolic Canon 34. It might be worthwhile to bear that principle in mind as the relationship of the primates to the Archbishop of Canterbury is further articulated.
 - d) I would prefer the image of ‘concentric circles’ to that of ‘two tiers’ used by JSC to describe what might prove to be different degrees of commitment to an eventual covenant (JSC, nn.32-33). Visually, the first image permits the Archbishop of Canterbury to be at the centre of the structure of communion, which is entirely appropriate.
12. In conclusion, I would emphasise my desire to advocate the use of common principles by Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans at this important time of ecclesiological discussion and decision in various contexts, drawn from the common tradition which we are privileged to share. In so doing, by the grace of God, may we prepare the way for the eventual restoration of full communion between us all.