

# COMBINED ANGLICAN-LUTHERAN STATEMENTS:

1973 TO 1993

## I. THE EUCHARIST

### 1. Preamble

The statement draws attention to basic points on which there is agreement, and lists those matters in which there is either disagreement or difference in emphasis in the way in which the doctrine of the eucharist has been expressed in the history of each communion.

This document is not intended to be an exhaustive statement on all areas of the theology of the eucharist. It concentrates on areas which we consider fundamental for an understanding of the sacrament, and, by clarifying areas of agreement and disagreement, aims to assist further growth in mutual understanding and unity of faith.

### 2. Terminology

Differences in terminology with reference to the eucharist have not always implied differences in theology or doctrine. For the sake of clarity, the following is observed:

1. In the course of the history of the Church various traditional titles or names have been used to designate the sacrament; eg Lord's Supper, holy communion, eucharist, liturgy, mass. The term *eucharist* is used in this statement because it has come to be most widely accepted today.
2. The phrase 'the presence of Christ' may have various connotations. Anglicans and Lutherans agree that the presence of Christ in the eucharist is not confined to the consecrated elements, since Christ is present in various ways in the entire rite. For the sake of clarity we distinguish between the *presence of Christ* in the entire rite, as in every act of worship, and the *real presence* of our Lord in the sacramental elements themselves.

### 3. The presence of Christ and the eucharist

We agree that Christ is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration. The same Lord invites his people to his table through the proclaimed word, presides at his table through his minister, and gives his body and blood through the consecrated elements.

#### 4. The real presence of Christ in the eucharist

1. Together we confess that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who take and receive the eucharist, according to the Lord's promise in the words of institution.
2. Together we reject
  - a. the medieval teaching of transubstantiation, and
  - b. the understanding of the eucharist as a mere memorial feast.

While affirming the *real presence* of Christ in the eucharist, neither the Anglican nor the Lutheran communion has any official dogma to explain how Christ is present in the sacrament.

3. The Lord's words at the Last Supper, 'Take, eat; this is my body . . . (Matt 26:26), do not allow us to separate the gift of his presence from either the sacramental elements or the act of sacramental eating. The eucharist elements are not mere signs (*mera signa*).
  4. We agree that the faith of the recipient in no way creates the real presence of Christ, but that it is through repentance and faith that we receive the Lord to our blessing.
  5. Together we confess that Christ's sacramental presence imparts forgiveness of sins, new life and salvation.
- The Lutheran Confessions emphasise the objective reality of Christ's sacramental presence with the doctrine which teaches that unbelievers and the unrepentant still receive the sacramental gift, but to their judgement.
  - Anglicans show reserve over against this doctrine, since in the gospels union with Christ is consequent upon faith. Nevertheless they believe that, while unbelievers still receive the elements of the sacrament, they do so to their condemnation.

#### 5. The eucharist and sacrifice

1. Together we confess that Christ's redeeming death and resurrection took place in history once and for all time. His death on the cross, the culmination of his whole life of obedience, was the one perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the whole world. There can be no repetition of, or addition to, what was accomplished once for all by Christ.
2. The Lord has given the eucharist to his church as a means through which his atoning work on the cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of his saints.
3. Thus the heart of the eucharist is the action of Christ who continues to give us the benefits of his earthly ministry and his perfect sacrifice on the cross. Nothing that believers do or offer should be allowed to obscure the heart of the sacrament, the divine sacramental gift.

4. Sacrificial language is appropriate because the eucharist centres on the sacrifice of Christ. In the liturgy Christians have the privilege and duty to respond by giving themselves in obedience, praise and thanksgiving (Rom 12:1; Heb 13:15).

## **6. The eucharist and eschatology**

We agree that the eucharist not only makes effective in the present the Lord's redeeming death and resurrection in the past; it also joyfully anticipates the perfected communion with God and the transformation of his creation in the future.

## **7. Liturgical practice and usage**

1. The sacramental presence of Christ is celebrated and received in the context of the total eucharistic service. We agree that this action may extend to the distribution of the consecrated elements to the sick who are absent but are considered to be part of the worshipping congregation.
2. We agree that the bread and wine which have been consecrated should not be returned to common use.

## **8. Matters requiring further exploration**

In order to reach further agreement or to clarify our several positions, we believe further study is necessary on the following questions:

- i. the action of the Holy Spirit in relation to the eucharist
- ii. the concept of unworthy participation in the eucharist
- iii. the relationship between ontological descriptions of the presence of Christ in the eucharist and signficatory language with regard to the elements and the action of the eucharist
- iv. the relation between ministry and the eucharist
- v. intercommunion

## **9. Conclusions**

As a result of our discussions we acknowledge that we have discovered a basic area of agreement and common confession, and that we have also eliminated some misunderstandings of each other's position. Furthermore, frank recognition of differences has not destroyed our mutual respect and the unity of faith that has been discovered. By further documenting our agreements as well as disagreements we trust that the cause of unity between us will be advanced.

21 November 1973; revised 26 October 1983

## II. MINISTRY

### 1. Preamble

The statement draws attention to basic points of fundamental agreement on the doctrine of Ministry, and locates the central areas of disagreement or difference in either terminology or practice. The statement is not to be read as an exhaustive treatment of the subject but as an attempt to highlight fundamental areas of agreement and disagreement with a view to clarifying especially those differences which must be faced as we together seek to grow in mutual understanding and unity of faith.

The participants in this dialogue have noted and welcomed the Anglican-Lutheran dialogue which has taken place on an international level, and have understood these Australian discussions to involve their national (Australian) Churches.

The discussion on Ministry soon made apparent the need to discuss the nature of the church and its essential marks. While both sides produced theses on the church and its marks, no separate statement on ecclesiology has been drawn up. Instead, the relevant areas of difference will become apparent in what follows.

### 2. Terminology

For the sake of clarity we note the following differences in terminology:

1. Anglicans speak of three *orders of ministry*, or of *holy orders*, thus reflecting that there are three offices, *bishop, priest, and deacon*, in the church.
2. Lutherans, by contrast, speak of *the office of the ministry*, thus reflecting their belief that there is one essential public *office* in the church.

While noting this difference in terminology, this statement consistently uses *ministry* to denote the task of the whole church as the servant of God, but *Ministry* for the special office of God's chosen servants who are called and commissioned to speak and act on behalf of the Lord for his church.

### 3. Divine authority

We are one in our confession that the New Testament Ministry is instituted by Christ for the public administration of the means of grace, that is, for the preaching of the gospel and the administering of the sacraments. The Ministry is therefore instituted not by human beings, but by God.

### 4. The call to the Ministry

It is God who calls and chooses individuals for the Ministry. While persons must be inwardly moved by the Holy Spirit to offer themselves for the Ministry, this inner sense of vocation (termed by some 'the inward call') does not by itself constitute God's call, nor does it authorise a person to exercise public Ministry in the church.

The call to the Ministry is effected only through the public authorisation by the church to exercise a Ministry. We are therefore one in our stand that no one shall exercise a public Ministry in the church unless he be duly called.

## **5. Public ordering and commission – ordination**

Together we hold that ordination is the solemn ecclesiastical rite in which a duly qualified person (cf 2 Timothy 3:2-7; Titus 1:5-9) is set apart for the Ministry and publicly commissioned to his office.

The call of God is thus publicly declared in ordination when the blessing and grace of God are invoked through the Holy Spirit with the laying on of hands.

Here we acknowledge our differences:

- Anglicans believe that two things are necessary for ordination as the ratification of God's call:
  - a. the consent of the congregation, and
  - b. the laying on of hands by a bishop, which is (among other things) a sign of the unity and catholicity of the church.
- For Lutherans, although the laying on of hands is an old biblical custom, symbolical of the conveying of the blessing of God, it rests on no divine command, and is not essential for the validity and the efficacy of the office. While any pastor may ordain another, ordination through a bishop or president is deemed desirable for the preservation of good order in the church.

## **6. Historic forms and apostolicity**

1. Together we confess that there is one apostolic church. Its apostolicity consists in the continuation and proclamation of the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and the administration of the sacraments. The apostolicity of the Ministry is found essentially in its obedience to Christ's command to go and preach, baptise and teach all nations (Matt 28:18f), that is, to continue in the mission first entrusted to the apostles of Christ.
2. We are also one in our faith that the Ministry of word and sacraments is essentially one Ministry. However, we acknowledge that this Ministry has, in the history of the church, assumed a variety of forms. While one in our common understanding of the apostolic succession of teaching as vital to the life of the church, we acknowledge the following differences:
  - Many Anglicans make a distinction between succession in apostolic teaching, functions and order, and see this to be a vital issue. Those who take this position see the leading of the Holy Spirit in the parallel historical development of the canon of Scripture, the creeds as summaries of the apostolic faith, the sacraments, and the historic episcopate. It is on these grounds that the historic episcopate is taken to be the one fixed axis of a flexible church order which adapts itself to the needs of word and sacrament in different historical situations. On this view, episcopacy has been, and will continue to be, compatible with great flexibility and variety in church organisation in a future united church.

- Lutherans and some Anglicans understand the continued proclamation of the apostolic teaching (word and sacraments) to be the essential apostolic succession. While they see the episcopate as desirable for the good ordering of the church, they do not regard it as part of the church's apostolicity.

## 7. Episcopacy

Together we confess that oversight (*episcopate*) concerning the purity of the church's doctrine, the ordering of the Ministry, and pastoral care of the church is inherent in the apostolic character of the church's life, mission, and ministry. Both communions have continued to exercise oversight over the church's teaching and ministry, but in a variety of ways.

The essential difference in understanding the way in which oversight (*episcopate*) is to be exercised can be seen from the following:

- In the Anglican Church a special *episcopate* is reserved for the bishop. He symbolises and exercises the authority the apostles once provided for the church. The traditional functions of the bishop include:
  - a. securing the purity of apostolic teaching and the proper ordering of the sacraments;
  - b. forwarding the mission of the church;
  - c. representing the church's unity and continuity, that is, its catholicity;
  - d. ordaining new ministers;
  - e. being the chief pastor in his diocese; and
  - f. administering the corporate discipline of the whole church as a 'father in God'.
- While the special office of bishop has been preserved in some Lutheran Churches, Lutherans hold that every pastor has a divine command to exercise *episcopate* over the flock of Christ to which he has been called. Accordingly, many of the traditional functions of the bishop are seen as being carried out by the pastorate. Nevertheless, for the sake of good order they can be exercised by a bishop or church president, but not by virtue of a divinely-ordained office.

## 8. The ministry of the church and the ordained Ministry

1. We agree that *ministry* is divinely committed to the whole church, and that every Christian is called to *ministry (diakonia)*. All believers participate in a common *diakonia* in the body of Christ – in a life of worship to God, in the sharing of his word, and in humble service to others (2 Cor 5:18; 1 Peter 2:9; 4:10-11; 1 Cor 12:7).
2. We are also united in our profession that God has given the special gift of the *Ministry* for the building up of the church (Eph 4:11ff, 1 Cor 12:28-30).
3. We further agree that, because the *Ministry* works with the word and sacraments by which the church lives and is extended, this vital function of the *Ministry* is related to the very basis of the church. Thus Ministry and church belong inseparably together.

## 9. Ordination and permanent status

1. Together we hold that ordination is not merely the public ratification of the right to exercise ecclesiastical functions, but that it also confers a sacred ecclesiastical office with a dignity which derives from the sacred means of grace that are administered by the office.
  2. Our respective formularies do not explicitly state that ordination confers a *character indelebilis* which becomes an inherent part of the person holding office. However, our common practice is that, where a man is re-admitted into the active Ministry after leaving it, he is not re-ordained.
- Anglican formularies imply that there is a permanent status which remains independent of the functions of the Ministry, which is the reason for not re-ordaining.
  - Lutherans tie the Ministry more closely to the exercise of the essential functions of Ministry (preaching the word and administering the sacraments). Yet by retaining the title 'pastor' for retired ministers they imply that there is a dignity which remains with one who has held the public office.

## 10. Practical implications for unity

While acknowledging that there is apostolic Ministry of word and sacrament in both our communions, we admit that the following differences exist with respect to the question of Ministry and church unity:

1. For Anglicans, the acceptance of episcopacy as part of the life of the church (and of episcopal ordination as the rule of the church) is at present a prerequisite for the formation of a fully united church with Anglican participation.
2. For Lutherans, there is no higher unity beyond unity of faith. Organic union may or may not follow from the unity of faith and confession; it belongs in the realm of external human ordering. Thus it is only the insistence on a particular form of *episcopate* that causes difficulty for Lutherans.

## 11. Conclusions

We together express our conviction that our discussions have led to a deeper understanding of the gospel faith which we share and which the Ministry of our churches seeks to pass on to all. We candidly acknowledge not only our different human traditions and terminology, but also the important theological differences that divide us.

Together we long for and pray for that deeper unity of faith which should be ours. Together we acknowledge that, since we are by virtue of the one baptism members of the one body of Christ, we should strive for a fuller agreement in matters of faith and a common celebration of the eucharist.

8 September 1975; revised 9 May 1984

### **III. BAPTISM**

#### **1. The nature of baptism**

Baptism is a sacrament of the church, instituted by Christ. It is administered with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in obedience to Christ's command (Matt 28:19). In this sacrament the baptised are united with Christ and incorporated into his body, the church. Because it is a unique event, it is not to be repeated.

#### **2. The effects of baptism**

The church celebrates the sacrament of baptism with trust in the divine promises of eternal salvation (Acts 2:38; cf Mark 16:16) and in the conviction that it gives what is promised. It grants birth to new life in Christ, forgiveness of sin both original and actual, and the gift of the Spirit (John 3:3-6; Acts 2:38); faith is created and confirmed, and grace increased. Through the gift of the Spirit, the baptised are immersed in the saving events of the sacrificial death and resurrection of Christ (Eph 2:5-6; Rom 6:3-6; Col 2:12; 3:3), and are made children of God and inheritors of eternal salvation (1 Peter 3:21; Rom 8:14-17; 1 John 3:1-3). In baptism the old Adam is put off and the new Adam is created, so that the believer is a new creation (Col 3:10; Eph 4:22-24; 2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15), being conformed to the likeness of Christ (Rom 8:29) and made to share in his risen life. All this is continually appropriated by faith.

The baptised are given a permanent status, function and responsibility within the church. The status, function and responsibility of the baptised are defined by the nature of the church as the royal, priestly and prophetic community of the new Israel, proclaiming God's kingship, his reconciling love and the life of the new age (1 Peter 2:9; 2 Tim 2:11-12; Col 1:12-13; Eph 1:13-14).

#### **3. The necessity of baptism**

God, our Saviour, wills that all should come to salvation and the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim 2:4). Since rebirth 'by water and the Spirit' is necessary to enter into the kingdom of God (John 3:5; Titus 3:4-8; cf Mark 16:16), the baptism of both adults and infants is necessary for their salvation, that is, entering into the promises of God (Acts 2:38-39; 10:47). Wilful rejection or abuse of the sacrament is therefore to be condemned; but we should not presume to judge what God will do with those who are not baptised through no fault of their own.

#### **4. Baptism and faith**

Baptism calls forth and calls for faith in the triune God (cf. Mark 16:16). This faith is itself a gift of the Holy Spirit, and includes the acknowledgment of, and firm trust in, the saving promises of God offered in the sacrament. The first glimmerings of faith often precede baptism in young people and adults, and we acknowledge the need to care for and recognise those who are disciples, that is, those who are still on the way to sacramental incorporation into the body of Christ (cf Acts 8:14; 10:1-48).



The validity of the sacrament does not depend on the faith, the moral perfection, or the formal orthodoxy of the person who administers it. Nor does it lose its validity if subsequently in unbelief the recipient rejects its grace and benefits, 'for the gifts and call of God are irrevocable' (Rom 11:29 [RSV]). Faith, however, is essential for the salutary reception of the grace of baptism.

Since in faith every believer is made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, he or she has a rightful claim upon the pastoral concern of all the members of our churches for encouragement and assistance in growth in the knowledge and love of the Lord (Eph 2:21; 4:11-16).

Dead to sin, but alive in the Spirit, the baptised lives the Christian life, striving to show forth daily, throughout the whole of life, the new image given in baptism, to die to sin and put to death the old Adam by repentance (Col 3:10). This new life is the free gift of God (Rom 6:3-6) and is lived in the strength of the merits of Christ (Gal 5:24).

## **5. The rite of baptism**

Each Church approves of the manner in which the rite of baptism is celebrated in the other Church. It is agreed that adults should be fully instructed before their baptism. In the case of the baptism of infants, parents and godparents should be given adequate preparation for their part in the rite and for the fulfilment of their obligations after the child is baptised and committed to their care.

The sacrament is administered by the celebrant who applies water to the person being baptised (either by pouring or dipping), and who at the same time says, "I baptise you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit". The use of water and the trinitarian formula is essential for the validity of the rite (Matt 28:19).

## **6. Baptism and the Christian church/congregation**

Baptism is an action which involves not only the one baptised. As baptism is a sacrament of the church, so it is the church, in obedience to God, that baptises children and adults. By this act they are made members of the body of Christ (1 Cor 12:13). It is agreed that the local congregation should be actively involved in the celebration of baptism. Therefore the rite of baptism is most fittingly celebrated in the context of the Sunday liturgy, not only so that the whole congregation may witness the admission of the newly baptised into Christ's church and welcome them, but also so that Christians may be reminded of the gifts of grace received and of the profession of faith and obedience to God which they made in their own baptism.

In cases where baptism is urgently requested, and in the absence of a clergyman, baptism may be administered by anyone, provided it is performed in the manner described above and with the intention of administering the Christian rite. If persons have been baptised privately, they should subsequently be received publicly into the Christian congregation.

## **7. Baptism and parents, godparents/sponsors**

When Christian parents and godparents bring a child to baptism, they assume responsibility for the Christian upbringing of the child. They will also recognise the church's obligation to teach and care for the child, and will seek this help from the congregation in the Christian nurture of the child (Matt 28:19-20). Since godparents/sponsors are to represent the congregation, they should therefore be communicant members of the church.

When non-Christian or nominal-Christian parents request baptism for their children, the pastor/parish priest will inform them or remind them of what baptism is and what it involves. If parents deny the grace of baptism or refuse to assume their responsibility for the Christian education of the child, or if they refuse to allow communicant members to act as godparents/sponsors or to allow Christians to minister to the child, they encourage the idea either that baptism is a meaningless act into which people can press their own ideas, or that it is a magical rite which must at all costs be performed for everyone. In these cases, the sacrament is in danger of being abused. On the other hand, if baptism is refused, such action unfairly prejudices the welfare of the child because of unbelieving or irresponsible parents, and makes the sacrament and its blessing dependent on things outside of baptism itself. While the pastor/parish priest should never baptise infants against the will of the parents, neither should he refuse to baptise simply because he suspects their motives.

## **8. Baptism and the Christian life**

We recognise that baptism is the first step of the whole sacramental process of the Christian life. This process involves a growing identification with Christ in his church. Beginning with the gift of the Spirit in baptism, this process leads men and women towards the fullness of union with Christ.

Since baptism gives forgiveness of sins and new life in Christ, growth in holiness of life means a daily return to the grace of God received in baptism (Eph 4:22-24).

Confirmation and holy communion are to be understood in this whole context of sacramental growth into Christian maturity (Col 1:28; Phil 3:12-15; Eph 4:13-14; cf Matt 5:48; 19:21; 1 Cor 14:20).

Where Christian parents of infants or adults cannot in integrity undertake the responsibilities involved in baptism, and yet still wish to associate themselves with the Christian community, we recommend pastoral sensitivity in the care of those who are still 'on the way' and unable to make the full Christian commitment involved in baptism.

## **9. Conclusion**

We give thanks for 'one baptism for the forgiveness of sins', and for the agreement we have reached.

18 May 1981; revised 9 May 1984

## IV. ANGLICAN – LUTHERAN MARRIAGES

### Information and Guidance

#### 1. Marriage and mixed marriage in general

- a. The Anglican Church of Australia has, in addition to the requirements of civil law, diocesan rules that regulate marriage and preparation for marriage which priests must follow. For example, no priest may solemnise a marriage where neither of the parties is baptised, or where certain degrees of affinity, in addition to those required by civil law, exist. All marriage ceremonies must follow the prescribed rites given in the *Book of Common Prayer* or *An Australian Prayer Book*; all marriages must be solemnised in churches or halls licensed by the bishop for divine worship, except in cases where special permission is given by the bishop.

The Lutheran Church of Australia has no such rules and regulations. Although a certain uniformity of practice exists, this may be varied from place to place by the local pastor who has the responsibility for accepting or rejecting the request of a couple who wish to be married, for preparing the couple for marriage and for the marriage order used. Pastors are strongly urged to use the Order of Marriage authorised by the church, but its use is not prescribed.

- b. The Anglican Church of Australia also has diocesan regulations regarding mixed marriages that involve an Anglican party. Practice, however, varies from diocese to diocese and should be ascertained.

For example, the regulations that apply in the Adelaide diocese state:

- i. an Anglican clergyman may assist, or be assisted by, the priest or minister of another denomination at the marriage service, provided he is satisfied that neither party to the marriage has been required to make promises likely to be detrimental to the faith of the Anglican party or the future harmony of the marriage.
- ii. A priest or minister of another denomination may be invited to take part in a marriage service in an Anglican church provided that the rector or priest in charge of the church where the marriage is to be solemnised gives his assent, that the rite used is an authorised rite of the Anglican Church, and that the Anglican clergyman is the officiant for specified parts of the authorised rites.
- iii. If an Anglican clergyman is invited to take part in a marriage service in a church of another denomination, he would expect the priest or minister of that denomination to solemnise the marriage using the rites of that denomination. His part in the service, similar to the part of an invited priest or minister who participates in a marriage service held in an Anglican church, could be to read a lesson and/or give an address and/or lead in prayer.

The Lutheran Church of Australia has no regulations that relate specifically to the Lutheran pastor taking part in a marriage service conducted by the priest or minister of another denomination in the church of that denomination, or to his

inviting the priest or minister of another denomination to take part in a marriage service conducted in a Lutheran church. His action, however, would be governed by the Theses on Joint Prayer and Worship which, with other theses, were accepted by the Lutheran Church of Australia when it came into being in 1966. The Theses on Joint Prayer and Worship give the general rule that a Lutheran pastor may not take part in services conducted by Churches not in altar and pulpit fellowship with the Lutheran Church of Australia. For the same reason a Lutheran pastor is not permitted to invite a priest or minister of another denomination to take part with him in conducting a service in a Lutheran church using Lutheran rites.

In a special situation this general rule may be modified, but only with the knowledge and permission of the president of the district in which the pastor is a member.

The advice given to the Lutheran pastor is that, while he may not officiate in a marriage service with the priest or minister of another denomination held in the church of that denomination, he may attend the service and, on invitation, extend greetings to the bridal couple after the completion of the service. He would expect a similar procedure to be followed by the priest or minister who is invited to attend a marriage service conducted by him in his church and would extend the same courtesy to him.

## **2. Preparation for marriage**

- a. When this is the first marriage for each party:
  - i. The couple will need to decide as early as possible in which church they will be married and who will marry them.
  - ii. The priest/pastor who will marry the couple has the primary responsibility to ensure that the couple is given adequate preparation for Christian marriage, including participation in preparation for marriage courses that may be provided in the diocese, parish or zone.
  - iii. Each party, however, should be encouraged to meet with his/her own priest/pastor to discuss matters that may be a concern, particularly in regard to marriage and the various practical matters that arise from a mixed marriage, eg church membership, church attendance, the baptism of children and their nurture in the church, family devotions.
  - iv. There may be situations, too, where it is desirable for the ministers of both parties to be involved in the decisions that need to be made regarding the future Christian life of the couple and their children. These decisions should be carefully and freely made, without undue pressure being exerted from either church concerned. The prime consideration should be the ultimate spiritual well-being of the couple and any family they may have, the long-term strengthening of the marriage, and a growing together in Christian love and unity which will allow them to face together, at the deepest level, the difficulties, opportunities and challenges of life they will encounter.
- b. When this is a marriage involving a divorced person whose former spouse is still living:

The Anglican Church of Australia has clearly stated principles contained in the Book of Common Prayer and in general Synod canons. Various diocesan regulations govern the procedures the priest is to follow in dealing with applications for remarriage after divorce.

For example, in the diocese of Adelaide, when reasonable grounds exist to proceed with the application, the priest compiles the necessary documentation and forwards this to the bishop, who will either issue a certificate permitting the marriage to be solemnised with the rites of the church or issue a letter refusing such permission. Before he issues a certificate permitting a remarriage with the rites of the church, the bishop needs to be satisfied, among other considerations, that:

- i. Such action does not contravene the teaching of our Lord as set out in holy Scripture.
- ii. The former marriage has been legally dissolved according to civil law.
- iii. There is no prospect of re-establishing a true marriage relationship between the partners or any former marriage to which the applicant was a party.
- iv. At least one of the applicants (preferably both) is a regular worshipping member of a congregation in the diocese, and has been such for at least six months before the application is received.
- v. The divorced person genuinely repents of any part that he or she might have played in the breakdown of the former marriage, is genuinely forgiving and knows the forgiveness and mercy of God.
- vi. The applicants are clear in their conscience, after taking due counsel with thought and prayer, that their remarriage is according to God's will.
- vii. The couple desiring to marry understand the church's teaching concerning marriage, and truly intend to enter into such a marriage and keep the vows thereof.
- viii. The applicant is prepared to fulfil his or her moral responsibility in respect of any former marriage, particularly in respect of the children of that marriage.

The Lutheran Church of Australia advises its pastors, in dealing with requests to remarry after divorce, to follow the procedures set down in the statement adopted by the church in 1978 titled 'The Attitude of the LCA to Marriage, Divorce and re-Marriage'. Pastoral concerns in relation to re-marriage that will be taken up include the following:

- i. The attitude of the divorced person toward the former spouse and the possibility of reconciliation and re-establishment of the former marriage.
- ii. The attitude of the divorced person to God's will for marriage.
- iii. Whether the divorced person has shown repentance for his/her part in the failure of the former marriage.
- iv. The extent to which the divorced person has fulfilled his/her Christian responsibility to the children of the former marriage.
- v. Consideration by the divorced person of remaining unmarried.
- vi. The divorced person's endeavour to remove and correct those factors that contributed to the divorce.
- vii. The willingness of the divorced person with the help of God to build a new marriage on a Christian foundation.

- viii The extent to which these concerns are understood and accepted by the prospective partner ('The Attitude of the LCE to Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage', *Doctrinal Statements and Theological Opinions of the LCA*, H.9).

### **3. After the marriage ceremony**

When the parties concerned remain members of their respective churches, although both the Anglican priest and the Lutheran pastor will have a special pastoral responsibility toward his/her respective member, both clergymen have a duty to exercise a high degree of mutual understanding and trust in supporting the marriage. In this connection, the following advice is apropos:

There is the need to realise that the solution of delicate personal problems involved in mixed marriage, of which no two are alike, is to be found in the maturing and sensitive growing together of the family itself. This sensitiveness must be matched by any source of outside assistance from which, if joint pastoral care is assumed, all hints of competitiveness, suspicion and possessiveness must be banished, since these would inhibit the necessary sensitiveness from the start (*Theology of Marriage and the Problems of Mixed Marriages*, Lutheran World Federation, World Alliance of Reformed Churches and Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in the Roman Catholic Church 1971-77, p. 24).

Adopted 11 May 1983

## V. EPISCOPE AND UNITY

A joint statement on the nature and function of *episcopo* ('oversight') in the church, in response to *The Niagara Report*, 1987.

1. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the true 'shepherd and *episcopos* (overseer)' of our lives, who has laid down his life for our sins, and taken it up again, to bring us to God. By this he establishes the church.  
(1 Peter 2:25, 3:18; John 10:1-19)
2. Christ is the head of the church, which is his body, and is head over all things for the church, so that in the fullness of time all things will be united ('headed up') and reconciled to God in him.  
(Col 1:18; Eph 1:10, 22-23; 1 Cor 15:20-28; Phil 2:5-11)
3. Christ exercises his *episcopo* ('oversight') by the proclamation of the gospel: the good news of the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God. This is conveyed through the church by word and sacrament.  
(2 Cor 5:14-21; Rom 1:17, 6:3-4; 1 Cor 11:26; Eph 3:10; Rev 1:16, 2:16, 19:15)
4. Christ calls, empowers and gives to the church those who are to exercise *episcopo* in the proclamation and ministry of the gospel. They are given to the church to equip all God's people for service (*diakonia*), so that the church be maintained and built up in that unity with God and with one another that the Spirit brings through the gospel.  
(Eph 4:1-16; Acts 20:28; cf Mark 6:34)
5. This *episcopo* in the gospel, and its operations among God's people and out into the world, has been present in the church from its beginning, and is essential to the church's nature and continuing mission.  
(Matt 28:18-20)
6. The hallmark of true *episcopo* in the gospel is faithfulness to the apostolic witness in accordance with the Scriptures. Widespread acceptance is not necessarily a guarantee of true gospel *episcopo*. Christ's ministry of the Father's word met with opposition from those who would refuse to accept the gospel; so also true *episcopo* in the gospel, properly exercised, will meet resistance in the church and beyond. Nevertheless, there is at work amongst God's faithful people an inner testimony of the Holy Spirit by which gospel teaching and living can be recognised and affirmed.  
(Rom 1:1-6; Gal 1:8-9; John 9-10, 15:18-16:4; 1 John 2:20-21, 27; Acts 15:28)
7. This *episcopo*, from earliest times, was exercised locally, regionally, and more generally, as exemplified by the apostle Paul's responsibility for all the churches in his care, Titus' oversight of the island of Crete, and his appointment of elders in every town.  
(2 Cor 11:28; 1 Cor 11:16, 14:33, 36-37; Titus 1:5)

8. Ordination is the church's way of publicly recognising and authorising those who have responsibility for exercising this *episcopate* in the gospel. Nevertheless, this *episcopate* is not restricted to those ordained, but is also exercised in the whole body of the church apart from recognised or designated office, inasmuch as all members have oversight one of another and responsibility for each other in the way of salvation.  
(Acts 6:6, 13:3, 14:23; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6, 1 Cor 12:4-7, 12-26; Eph 4:25; 1 Peter 4:10-11; Heb 12:15, Greek *episkopountes*)
9. Expressions of ordained *episcopate* in Anglican and Lutheran churches have, for certain historical reasons, differed between the two churches.
- 9.1 Anglicans seek to maintain a threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, with *episcopate* centred mainly on the historic episcopate. Local *episcopate* is exercised by parish priests under the authority of the bishop who has the *episcopate* of all the churches in that diocese. Anglicans see ordination by bishops as an expression of prayerful authorisation by the wider church. Some Anglicans see episcopally ordained ministry as a sacramental witness to the presence and action of Christ in the church. *Episcopate* is also exercised in the whole body of the church by parish councils, meetings of congregations and the synodical process.
- 9.2 Lutherans have tended to emphasise a single order identified as the office of the ordained ministry, with *episcopate* being the God-given responsibility of the pastor. In their ecclesiastical practice they have also acknowledged the importance of a wider, regional and/or national oversight (*episcopate*) of this one ministry by establishing the office of president or bishop. Such *episcopate* is seen as necessary for the proper proclamation of the gospel and the right administration of the sacraments and for good order in the church. *Episcopate* is also regarded as residing in the whole body of the church.

Along with this attitude to *episcopate*, there is an openness among Lutherans towards the historically attested threefold ordering of the ordained ministry. In the *Apology* of the Augsburg Confession the reformers acknowledge that 'the Fathers had good and useful reasons for instituting ecclesiastical discipline in the manner described by the ancient canons', and they express their 'deep desire to maintain the church polity and various ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, even if these have been created by human authority' (*Apology* XIV.1; cf XIV.5).

Thus in varying and similar ways, both churches give personal, collegial and corporate expression to the exercise of *episcopate*.

10. Anglican and Lutheran churches can acknowledge each other as churches standing in the apostolic succession, and can affirm each other's ordained ministries as valid expressions of gospel *episcopate* which are not essentially different. By 'apostolic succession' we mean 'a succession in the presiding ministry of a church, which stands in the continuity of apostolic faith' (see *The Niagara Report*, sections 20, 53, 94; also *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M. 35).



11. God's plan for the fullness of time is to unite all things in Christ. This unity already exists in the church because Christ has reconciled us to God and one another in one body through the cross. The goal of gospel *episcopate* and mission is that all come together to unity and maturity in the fullness of Christ. Wherever *episcopate* is exercised in unity, proper expression is given to the gospel. (Eph 1:10, 2:14-17, 4:11-16; Phil 2:1-2; John 17:11)

Adopted 9 June 1993

## APPENDIX

### THE BISHOP IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH TODAY

St Augustine of Hippo gives a rather delightful picture of the ministry of a bishop in the fifth century. He is

to rebuke agitators, to comfort the faint-hearted, to take care of the weak, to confute enemies, to take heed of snares, to teach the uneducated, to waken the sluggish, to hold back the quarrelsome, to put the conceited in their place, to appease the militant, to give help to the poor, to liberate the oppressed, to encourage the good, to endure the evil, and — O —to love them all.

His picture contrasts markedly with the kind of episcopacy which emerged during the Middle Ages, and to which the sixteenth century reformers understandably strongly reacted.

The purpose of this paper is not to examine the history or theology of episcopacy but to describe the episcopal office as I have experienced it in the Anglican Church of Australia over the past thirty years. I have served as bishop of three dioceses of diverse character. Wangaratta was a small rural diocese of about twenty-five parishes where it was possible for the bishop to know personally all the clergy and many of the active laity. Adelaide was a medium-sized metropolitan diocese with about seventy parishes and one hundred and forty active clergy and one assistant bishop. Melbourne was a very large diocese with about two hundred and thirty parishes, over four hundred active clergy and four regional bishops, each responsible under the archbishop for a region of the diocese.

The bishop is the chief pastor of the diocese, chief minister of word and sacrament and the leader of the church's mission. In the contemporary world there is strong pressure from members of the church who are involved in the world of business to see the bishop as CEO of the diocese. That is a concept which I have always firmly resisted. It is true that some of the bishop's responsibilities are those of a CEO, and in a real sense the 'buck' stops with him. He must necessarily be involved in administration because he is to lead and co-ordinate the pastoral and evangelistic ministry of the diocese. Yet he is not primarily an administrator, and the style of administration must be spiritual and pastoral. His symbol is a shepherd's crook, not a computer, and his traditional title is 'Father in God'.

As chief pastor the bishop does his best to know and be known by the people of the diocese. This is much easier in a diocese the size of Wangaratta than in Melbourne. He cannot, of course, directly pastor all his people in his own person. He is to be the leader and enabler of pastoral care and mission, but much has to be done by delegation. This he does by ordaining priests and deacons and by licensing clergy and lay ministers to serve in the diocese. It is common to describe a bishop as pastor of pastors (*pastor pastorum*), and that

is an important part of his role; but he is no less chief pastor of the laity. When he inducts a priest into the cure of souls in a parish it is customary for the bishop, in handing him his licence, to say such words as, 'Accept this charge, which is both mine and thine'. This expresses the principle that, though the bishop delegates to the parish priests the day by day cure of souls in the parish, he does not withdraw from his own continuing pastoral responsibility for the parish which he delegates to and shares with the priest.

This pastoral relationship with the people of God in the parish is reflected in the pastoral visits which the bishop makes to the parish. He comes not as a visitor from outside but as one who comes by right to a parish which is his. On such a visit the bishop will customarily preside at the eucharist and preach, and at regular intervals he will come to confirm (and possibly baptise). The older custom — not always followed these days with church buildings being differently arranged — was that there was always a bishop's chair in the chancel of the church which, even in the bishop's absence, signified his abiding place in the parish.

Because the bishops can obviously know and care directly for only a limited number of people, it might be asked whether it is a fiction to speak of him as chief pastor in a large diocese. The fact is that, as with other aspects of his episcopal ministry, the bishop does not stand alone. He shares his ministry of word and sacrament and pastoral care with his clergy and lay people, though there are aspects which the bishop alone is authorised to perform. It is not unlike the way a good parish priest shares many parts of his ministry with lay people in the parish. What makes the bishop's role as pastor distinctive is that he is able to combine in his own office both the loving care of his people and power to effect change and make things happen. This is where the managerial aspect of his work comes into service of the bishop's pastoral ministry. Without being an autocrat the bishop may, either by the use of powers specifically vested in him or by his ability to influence decision-making in the diocese and the wider church, be able to effect changes which serve pastoral ends.

The ministry of *episcopus* embraces a role of governance which includes the exercise of discipline. As with all good discipline, much is accomplished informally. The bishop is often in a position of dealing, either directly or through deputies, with situations of conflict. Sometimes clergy assume that where they are in conflict with their people the bishop should naturally be on their side. It will, in fact, often be the case that the bishop has to defend the rights of his clergy against overbearing lay people. But it is also not infrequent that the lay people of the parish need to be defended against an autocratic parish priest. The bishop has the responsibility to be an impartial arbiter, trying to discover the truth and enabling justice and reconciliation in situations of conflict. If reconciliation is not possible, decisive disciplinary action may be required. In the Anglican Church the power of dismissal of a parish priest does not normally rest with the bishop alone, however, and there are legal processes designed to preserve the rights of a priest against an autocratic bishop. The bishop must therefore be careful to ensure that any disciplinary action is executed with due process according to rules laid down in the constitution and canons of the church. The legal basis for the exercise of the bishop's authority in disciplinary cases is the oath of canonical obedience to the bishop. No priest or deacon can exercise ministry in a diocese without the bishop's licence, and before receiving the licence the cleric must swear the oath of canonical obedience. This does not give the bishop the power to require anything at whim, but it does empower him to bring the canon law of the church to bear on a minister if there is some disciplinary breach.

It must be emphasised that an Anglican bishop does not have autocratic powers. He is bound by the constitution and canons of the church, as are other clergy and lay officers. These rules are made not by the bishops but by properly constituted synods in which clergy and representative lay people join with the bishop to establish legislation which then becomes binding on all. The bishop also works constantly with a diocesan council or standing committee of the synod. In the case of Melbourne (and this would be replicated in other dioceses) the bishop may act in temporal matters only with the agreement of his

council. In spiritual matters the bishop has greater freedom of decision and action. But in many matters it is not easy in practice to make a clear distinction between the temporal and the spiritual, and many decisions in spiritual areas will require decisions about financial expenditure which must be approved by the council. The reality is that bishops normally consult widely, whether with diocesan council or synod, or with clergy in conference and in less formal ways.

It is a prime responsibility of the bishop as chief pastor to see that the people of God are nurtured in the word of God. Together with his fellow bishops he is to guard and teach the apostolic faith. The bishop's chair or throne in his cathedral is, above all, a symbol of his teaching authority. Every bishop is to be in a sense a theologian — not necessarily in the academic sense but as one who is tune with and understands and proclaims the faith of the church. At the ecumenical councils of the early church it was understood that the bishop brought with him the credal faith of his local church. The decisions of the council were taken back to the local church, which would want to be satisfied that the decisions and formulations of the council were in accord with the faith they had received. It was in this sense that the Archbishop of Canterbury made a point of inviting the bishops attending the 1988 Lambeth Conference to 'bring your diocese with you'.

In a recent report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission titled *The Gift of Authority*, it is suggested that the bishops have a particular responsibility for the 'ministry of memory' in the church. That is, they are to bring constantly to the mind of the church the corporate memory of the apostolic faith. Of course, the whole church carries this memory, but those with responsibility of *episcopate* are specially charged with this crucial task. I recall the preacher at one consecration of a new bishop declaring that the essence of being a bishop was to be conservative. In the positive sense in which we speak of conservation (eg of the environment) that is true. It does not, however, mean that the bishop must be in a rut or only look backwards. As the world changes and patterns of thought alter, there is need from time to time for the apostolic faith to be formulated in new ways in order to preserve the essential content of the deposit of faith. And there is constant need for the faith to be applied to new situations. To this end there has to be a constant process of theological exploration, and in that process guardianship of the faith includes guardianship of the exploration of the faith. It is not a matter of simply repeating the old formulations.

The way in which Anglican synods are structured reflects one way by which the bishop's guardianship of apostolic faith and order can be exercised. An Australian Anglican synod consists of three houses: bishops, clergy and laity. The three houses normally meet as one body, but on important issues a vote by orders may be required. Unless the vote is carried in each house it will fail. In the General Synod all the diocesan bishops together form the house of bishops, and in a diocesan synod the diocesan bishop is the sole member of the house. This means that the bishops virtually have a power of veto (as indeed do the other houses). This was illustrated recently in the Sydney diocesan synod when the archbishop declined to assent to legislation which would have permitted lay presidency at the eucharist.

How does a bishop fulfil his responsibility as a teacher of the faith? Like any of the clergy he does so in his preaching. Particularly on major diocesan or community occasions the bishop has an opportunity, with a wider than usual audience, to teach the faith and to speak on its application to the life of the church or community. As a diocesan bishop, I regarded my monthly letters in the diocesan paper as an important teaching opportunity. Individual letters to people seeking guidance can also be useful vehicles of teaching. The bishop's charge to his synod may be used to deal with theological as well as administrative issues. It was my custom to give an annual series of addresses on theological, devotional or ethical themes in my cathedral which members of the diocese were invited to attend and which were subsequently made available in printed form. Latterly on a couple of occasions, in an effort to take the faith to the wider community, I held a series of Conversations with the Archbishop in which I engaged in dialogue with well known public figures who might not

share my own position on the topic under discussion. In these and other ways the bishop is able to use his position to teach the apostolic faith.

Because the nurture of God's people is not only by word but also by sacrament, the bishop is also the chief sacramental minister of the diocese. In the Anglican Church he alone may ordain and confirm. The bishop's role in confirmation preserves his place in Christian initiation. Most of the work of baptising is fulfilled by priests in parishes, but the bishop's role in confirmation draws attention to the fact that initiation is into membership of the church universal and not simply of a local congregation. On diocesan occasions and usually on pastoral visits to parishes, the bishop presides at the eucharist, because the one who presides over the church in the diocese is the natural president of the eucharistic community in its worship.

In recent times there has been a recovery of the early church principle that the bishop is the natural leader of the church's mission to the world. In the ordinals of the Reformation this aspect of *episcopus* was given little place, for it had been largely neglected during the Middle Ages. In the early years of Anglican missionary expansion no bishops were appointed outside Britain, and it was only when the church was well established overseas that the need to appoint bishops was considered. From the middle of the nineteenth century, however, it was recognised that the bishop was the natural leader of mission. In parts of Africa today, such as Nigeria, there has been a considerable expansion of the episcopate on the basis that bishops should be the pioneering missionaries in new areas, gathering a team of clergy and lay people around them. In this way an important dimension of the bishop's role has been recovered, bearing in mind that to be apostolic is to be sent on mission. So the modern bishop not only takes opportunities for mission and evangelism in his personal ministry but also has the responsibility of coordinating and enabling the mission of the whole people of God in his diocese. To do this effectively the bishop needs a good understanding of the world which provides the context for the church's mission, recognising that the methods of past years may not necessarily be the most appropriate for today.

In all of this, it is at the heart of the bishop's role to be a personal centre of unity for the church. This role is fulfilled as at a number of levels. Within his own diocese he seeks to draw together the clergy and lay people with a sense of common purpose in God's work. What has already been said in respect of the bishop's role as chief minister of word and sacrament, of pastoral care, and as leader of mission, indicates ways in which he functions as centre of unity. He may, however, face real tension in this respect. The church has a prophetic role in the community, and while the bishop may not himself be a person of particular prophetic gifts, he must nevertheless be a leader in the exercise of the church's prophetic ministry. Yet the prophet is, typically, a divisive figure. In telling forth God's purpose in the emerging world, the prophet's message will often necessarily be uncomfortable both to the world outside and to many in the comfortable church. Combining the roles of pastor and prophet is no easy task; yet neither can be neglected and they can only be held together in tension. It is only in the integrity of the bishop's life and ministry that the necessary prophetic word can be spoken and acted upon without damaging the unity of the church.

Unity is not simply the task of the individual bishop in his own diocese. The bishops of the church have a collegial role, and they have a corporate responsibility for the church's unity. In recent ecclesiology much has been written of the church as *koinonia*. The communion of the bishops gives concrete expression to the community of the churches. Through the communion of the bishops the local churches over which the individual bishops preside are in communion with one another; so the collegial relationship of the bishops is crucial. In Australia the bishops meet together in conference at least once a year. In the Anglican communion as a whole they meet in the Lambeth Conference every ten years. Neither the Australian Bishops' Conference nor the Lambeth Conference has legislative authority. Yet their influence is enormous. It is my view that in the face of divided opinions on significant

matters in the church in recent years, the very real communion of the bishops (who among themselves held the same divided opinions as existed in the church at large) has been crucial in maintaining our unity. The same is true of the Lambeth Conference. Its influence is one of moral suasion, not jurisdiction, and on some matters there are sharp differences of opinion among the bishops; yet their collegiality is an important means by which God holds the church together in communion.

So the collegiality of the episcopate is an important expression of the catholicity of the church in our own day. But *koinonia* extends through time as well as space, and the bishops as apostolic persons signify the maintenance of the church in our day in communion with the church of the ages reaching back to the apostles. There has been important growth in our understanding of apostolicity in recent years. Apostolic succession cannot be understood as depending entirely on the historic succession of bishops down the centuries. There is a wider apostolicity of faith and order; but the succession of bishops is an important outward and visible sign of the church's apostolicity and bears tangible testimony to the continuity of the church in every age with that of the apostles.

These characteristics of the bishop's office combine to make the bishop the representative *par excellence* in the church. Whether it be in representing his diocese in some wider council such as the Lambeth Conference or representing the church in ecumenical relations or being a spokesman with government or through the media, the bishop has a distinctive role. While in one sense the church can speak formally only when it expresses its mind through a representative synod, the bishop is able to give a swift and authoritative response when such is needed. He can do so with a measure of confidence because he is in touch with the mind of the church and because of his representative status. This is where his personal *episcopate* has advantage over the sometimes-necessary clumsiness of corporate *episcopate*. There are, of course, real limits to what the bishop can say and do on his own, but within those limits he has an ability to move which *episcopate* by committee often lacks.

One final aspect of the ministry of a bishop must be mentioned, though with some diffidence. At his consecration the bishop-elect is asked to commit himself to a certain way of life. He is to put aside all ungodly and worldly behaviour, to live modestly in justice and godliness, to show compassion to the poor and the stranger, and to be gentle with the abused and needy. All of this is to be grounded in faithfulness in prayer and the study of the Scriptures. In short, he is called to holiness of life so that he may be a true example to his flock. I mention this with some reserve because I know how far we bishops — at least I speak for myself — fall short in this high calling. I dare say that if bishops down the centuries had been truly faithful to this calling, episcopacy would never have become a source of controversy and disunity in the church.

The words spoken to a new bishop at his consecration sum up his task well:

Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf.  
Encourage the faithful, support the weak, heal the sick,  
Bind up the broken, restore the outcast, seek the lost.

There is the true task of the bishop. It is not unlike what Augustine described so many centuries ago.

Keith Rayner,  
Past Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia

## Participants in the Australian Anglican-Lutheran Dialogue

The following list records those who were members during a term but did not necessarily serve for the full term.

### Anglican Members

#### 1972-1976

The Revd K.S. Chittleborough  
Archdeacon N.C. Paynter  
The Revd Canon G.J. Reglar  
The Rt Revd L.E.W. Renfrey

#### 1977-1981

The Revd Canon K.S. Chittleborough  
The Revd Canon G.J. Reglar  
The Rt Revd L.E.W. Renfrey  
The Revd J.L. Roderick  
The Revd G.M. Yould

#### 1982-1984

The Revd Canon K.S. Chittleborough  
The Revd K. Giles  
The Revd Canon G.J. Reglar  
The Revd J.L. Roderick

#### 1985-1993

The Revd Dr Ross E. Bensley  
The Revd Martin E. Bleby  
The Revd Dr. John Gaden  
The Revd Kevin Giles  
The Revd Christopher Myers  
The Revd John L. Roderick  
The Revd Graham Ross  
The Rt Revd Graham H. Walden  
The Revd Dr Duncan S.W. Reid

#### 1997-2000

The Revd Martin E. Bleby (Secretary)  
The Revd Timothy J. Harris  
The Revd Dr Duncan S.W. Reid  
The Rt Revd David Silk  
The Rt Revd Graham H. Walden  
(Co-Chairman)

### Lutheran Members

The Revd Dr L.B. Grope  
The Revd Dr H.P. Hamann  
The Revd C.I. Koch  
The Revd Dr M. Lohe  
The Revd Dr V.C. Pfitzner

The Revd Dr E.W. Janetzki  
The Revd Dr. J.B. Koch  
The Revd Elmore Leske  
The Revd Dr V.C. Pfitzner  
The Revd Dr J.T.E. Renner

The Revd Dr E.W. Janetzki  
The Revd Elmore Leske  
The Revd Dr V.C. Pfitzner  
The Revd Dr J.T.E. Renner

The Revd Malcolm I. Bartsch  
The Revd Elmore Leske  
The Revd Dr Ulf W. Metzner  
The Revd Dr J.T.Erich Renner  
The Revd John Sims  
The Revd Wayne T. Zweck

The Revd Bruce W. Adams  
The Revd Dr Malcolm I. Bartsch  
The Revd David W. Buck  
The Revd Dr Victor C. Pfitzner (Co-Chairman)  
The Revd Roger W. Whittall  
The Revd Ian E. Zweck