ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC PERMANENT JOINT COMMISSION

First Meeting - Windsor, 9th - 15th January 1970

THE CHURCH, INTERCOMMUNION, AND THE MINISTRY

by

Arthur A. Vogel

Largely due to the influence of the statement in Lumen Gentium that "in the sacrament of the Eucharistic bread the unity of all believers who form one body in Christ... is both expressed and brought about,"[1] and the statement in De Ecumenismo that in the Eucharist "the unity of the Church is both signified and brought about,"[2] the affirmation that the Eucharist is both a sign and cause of unity has become a byword in our day. It is well known that different people emphasize different aspects of the polarity of the Eucharist as sign and cause of unity; the significance of the Eucharist determines its use in their eyes. Whichever pole is given the primacy, however, it is gratifying to discover fewer and fewer people who think the nature and use of the Eucharist are isolated considerations. It is now commonly acknowledged that a full consideration of the Eucharist involves a complete ecclesiology, and a full ecclesiology necessarily involves a doctrine of the ministry.

The importance of the context within which theological problems are viewed has thus risen to the foreground. To see problems concerning the Eucharist and the ministry placed in their full ecclesial setting is good; it is frequently an improvement. But we may ask if even that is good enough. There is considerable evidence which indicates that it is not, because the Church in itself is not an ultimate context. The Church exists for the world and in the world; its ultimate destiny we believe is to become coextensive with the world, but, at least for the moment, the world must be seen as the context of the Church rather than vice versa. The Church as "The People of God,", and as a "pilgrim" obviously depends on the world: it is a general truth that no person exists without a world; certainly no pilgrim exists without one. Even the Church is not the sufficient context for understanding the holy Eucharist and the ministry, for the Church itself is in the world and cannot know itself apart from the world. No longer can the Church think of itself as an isolated entity confronting the world. As a pilgrim, the Church exists *in via* and must not pretend to a finality which is foreign to it. How the Church can and will understand itself in the midst of the world is, to a large extent, the source of the religious crisis of our age. For too long what has been called a "theological

positivism" (but another name for theological triumphalism) has been allowed to linger in too many areas of theology: such a positivism seeks to express theological truth without proper reference to the world, history, and time.

The remarks we have been making about the relationships between the Eucharist, the ministry, and the Church supply but one example of the universal truth that all meaning is contextual. The ultimate context for human meaning is the horizon of man's experience in the world when that experience is taken in its totality. Anything which has meaning for man must somehow have meaning for and in his experience. Ultimately, meaning for man is grounded in the manner of his most immediate insertion into being; it is grounded, in other words, in the most basic features of the human condition which define the type of experience he can have.

An adequate analysis of the basic features of the human condition obviously cannot be given in this place, but an adequate analysis of the human condition is a necessary prerequisite for an adequate understanding of any human problem. Certainly such an understanding is the prerequisite for an adequate approach to the issues to be discussed in this paper. In making that statement I am not, happily, claiming that the theological problems before us depend for their solution upon adherence to one philosophical school rather than another. The requirement to which I am referring is the necessity of starting any reasonable reflection about man from adequate descriptive data of the human conditions.

The best descriptive data about man with which we are furnished today indicates, I suggest, that man as a person is radically temporal in his constitution, being a constant synthesis of the modalities of time known as past, present, and future; he is most himself through a specific location in the world, which location originates through his body; his being is intentional, always referring beyond itself and thus always correlative to a world; his being is linguistic, a type of being which permits and requires interpretation; as a person, he is always a whole, never merely a conjuntion of discrete parts; he is communal, not able to be himself by himself.

If such specific problems as the nature of the Church, the Eucharist, and the ministry can be seen in immediate relation to such themes as we have just mentioned, themes which lie at the foundation of all human meaning, what once might have been thought to be isolated religious problems will take on new significance; a new motivation for solving such problems will

arise, and new insights out of which solutions can come will be furnished. If, for example, the Church and the holy Eucharist can be understood in terms that are in one sense coextensive with "human being," then the Church and the holy Eucharist can be understood in a manner which makes an immediate difference to <u>being human</u>. If the Church and the holy Eucharist can be brought into focus by being directly related to the ultimate context of human meaning they will not appear to be issues which ought to concern only a few specialists. They will not be thought of as isolated areas into which some may retreat if they wish; the Church and the holy Eucharist will, instead, be thought of as perfections of a human condition which none can escape. Not "whether" but "how" one will participate in the fabric of the Church and the Eucharist will then be the first question we must ask ourselves.

The claims which have just been made are so big that we must try to substantiate them by at least one example.[3]

Upon the basis of what I take to be the best contemporary insights of the sciences studying man, it is necessary to say that man as a person always has bodily, linguistic, and communal aspects. We must, in fact, say more than that: in his most immediate being, man does not just have a body, he <u>is</u> a body. He is not just in space; he lives space. His most immediate living is bodily living. Moreover, the human world is truly said to be a world of words. We define our worlds by our words; so it is that the "world of science" differs from the "world of business" and so on. We are inserted into reality through language in a manner analagous to that by which we are inserted into reality through our bodies. We are born into fields of meaning which precede us in our families and in our cultures; in learning to speak we enter those worlds of meaning. Men use words and have words, but there is a profound sense in which man <u>is</u> word. He is expression, and his being needs to be interpreted because his being is "semantic." Both man's body and his language make him communal; we are necessarily related to other

not hold the whole faith as proclaimed by the Roman Catholic Church, Lumen Gentium states that "they also recognize and receive other sacraments within their own Churches or ecclesial communities."[13] The Decree on Ecumenism speaks of "separated Churches," and states that "men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are brought into a certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church."[14] It has been argued that the recognition that ecclesial communities other than the Roman Catholic Church are themselves churches necessitates the recognition of the authenticity and "real efficacy of their ministries: that is, that if a church is an authentic Christian church, then it follows that 'our Lord conveys through the [ministry of that church] the same grace of the Word and the Sacraments as he bestows through the historic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons.' But it is worth adding here that such an acknowledgment would not prejudge the issue of whether the orders of such a church are valid from the catholic point of view. The validity of orders is a canonical question: that is, it is essentially a question within a particular church that can be defined as a church in canonical-juridical terms."[15]

A different sequence of argument based on the same premises reasons that "where one church recognises the churchness of another body, it would seem that it necessarily recognises thereby, at least to some extent, the authenticity of its eucharistic celebrations."[16] Fr. Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., believes that when Protestants intend to do what Christ did at the Last Supper "Christ truly gives them the identical grace of the Eucharist that we Catholics receive in our celebration and reception of the Eucharist.[17]

From the authenticity of a church and its Eucharist the authenticity of its ministry can be concluded, for ministry is of the esse of the Church. Either sequence of argument states that where the Church is there the Church's ministry must somehow be also. Interestingly enough, one of the first things that the Archbishops of England said in response to the Bull Apostolicae Curae of Pope Leo XIII was that the condemnation of Anglican orders "aimed at overthrowing our whole position as a Church."[18] Fr. Nicholas Lash, referring to the authenticity which must be granted to the Eucharist and ministry of any church which is recognized to be a church states that "the recognition of other christians as christians (a recognition of their truly christian faith and witness) demands sacramental expression. (I prefer not to speak, at any point, of an 'existing invisible unity', because faith and witness are visible realities, even when they have not yet found

sacramental and structural expression.)"[19]

Several agenda items are suggested for the subcommittees of this Commission by the material just summarized. Does the position taken by the Second Vatican Council not require a more fully explicated ecclesiology than has yet been produced by the Roman Catholic Church? There are those within that Church who think so and who maintain that the consistency of the Council - if it be consistent - requires new theological elaborations from within its own ranks and in dialogue with other churches. Questions about the nature of the "validity" of orders are also raised. There is a growing acceptance in many theological circles of the view that "validity" is a canonical matter and refers to the "aptness of a sacramental sign" rather than to the efficacy of a sacrament.[20] Can agreement be reached on that issue? If so, a whole ecclesiology will be involved.

Of special interest to Anglicans is the consistency or inconsistency of Vatican II in its statement that communicatio in sacris "is not merely possible but recommended" with the Eastern Churches.[21] Fr. Diekmann feels that the Decree on Ecumenism is inconsistent in this regard.[22] Fr. Hamer asserts that there are only canonical differences between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches; they are not separated as "the result of a clash at the level of faith."[23] He speaks of a "sacramental identity" between the two churches, but how could there be on Fr. Hamer's own grounds? There is an obvious dogmatic difference between the two: the Orthodox do not accept the Roman Catholic Church's dogmas of the Infallibility of the Pope, the Immaculate Conception or Assumption of the Virgin Mary. If the concept of the "hierarchy of truths" enables the two churches in question to eucharistize together, then the identity of the Eucharist with the jurisdictional structure of the Roman Catholic Church, to which Fr. Hamer appealed to prohibit intercommunion with other churches, has been modified to allow it with the Orthodox. Where is the consistency here? The Orthodox conceive the essential unity of the Church to reside in the sacraments, not papal jurisdiction, and they believe their differences from the Roman Catholic Church to be essential ones in ecclesiology.[24] What are the consequences of that fact? Authorization granted by the Roman Catholic bishops of the Fiji and Gilbert Islands (in accordance with the Directory, Part I, paragraph 55, published by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity) for Anglicans to receive the Eucharist in the Roman Church where Anglican priests are not available is an entirely consistent move.[25]

When Roman Catholic theologians have advocated (as, for

example, in the instances we have examined) a reappraisal of the authenticity of the Eucharist and ministry outside the Roman Catholic Church, and when they have asked for a renewed ecclesiol y, they have done so in an attempt to harmonize various statements of Vatican II among themselves and to harmonize those statements with the theology of their church. In addition they have seen the Church in a context wider than its canonical definition. The latter is most important.

Quoting Schillebeeckx's remark that "the church is mankind insofar as it willingly places itself under Christ's influence..." and Karl Rahner's statement that "mankind in its entirety is the People of God, and... membership of this People is a constitutive element of our concrete humanity," Martin Redfern agrees with Schillebeeckx that "'thanks...to Christ's historical coming there is in living humanity a kind of built-in compass pointing to the church... This pointing to the church, or mankind's need of her in the concrete, and, on the other hand, her going out to mankind, are both visible forms of the one operative salvation which our Lord is in the Spirit of God.' The direct revelance of this for our particular problem of intercommunion is not far to seek. In this perspective of our essential Christian mission being to make present and build up that communio of all mankind to which mankind itself is tending, and to realise our own fundamentally social humanity in the explicit profession of our common incorporation into the prototype man, the second Adam, the pattern of human divisions radically alters: the distinction between catholic and non-catholic remains, of course, but it appears less (and less important) than the difference between 'explicit' and 'implicit' (or'anonymous') Christianity - and both distinctions fall into comparative insignificance before the fundamental distinction between those who work to build up the unity of mankind in Christ, and those who work to divide and alienate mankind."[26]

Seeing Christians' inability to eucharistize together as "an outright denial of Christ and of God's saving plan for the unity of mankind... is a strong theological argument which actively urges intercommunion."[27] When looked at in the total human context - which is the true Christian context - many differences among Christians are not as big as they appear in more limited, historically inherited denominational contexts. That conclusion would also follow from the opening remarks of this paper which analysed the meaning of the Eucharist in terms of body, word, and community - themes as universal as mankind and in which all mankind participates. Time is of the essence, for the inability of Christians to eucharistize together bears the weight of all

mankind; Christians are involved in something bigger than denominational feuds when they exclude each other from the Eucharist.

The setting in which such a theological problem as intercommunion is seen accounts, to a large extent, for the different conclusions drawn by the theologians we have examined. I do not think the importance of a context adequate to the human condition can be overemphasized in ecumenical discussions, but certainly important areas of investigation and concern have been brought forward from sources other than those which we have so far noticed.

With respect to the Church, theology has shown the need for using many images and analogies in our thought. The Church as "The People of God" needs to be completed, for example, by the notion of the Church as the "Body of Christ" to show what is new in it. It was once fashionable to distinguish the Church from the sacraments because the Church was their source; now, precisely because the Church is their source, the importance is seen of considering the Church "as the primary sacrament."[28] As itself a sacramental sign, the Church is grace visible in the world, the earthly visibility of the high-priesthood Christ now exercises in heaven.[29] The Church is temporal and expectant in its core, manifesting a never-to-be-lost eschatological dimension. Its primary purpose in the world is to enable mankind to achieve its divine destiny.

All the sacraments may be seen as "basic acts of the self-realization of the Church," but the Eucharist is the supreme actuation of the Church as the community of salvation.[30] For that reason the Eucharist may be seen as the source and setting of all other sacraments.[31] Because of the common understanding of the sacraments held by the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, it was a natural thing for the official Consultation between the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Churches in the U.S.A. (hereafter abbreviated "ARC") to take the "Church as a Eucharistic Community" as a continuing dimension of its first theme. It was a consensus we found we could begin with, and it is one which I hope the International Commission can commend to its subcommittees also.

Dimensions of the Church which are apt to be most problematic for Anglican-Roman relations are those of authority and ministry. "Authority" is being treated as a special topic at this meeting, so I will say nothing more about it here. "Ministry," the third topic assigned to this paper, will be discussed later.

Let us now turn our attention to aspects of the Eucharist we have not yet considered.

If the Church is a eucharistic community, upon entering the Church through baptism one is incorporated into on-going eucharistic activity. (That statement assumes, of course, that the essential nature of the Eucharist cannot simplistically be reduced to services which begin and end in church buildings!) If the identity of the Church and Eucharist is taken seriously, and if the Eucharist is the source of all the sacraments, baptism must be considered the first act of eucharistic participation. Every Christian act is some degree of such participation. In the early Church, for example, in Ambrose, Justin, and Hippolytus, the Eucharist was seen as the completion of baptism.[32] Among contemporary theologians, Fr. Schillebeeckx has written that any valid baptism gives "an inner orientation to the Catholic sacrament of the Eucharist. Furthermore, valid baptism is implicity a 'Eucharist of desire'."[33] Historical practice and theological consistency seem to support the contention that the Eucharist cannot be saved for the final sign of unity. It is such a sign but, in a most literal and univocal sense, it is too pervasive and essential to be isolated from any Christian reality.

We are made one in baptism by entering the one body of Christ, and it is that body, which in the mode of on-going expansion, is present in the Eucharist. There is a literal sense in which we already eucharistize together in baptism, but we do so in a manner which requires ever-growing cosmic inclusion. Such inclusion is the work of the Holy Eucharist: through eucharistic activity the whole universe is to be consecrated to God in Christ. Once again we can be helped to understand our religion through an understanding of our daily lives.[34] As we most immediately live the bodies which locate us in the world, we "take them up" in our creative activities and extend the pattern of spatial and temporal organization which originates in them to the world through the manner in which we meet and engage other people and objects in the world. As we most immediately live our bodies, we develop styles of living which we cannot help but communicate and try to extend in the world through our bodily activities in the world. Before we can extend the style of our bodily living to the world in our daily lives, however, we must first be our bodies through birth.

Such insights can help us understand the relationship of baptism to the Holy Eucharist and the sense in which the eucharistic body perfects the mystical body, the Church. (We know that the Church was first called the "mystical body" when it was participating in the holy mysteries, the Eucharist.) The Christian life consists in extending to the world the structure of the body of Christ into which we are born in baptism. Just as

we must be our bodies before we can extend their style of living into the world, so we must be Christ's body before we can extend his style of living into the world. We enter (are born into) Christ's body through baptism; we extend (or universalize) Christ's body through our eucharistic activity. We can thus understand why baptism is a prerequisite for the Holy Eucharist and the sense in which baptism requires the Eucharist for its own completion. Even in our "natural" lives, responsible, creative living in the world is the means of our perfection; our birth alone is not our end.

Even though baptism is incorporation into a eucharistic community (and even though there must be a relationship of all mankind to the Eucharist as there is a relationship of all mankind to the Church), in its explicit celebration, the Eucharist manifests as well as causes unity. From the time of Israel on, cultic worship signified, as well as caused, communal oneness.[35]

When Christians answer Christ's call to "do this in remembrance of me," they must manifest a unity of faith specific enough to proclaim to the world and to each other that they assemble in response to God's call; they must specifically admit that Christ is their Truth. On the cross, Jesus was the New Israel, the people Israel: being called to Christ, Christians are called to a community which precedes them. That, too, must be shown in their profession of faith. Christians receive both grace and community as gifts before they are themselves able to participate in graceful communal growth.

The problem which arises between Anglicans and Romans (as well as among Christians generally) is not whether there must be unity before eucharistic participation, but how much unity there must be. Can it be said that Anglicans and Roman Catholics believe in "different creeds"? I believe not, but some unequivocal consensus must be reached on this point. That consensus should not be difficult in view of such statements as the following, made by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church:

> As expressed in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, we hold the Nicene Creed, as part of the essential core of the continuous, historic tradition of the Church and therefore an element in the life of any united Church. The Apostles' Creed is likewise held to be the minimal baptismal confession. Thus our Church is irrevocably committed to the historic Creeds and regards the Nicene Creed as it was affirmed at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., as an indispensable norm for the Christian faith.[36]

There are people who interpret point a in Cardinal Bea's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury of June 10, 1968, as hesitancy on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to acknowledge, at the

moment, the oneness of the faith of the two churches as described in paragraph 7 of the Malta Report.

I should think there would be no difficulty in establishing the "institutional" identity of faith between our two churches as described in the Malta Report, but a whole nest of important topics for relations between our churches is uncovered if one asks what the nature of faith itself is. Is it assent? Is it commitment? What is the relationship between the two? Here the nature of revelation becomes pivotal. Such Roman Catholic theologians as Gabriel Moran stress that although propositions are necessary to revelation, revelation is essentially an interpersonal activity - not propositional statements. By stressing the experiential, personal, and communal aspects of revelation, showing that the person to whom revelation is made himself becomes a part of the revelatory process, Moran stresses the temporal and eschatological aspects of revelation. He states that he has "no intention of denying the necessity and importance of the conceptual," but he notes that "attaining the truth of revelation for the apostles depended first of all not upon the correct joining of concepts, but upon the fundamental option for Truth, that is, the God of Truth.[37]

If faith and revelation are discussed in the radically personal and experiential terms used by Moran, the sacraments themselves are seen to be revelation. They are the "intersubjective experience of the Christian community in God: God giving himself in Christ to man in community..."[38] A Christian's sacramental life is intimate participation in on-going revelation. Such revelation moves towards a goal; it does not enshrine final propositional Truth. As we have indicated, there must be an unequivocal choice of Jesus Christ through baptism before it is possible for Christians ritually to eucharistize together, but understanding revelation and faith in the terms in which they have just been presented to us, why should not, because of the eschatological and temporal nature of revelation, the faith which is ascribed to in baptism be the sufficient faith to admit a Christian to the Eucharist? Entrance into the Christian community is entrance into an on-going communal revelation mediated through the sacraments. Both the sacraments and revelation are means of growth and must be shared as widely as consistency with the finality and nature of Christ admit. But even Jesus, it must be remembered, ascended to a glory which lay ahead of him. In any ultimate analysis - and considered from God's point of view - which is worse, an actual sinner who in "a state of orthodoxy" receives

the Holy Eucharist, or a Christian who, in a state of grace, receives the Holy Eucharist without canonical authorization? Canonical and denominational issues must be jolted into their true Christian perspective, the perspective they have in the eyes of God, The issue is squarely before us as official representatives of our churches, for, at least in the U.S.A., canonically unauthorized intercommunion is constantly going on between members of our two churches. We can overlook the existential signs of our time only to our harm.

If the essentially participatory and temporal nature of revelation is seen, and if the sacraments themselves are the means of such revelation, then the necessity of intercommunion - or better, communicatio in sacris - as soon as possible is necessary in the name of the very Truth we proclaim.

Before departing too far from the remarks which grew out of the inner relation existing between baptism and the Eucharist, it should be added that, although it seems to me that the baptismal faith should essentially admit a believer to the Eucharist, other criteria must also be allowed. Where a specific eucharistic celebration is going to be shared, explicit agreement about the sacramental nature of the Eucharist and the real presence of Christ in it should also be required. (We shall again postpone considerations of the ministry.) On such matters as the structure of the Eucharist, the inclusion of the words of institution, the epiclesis, the elements, etc. where are no special difficulties between our two churches; indeed, consensus on such matters is today larger than the Anglican and Roman Communions.

Specific problems pertaining to the Eucharist remain in some people's minds because our churches are historical and have their identity from the past as well as towards the future. The sacrificial nature of the Eucharist is one such problem, but in the light of contemporary research into the nature of sacrifice, I commend to this body and to its subcommittees the statement made after the fourth meeting of ARC:

> We have made a careful study of the Documents of the Second Vatican Council, the Lambeth Conference Report of 1958 and the 1949 Statement of Faith and Order of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA and other statements of the contemporary position of both our Churches...Whatever doctrinal disagreements may remain between our Churches, the understanding of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist is not among them."

The nature of the Eucharist determines its use. The systematic and experiential analysis to which we have so far referred, as well as explicit statements from Vatican II, have

shown the propriety of using the Eucharist as a source as well as a sign of unity. Help for that point of view is also found in contemporary biblical studies. One reason already mentioned for using the Eucharist as a means to unity is the Eucharist's eschatological nature; the Eucharist is itself anticipatory of something beyond itself. Not only is it not wrong for man to anticipate the future, the Eucharist itself is such anticipation. The Eucharist forces us into such anticipation. New Testament research too, is being led to emphasize the eschatological significance of the Eucharist: the stressing of the passover setting of the Last Supper in the synoptic Gospels points up the eschatological nature of that meal, for the passover was the most messianic of the Jewish feasts.[39] A messianic connotation is also seen in St. Paul's use of "the body of Christ" as the means by which those who are near are to be made one with those who are far off (Ephes. 2:13 and 3:6). The messianic and eschatological (Exodus) theme in the eucharistic commentary of John 6 has also been called to attention .

Besides the eschatological dimension, the atoning dimension of the Eucharist is being re-emphasized in New Testament study. As blood was the basis for restoring, on the Day of Atonement, the covenant community after the people's transgressions (Levit. 16:15), the association of blood and covenant in the eucharistic accounts of Luke, Paul, Matthew, and Mark intends a bringing together of people. The Eucharist makes present the "blood of propritiation" by means of which the communal unity of God's people is achieved. Edward Kilmartin finds vicarious expiation instead of the ritual sacrifical theme emphasized in the "bread-saying of Paul/Luke and in the cup-saying of Mark/Matthew," in a typology relating Jesus to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.[41] If the Eucharist makes present the instrumental work of Christ's cleansing blood and is the primary means of anticipating the messianic future, its role in the Christian community cannot possibly be restricted to that of a sign of unity which has already been achieved.

With respect to the ministry our two churches do not begin discussion in a vacuum. Much has gone before. What we most need to do at the present time is not betray the authenticity of our own existence and deny the creative presence of the Holy Spirit by trying to relive the past.

ARC tried to avoid hardened attitudes and the mind set of old controversies by looking at the ministry within the setting of the eucharistic community as a whole. Seeing the ministry located in the community of faith is becoming the rule today,

and as a result of that approach, apostolic succession is increasingly being described in terms applying to the Church as a community instead of in terms of a mechanical laying on of hands going back from individual to individual in history. Hans Küng's two books Structures of the Church and The Church, are good illustrations of such an approach.

The press release given at the conclusion of ARC's third meeting noted that "Episcopalians believe in the sacramental nature of Holy Orders." The statement went on to say that "both Churches believe that men are set apart for the ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop by an act of God in the Church through prayer and the laying on of hands by the Bishop. It was agreed that ordination gives man grace and authority for a life-long ministry." At that same meeting, after an examination of the Preface to the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer and the differentiation between priest and minister in the rubrics of the Order for Holy Communion in the same book, it was agreed that there is the proper intention to ordain priests, in the accepted Roman Catholic sense of that term, in the Episcopal Church.

The relation of the ministerial to the royal (universal or common) priesthood, or of the ordained ministry to the community of faith, is a most important consideration. As is well known, pressure has been increased from a number of sources in recent years to reopen the issue of Anglican orders. The work of John Jay Hughes[42] and William H. van de Pol immediately come to mind as members of the Roman Catholic Church who urge such reconsideration. Fr. van de Pol thinks that the obstacle to unity caused by Apostolicae Curae should "be put out of the way as soon as possible."[43] He contends that the condemnation of Anglican orders "is not an infallible proclamation of a dogma, but a disciplinary regulation or ordinance which of itself is not infallible."[44] The absolutism of the wording of the Bull of condemnation is regarded by him as only "an example of a fixed curial style."

Because of the historical background of our two churches and the "special place" Anglicans hold among the churches in the West according to the Decree on Ecumenism, the issue of ministerial orders can be thought of as a special issue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Even if it were taken in that narrow context, the issue should be re-evaluated dialogically.

An alternate procedure would be to consider the broader theological issues concerning the role and nature of the ordained ministry within the primacy of the community of faith. ARC's fifth meeting made the following statement as part of its press

release:

> After studying official documentation and theological papers on the necessity and role of the ordained priesthood and the relationship of this ministry to the common priesthood and role of the laity in the church, it was agreed that there is no basic difference of understanding on these topics and that whatever minor differences of understanding exist they do not in themselves constitute the barrier to the two churches celebrating and receiving communion together.

The International Commission should do whatever is necessary to consolidate and justify in its own eyes the conclusion reached by ARC. In the end, of course, such a consensus must be voiced at the highest levels of authority in our two churches.

As with all of the topics assigned to this paper, in matters pertaining to ministerial orders, we find ourselves in the midst of developing theological trends and changing theological currents. The healthiest sign of life and the best promise for unity between our two churches would be found if our churches could grow together through a commonly developed (or, better, commonly developing) theology of the ministry as that ministry is viewed in its relationship to the "baptismal ministry." Fr. van Beeck sees "the Sacrament of Order....[to be] an intensification and specification of the Sacrament of Baptism."[45] Fr. Bernard Cooke, S.J., represents the views of a number of Roman Catholic, as well as non-Roman, theologians when he writes that we must not think of the "power of Orders" as a "semi-magical power." He allows that a new "potential for action in the order of grace" may be imparted at ordination, but he goes on to state that "at the present stage of theological investigation it is far from clear that is the case. It seems that we must examine whether the 'power' connected with the Sacrament of Orders is not rather the kind of power that is peculiar to man's life in society, the kind of power that is connected with office and jurisdiction and authority."[46] The sacramental nature of the ordained ministry needs further examination according to Fr. Cooke; in the course of that examination the communal source and the communal end of all the sacraments must be given their due recognition, a theme which Fr. van Beeck also stresses. Because of the oneness of the community formed by baptism, the "continuum" of "the ministerial priesthood of Catholic tradition and the ministry of authentic Protestant tradition" must be further investigated.[47] Such problems are wider than Anglican-Roman relations as many people would conceive them, but they afford essential grounds out of which Anglican and Roman Catholic

consensus could emerge.

I will gladly leave the decision to the wisdom of this Commission as to whether problems of ministerial order should be considered in the narrower or wider context. My only hope would be that we commend whichever course seems most likely to hasten our ability to practice responsible intercommunion and ultimately to achieve communicatio in sacris. Our primary goal is not a fixed state between two institutional churches but a personal liberation from the bondage of the past which will enable us to grow together in the eucharistic consecration of the universe. Our present goal is to be able better to begin to grow together in what is promised to be a never-ending eucharistic life. If we can understand that we are only working together now on a beginning, perhaps we will not be put off by the "accomplishments" of the past.

In the Constitution on the Church of the Second Vatican Council the three-fold offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King structured the discussion of both the ordained ministry (especially the description of the episcopate) and the laity. The report on "The Renewal of the Church in Ministry" of the Lambeth Conference of 1968 employs the same three-fold structure in its discussion of the priesthood. It is noteworthy that the schema is in current use in both churches; an obvious common point for dialogue is thus provided. The existence of this common method of analysis in Vatican II and Lambeth, 1968, should be called to the attention of this Commission, but the themes concerned when Prophet, Priest, and King are translated into creed, cult, and code or "teaching, sanctifying, and governing" indicates that the schema is more apt to offer a summary of problems than to point the way to a solution of them.[48]

There is need to do little more than list other problems concerning the ministry which are obvious agenda items for Anglican-Roman Catholic discussions.

I. There are problems concerning the relation of the various orders of the ordained ministry among themselves. These problems are especially acute where the relations of bishops to priests (presbyters) are considered. How does the episcopal order differ from the presbyteral order? Is episcopal ability to ordain a matter of sacramental character or of jurisdiction? A consistent theological explication adequate to the facts of history has yet to be produced.

Among the problems included in this first category we may also ask whether a presbyter in any sense "derives his share in ministry from the bishop."[49] Bishops and priests share in the

priesthood of Christ; that being the case, is it not wrong to insinuate that bishops delegate their priesthood to presbyters? Christ's sending of the "70" indicates that ministry originates immediately in him; it was not given to the apostles in a manner which enabled them to share what was exclusively theirs with others.[50] Other questions also arise about the relation of orders of ministry to Christ: do, for example, bishops (and the Pope) serve as vicars of Christ or as "representatives" of Christ in a different manner?

II There is the question of the papal office itself. Because this issue brings up the problem of authority, we will not treat it in detail. The one question we will ask about the papal office in this paper concerns the manner in which that office signifies the unity of the Church. The question I propose can arise out of the English translation of the Constitution on the Church as it is contained in The Documents of Vatican II, edited by Walter M. Abbot, S.J. In that translation we read that the Pope, as Peter's successor, "is the perpetual and visible source and foundation of the unity of the bishops and of the multitude of the faithful. The individual bishop, however, is the visible principle and foundation of unity of his particular church..."[51] The official Latin text of the Constitution uses the phrase, visibile principium et fundamentum, of both Pope and bishops. In the English translation, the one word principium is translated as "source" when referring to the Pope but as "principle" when referring to bishops.

In traditional Thomistic terminology the terms "principle" and "source" are generally considered synonyms: a principle may be defined as any source or beginning, in contradistinction to a cause which is said to be a certain kind of beginning, i.e., one which contributes something positive to another thereby making that other an "effect." The theological concern in this instance, of course, is whether or not a causal role or only an expressive role is attributed to the Pope in relation to the Church's unity. There is enough latitude for either interpretation in the Constitution itself; it is well-known which interpretation would be consistent with the present posture of the Anglican and Orthodox churches.

* * * * *

I do not wish to make an already long paper longer, but the warm experience I have had in the official consultations between our two churches in the U.S.A. and some of the disappointments I have shared with Roman brethren in those

consultations prompts me to close with a few additional remarks.

It will be noted that I have quoted almost exclusively from Roman Catholic sources in this paper; the selection of references and quotations was purposeful. It illustrates again what is now a commonplace - and what has been our constant experience in ARC - that theological communities no longer follow denominational lines. Now-a-days a person's theological problems can usually be stated in the words of someone from another denomination. We live in a day of philosophical and theological pluralism. It is suggested by Karl Rahner that such pluralism is irreducible; it is based upon the perspectival nature of man and cannot be made to go away by better teamwork between theologians.[52]

To be sure canonical clarity can still be found in churches, but such clarity is abstract, lacking the concretness of man himself. As a result, where canonical clarity is achieved, it is frequently achieved at the expense of the human condition, at the expense of the full condition of the Church in this world. That is what leads some to see the institutional church as unreal in spite of its presence; the absolute claims canonically made by the institutional church may cause the Church itself to lose its credibility. Under such conditions, the turmoil which the Church is presently experiencing in the world should not be surprising.

Time and again <u>time</u> appears to be crucial to the issues we are discussing. What we should do <u>now</u> is our problem. Every fully human problem has a temporal dimension, as does every truly human word. Gerhard Ebeling, the Lutheran theologian, has emphasized that there are right and wrong times to use every word which is humanly significant.

Gabriel Moran admits that the Jews were not good scientific historians, but taking the temporal nature of man seriously was their unique contribution to our understanding of history. That insight of the Jews enabled time to be the means of God's revelation to man, not the enemy God's revelation had to overcome. Thus it can be said (as, for example, in the Theology of Hope) that the Incarnation is not an eternal "moment" in time but the eternal living time. Johannes Metz asserts that God himself appears in history; "transcendance itself has become an event."[53] Theologians not identified with the Theology of Hope make essentially the same point. Karl Rahner states that "the Logos did not merely become (statically) man in Christ; he assumed a human history."[54] He writes that God "who is unchangeable in himself can <u>himself</u> become subject to change

in something else."[55]

Christian truth is a saving truth and so involves the whole man, that is, man in his temporal situation. The Christian revelation cannot adequately be conceived in terms of an atemporal truth immutably existing through time; on such a view no time is right, only the truth is right - and it is eternal. A more adequate view of the Incarnation sees revelation as tendential and directional. God lives time in Christ; he does not flash timeless messages to us at times. The temporal nature of man and of God's revelation to man in Jesus Christ does not allow the type of separation between theory and practice which surreptitiously creeps into much theological thought. A new relationship between theory and practice must be worked out "if theological thought is not to be left at a pre-critical stage," according to Metz. He continues, "properly speaking, the so-called fundamental hermaneutic problem of theology is not the problem of how systematic theology stands in relation to historical theology, how dogma stands in relation to history, but what is the relation between theory and practice, between understanding the faith and social practice."[56] Certianly "social practice" can be interpreted in a wide enough sense to include intercommunion!

Karl Rahner, too, sees unity as something which is achieved through practice rather than as something upon which practice must wait. The verification of credal oneness is itself a temporal process according to him; it is not an atemporal judgment. He suggests that the pluralistic theologies presently existing in the Church are now commonly seen to "occupy a different place of importance in the credal outlook" of individual churches. "In other words, they now are put at a greater distance from credal profession in every Church, and are viewed in a larger context which leaves room for the legitimate coexistence of many theologies."[57] Such considerations make it legitimate to suggest that "if we wish to achieve credal oneness and to verify it, then we must <u>utter</u> this profession together, concretely celebrate the death of the Lord together, execute the sacraments together, and engage in joint activity in the world. Through these activites, the oneness and sameness of our credal profession will become real, whatever pluralism may exist in theology."[58]

Fr. Rahner mentions the "larger context" within which theological differences are seen today. The importance of context, the note on which this paper began, is the note on which it will end. At a discussion of intercommunion at the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala,

one speaker called present pressure for responsible intercommunion between churches "antitheological." A second speaker quickly denied that to be the case, and it is with him that I hope we can agree. I do not believe that the pressure for intercommunion presently building up in almost all the churches of the Western World is a re-emergence of the "old liberalism" saying that theology is unimportant. The phenomenon now appearing in the churches is a result of a new, more basic and inclusive type of theologizing - a theologizing which understands itself to be coextensive with the human condition and the totality of man's world. We are witnessing a change in theological contexts, not a revolt against theology. The only revolt is against the old "positivistic" way of doing theology.

When the first thing about the Eucharist is seen to be its consequences for mankind as a whole and the human condition as such, a different set of priorities is established than when eucharistic consequences for all mankind are thought to be subsequent to other more immediate and restricted consequences. In a sense it depends on how available to the world Christians think the "man for others" is.

Footnotes

1. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," article 3. All references to documents of Vatican II will be to the articles of the schemata. The translations used are those found in The Documents of Vatican II, Walter M. Abbott, S.J., General Editor, Guild Press, American Press, Association Press, 1966.

2. "Decree on Ecumenism," 2.

3. A more comprehensive development of the following discussion can be found in Is the Last Supper Finsihed; Secular Light on a Sacred Meal by Arthur A. Vogel, (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1968), passim.

4. Jerome Hamer, O.P., "Stages on the Road to Unity: the Problem of Intercommunion," One in Christ, IV (No. 3, 1968).

5. Ibid., p. 239.

6. Ibid., P. 241.

7. Ibid., p. 240.

8. Ibid., p. 242.

9. Ibid., p. 245.

10. Ibid., p. 247.

11. Ibid., p.248.

12. Ibid., p.249.

13. Article 15.

14. Article 3.

15. Martin Redfern, "Freedom of Worship: Intercommunion," in Christians and World Freedom, ed. by Laurence Bright, OP, (Baltimore: Helicon Press, Inc., 1966), p.87.

16. Nicholas Lash, His Presence in the World: A Study of Eucharistic Worship and Theology, (Dayton: Pflaum Press, 1968), p.186.

17. IDO-C (Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church), No. 68-38, (9.22.68), p.7.

18. Anglican Orders: The Bull of his Holiness Leo XIII and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 23.

19. Lash, op. cit., p.199.

20. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order held in Edinburgh, 1937, observed that "validity" was sometimes understood to mean "efficacious" while at other times it was taken to mean "correctly performed." The influential article by Frans Josef van Beeck, S.J., "Towards an Ecumenical Understanding of the Sacraments," in Journal of Ecumenical Studies, III (Winter 1966), urges the canonical understanding of the term "valid." Daniel O'Hanlon, S.J. drew heavily from Fr. van Beeck for his article "A New Approach to Validity of Church Orders," in Reconsiderations: Roman Catholic/Presbyterian and Reformed Theological Conversations, 1966-67, (New York: World Horizons, 1967). pp. 139ff. Fr. Lash assumes the canonical meaning of "validity" in the work of his to which we just referred, cf., p.192.

21. "Decree on Ecumenism," 15.

22. Diekmann, art. cit., p.9.

23. Hamer, art. cit., p.245.

24. Cf., John Meyendorff, The Orthodox Church, (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1962), p. 212.

25. Religious News Service report, July 10, 1969.

26. Redfern, art. cit., pp.74f.

27. Ibid., pp. 76f.

28. Karl Rahner, Theological Investigations, IV. Trans. by Kevin Smyth. (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1966), p.272.

29. Cf., E. Schillebeeckx, Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God, (London: Sheed & Ward Stagbooks, 1963), pp. 56, 198.

30. Rahner, op. cit., p.281.

31. Cf., Alexander Schmemann, Sacraments and Orthodoxy, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), passim.

32. Cf., Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., Christian Sacraments and Christian Personality, (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1965, p.23.

33. Schillebeeckx, op. cit., p.240.

34. Vogel, op. cit., p.85.

35. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., "Eucharist: Source or Expression of Community?" Worship, Vol. 40 (June 1966), p.340.

36. The Pastoral Letter: Issued by the House of Bishops Assembled, Dallas, Texas, November 12-17, 1960. (New York: Executive Council, 815 Second Ave), p.4.

37. Gabriel Moran, Theology of Revelation, (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), p.86.

38. Ibid., p.125

39. Edward Kilmartin, S.J., "The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church," in The Breaking of Bread, Concilium, Vol. 40, (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), p.36.

40. Luc Dequeker and Willem Zuidema, "The Eucharist and St. Paul," The Breaking of Bread, p.58.

41, Kilmartin, art. cit., p.37.

42. John Jay Hughes, Absolutely Null and Utterly Void: The Papal Condemnation of Anglican Orders, 1896, (Washington: Corpus Books, 1968).

43. William H. van de Pol, Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective, (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1965), p.269.

44. Ibid., p.59.

45. van Beeck, art. cit., p.105.

46. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., "Contemporary Study of Priesthood," American Church Quarterly, VI, (Fall, 1969), p.136.

47. Ibid., p.132.

48. Lawrence B. Guillot, Ministry in Ecumenical Perspective: The Ministry of Priests and Priesthood as a Problem in Ecumenical Relations for Anglicans and Roman Catholics, (Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Theologica, Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1969), pp. vii, 374ff. Copies of Fr. Guillot's doctoral thesis have been distributed to all of the members of ARC.

49. Ibid., p.361.

50. Cf., Max Thurian, The One Bread. Trans. by Theodore DuBois. (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1969), p.74.

51. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 23.

52. Cf., Karl Rahner, S.J., "Pluralism in Theology and the Oneness of the Church's Profession of Faith," Trans. by John Dury in The Development of Fundamental Theology, Concilium, Vol. 46, (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), p.106.

53. Johannes B. Metz, Theology of the World. Trans. by William Glen-Doepel. (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p.22.

54. Karl Rahner, S.J. Theological Investigations, I. Trans. by Cornelius Ernst, O.P. (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1965, p.167.

55. Rahner, Investigations, IV, p.113.

56. Metz, op cit., p.112.

57. Rahner's "Pluralism in Theology and the Oneness of the Church's Profession of Faith," p.122.

58. Ibid.

AFT
19.11.69