

## Future Agenda for Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue

# Evaluation of the ARCIC Final Report

*In an evaluation of the "Final Report" by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops praised commission findings while offering various criticisms and suggesting areas for future discussion by the new ARCIC commission. (Excerpts from the ARCIC I "Final Report" appeared in Origins, vol. 11, no. 44.) ARCIC I's 1982 findings on the eucharist, on ministry and ordination, and on authority in the church were evaluated by a six-member ad hoc committee headed by Archbishop John Whealon of Hartford, Conn. The committee's evaluation was accepted by a vote of the U.S. bishops Nov. 15 during their national meeting in Washington, D.C. "We find the doctrine contained in the 'Final Report' consonant in substance with Catholic faith when it comes to the Lord's real presence in the eucharist. The Roman Catholic Church has reason to rejoice and be grateful for the efforts of ARCIC I which have made such a conclusion possible and responsible," the evaluation stated. But it added: "An unfinished agenda precludes our saying at present that this doctrinal agreement in faith includes all that is essential for full communion between the two churches." Matters concerning the eucharist as sacrifice, the Anglican view of reserving the eucharist as an extension of eucharistic worship, apostolic succession and the lasting foundation for the primacy of Peter's successors were just some points the committee recommended for discussion by ARCIC II. And the committee expressed hope "that ARCIC II will be asked to prepare its conclusions for a session of the Synod of Bishops with Anglican input and representation." The evaluation follows.*

### I. Introduction

On the occasion of the canonization of the 40 martyrs of England and Wales, Pope Paul VI expressed this wish: "May the blood of these martyrs be able to heal the great wound inflicted upon God's church by reason of the separation of the Anglican Church from the Catholic Church."

At the same time he looked to the future with hope and sought to assuage fears:

"There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and the worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church when the Roman Catholic Church — this humble servant of the servants of God — is able to embrace her ever-beloved sister in the one authentic communion of the family of Christ: a communion of origin and of faith, a communion of priesthood and of rule, a communion of the saints in the freedom of love of the Spirit of Jesus."

It is the conviction of this committee that the day which Pope Paul saw with joy from afar has come closer as a result of the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (hereafter ARCIC I).

This same committee takes seriously its charge to respond to the question posed by the president of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. On March 17, 1982, Cardinal Jan Willebrands wrote to Archbishop John Roach, president of the episcopal conference of the United States of America. His letter contained three requests: a) that a careful study be made of "The Final Report" of ARCIC I; b) that a considered judgment be given on the work accomplished; and c) that the reply of the conference address itself to the question "whether it ("The Final Report") is consonant in substance with the faith of the Catholic Church concerning the matters discussed."

Given its mandate, ARCIC I directed its attention to "Eucharistic Doctrine" (1971); "Ministry and Ordination" (1973); "Authority in the Church I" (1976); and "Authority in the Church II" (1981). The members of the commission are to be commended for responding to criticisms and questions raised about their first three statements. Their replies appeared in three sets of "Elucidations"; the first two issued in 1979 and the third in 1981.

This committee notes with approval that the stated concern of ARCIC I was not to evade the historic difficulties between the two communions but to avoid the controversial language in which those difficulties had often been discuss-

The U.S. bishops' evaluation of the conclusions of the first Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's dialogue, printed here, marks a "historic" step in ecumenical relations, the first time that the U.S. episcopal conference has issued a formal response to any of the "dozens and dozens" of such dialogue statements, Archbishop John Whealon of Hartford, Conn., said in presenting the evaluation for consideration during the bishops' Nov. 12-15 annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

Whealon headed an ad hoc committee of bishops formed to make the evaluation. The committee included Archbishops James Hickey of Washington and Daniel Pilarczyk of Cincinnati, and Bishops Ernest Unterkoefler of Charleston, S.C., Raymond Lessard of Savannah, Ga., and Michael Murphy of Erie, Pa. Father Carl Peter, dean of The Catholic University of America's School of Religion and a member of the Vatican's International Theological Commission, served as the committee's theological expert and was chief author of the evaluation.

The subject of the evaluation, the "Final Report" of ARCIC I, was the result of 12 years of work, from 1970 through 1982, by the international commission established by Pope Paul VI and the then-Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, to seek ways of resolving the doctrinal differences which have separated the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches for 400 years. Published in 1982, it covers agreements on the eucharist, ministry and authority in the church. The "Final Report" was not intended to mark the end of Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, but



ed in the past.<sup>4</sup> In re-examining the common inheritance of Anglicans and Roman Catholics, particularly the Scriptures, the authors of "The Final Report" chose imagery and concepts which were the exclusive legacy of neither of the two churches but in which each would hopefully be able to recognize its own faith.<sup>5</sup> Such recognition will in our view not be possible without making some comparison of the new with the older and more traditional formulations of the faith regarding the eucharist, ordained ministry and church authority. In this response we shall from time to time make use of traditional terminology; we regard this usage as supportive of the intent of ARCIC I. The Gospel must be presented in ways that will lead to closer unity among Christians. In the process it must remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ without losing its identity. An important measure of the evangelical fruitfulness to be expected of new formulations of Christian faith is their fidelity to the apostolic tradition preserved in the church's teaching through the centuries.

## II. Eucharistic Doctrine in "The Final Report"

### A. Real Presence

We turn first to the presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist. ARCIC I affirms that "bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ,"<sup>6</sup> who through his minister presides at his table and "gives himself sacramentally in his paschal sacrifice."<sup>7</sup> In signs the Lord who is at the right hand of the Father offers the special gift of himself.<sup>8</sup> When met by faith this offering results in a life-giving encounter.<sup>9</sup> But independently of the individual's faith, Christ's eucharistic presence involves the gift of himself to the church.<sup>11</sup>

This is, in our judgment, an admirable confession of common faith by the members of ARCIC I; here we find an affirmation of a eucharistic presence of Jesus Christ that is said to be "true" and "real."<sup>12</sup> In the doctrinal disputes of the 16th century fidelity to the New Testament led the Roman Catholic Church to describe that presence as true, real and substantial.<sup>13</sup> What ARCIC I has professed in our day is consonant in substance with that faith.

### B. Change or Becoming in the Sacrament

For ARCIC I it is a matter of concern that the presence of Christ in the eucharist not be misinterpreted to the detriment of individuals and impoverishment of the church. Replying to the criticism that their "Agreed Statement Eucharistic Doctrine (hereafter: ASED) may express "a materialistic conception of Christ's presence,"<sup>14</sup> they indicate what kind of presence they are not affirming. When bread and wine are said to become the body and blood of Christ, this does not mean the glorified Lord is encountered *only* in the eucharistic elements and not as well in: 1) the preaching of his word, 2) the fellowship of his disciples gathered at his supper, and 3) "the heart of the believer."<sup>15</sup> The real presence is unique but does not imply the absence

of Christ everywhere else.

What is more, the "body and blood of Christ are given through the action of the Holy Spirit."<sup>16</sup> This involves a becoming on the part of the bread and wine but not a "material change" or one that "follows the physical laws of this world."<sup>17</sup>

The presence of Christ is said to be a sacramental one,<sup>18</sup> which is not the presence he had in his earthly life<sup>19</sup> and which is transcended by the presence he has at the right hand of the Father.<sup>20</sup> In this way "The Final Report" finds in the eucharist an utterly unique closeness of the Lord Jesus to his people. We acknowledge that the use of such an expression as "the sacramental body of the risen Lord (italics ours)"<sup>21</sup> may be puzzling for some. We regard the phrase and its equivalents as intended to assert a real, objective presence, but to do so in a way that will give no grounds for superstition and distortion of God's word. *Sacramental* would thus be opposed not to *real* or *true*, but to *materialistic*, understood in the sense the members of ARCIC I have given that term.

There is a variety of ways in which "The Final Report" describes the presence of Christ in the eucharist and the change in the elements which accompanies that presence. In both cases, however, we find the descriptions consonant in substance with the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. What is more we wish to give special praise to the statement that the *ultimate* change intended by God in the eucharist is not the transubstantiation of the elements, but the transformation of human beings into the likeness of Christ.<sup>22</sup>

### C. Criticisms of Treatment of Eucharistic Change

There are however two criticisms we wish to offer at this point. The first has to do with consistency. In a footnote, "The Final Report" says *transubstantiation* should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and of a mysterious and radical change that takes place, but not as explaining *how* the change takes place.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless ARCIC I goes on to explain that the change does *not* occur materialistically, does not occur according to the laws of our world, does not occur so as to result in the presence Jesus had for his contemporaries, and does come about by the action of the Holy Spirit.<sup>24</sup> The footnote in question makes too sharp a distinction between the *fact* of Christ's presence and the *how* of that presence. It may well be that the assertion of the fact of Christ's presence today as in the past makes it almost unavoidable to say something regarding the *how* of that presence. "The Final Report" seems to have done just that when describing the change of bread and wine by means of a reference to God and not in terms of the laws (or exceptions thereto) of physics and chemistry.

Second, the affirmation of Christ's presence by ARCIC I must be assessed in the ecumenical context in which Anglicans have sought to confess a common eucharistic faith

merely the conclusion of its initial phase

The Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Catholic co-sponsor of the dialogue, has asked episcopal conferences to respond to the "Final Report" by mid-1985. A similar process of official responses is also under way among the member churches of the Anglican Communion.

The critiques eventually will be taken up by a successor commission, ARCIC II, established in 1982 by Pope John Paul II and the primate of the Anglican Communion, Archbishop Robert Runcie of Canterbury. ARCIC II's mandate is to resolve remaining doctrinal questions from the ARCIC I agreements, to study all that hinders mutual recognition of the ministries of the two communions and to recommend practical steps to restore full communion.

When ARCIC I's "Final Report" was released in March 1982, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, prefect of the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, said the congregation views the report as "a significant step toward reconciliation" between the two churches, but does not believe it yet possible to state, as ARCIC I did, that a truly "substantial" agreement on doctrine has been reached. Ratzinger expressed his views in a letter to the Catholic co-chairman of the dialogue group, Bishop Alan Clark of East Anglia, Great Britain. His letter also said the congregation would send "detailed observations" on the "Final Report" to all bishops' conferences.

When subsequently released, the doctrinal congregation's report hailed the "Final Report" as "a singular event in the history of the relations between the two commu-



nians." Yet it also criticizes the report as either ambiguous or inadequate on a number of key points. While the report "does not yet constitute a substantial and explicit agreement on some essential elements of Catholic faith," it can be "a useful basis" for continuing the dialogue, which needs to be deepened and extended, the congregation said.

The text of Ratzinger's letter appeared in *Origins*, vol. 11, pp. 703f. The doctrinal congregation's observations appeared in the same volume, pp. 752ff.

The "Final Report" of ARCIC I included the texts of the commission's agreed statements on the eucharist (1971), ministry and ordination (1973), two statements on authority in the church (1976) and (1981), elucidations on the first three texts and several appendices. A major excerpt from the report, including the 1981 statement on authority, appeared in *Origins*, vol. 11, pp. 693ff.

For the texts of the earlier agreed statements included in the "Final Report," see in *Origins*:

—Statement on the Eucharist, vol. 1, pp. 486ff;

—Statement on Ministry and Ordination, vol. 3, pp. 401ff;

—Statement on Authority in the Church I, vol. 6, pp. 401ff.

Other related texts in *Origins* include:

—"Reflections on Christian Anthropology: A Context for Approaching Difficult Ecumenical Questions," statement by the U.S. Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue group, vol. 13, pp. 505ff;

—Joint Statement of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie (announcing establishment of ARCIC II), vol. 12, pp. 49f;

—Pope John Paul II's Address in Canterbury Cathedral, vol. 12, pp. 51ff;

—Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Donald Coggan of Canterbury (April 29, 1967), vol. 7, pp. 255f.

with Lutherans. In the "Pullach Report" of 1972, representatives of these two churches explicitly affirmed "the real presence of Christ in this sacrament." They then added, "In the eucharistic action (including consecration) and reception, the bread and wine, while remaining bread and wine, become the means whereby Christ is truly present and gives himself to the communicants."<sup>22</sup>

When it comes to God's action and its effect on the eucharistic elements of bread and wine, the assertions of ARCIC I should be compared with those of the "Pullach Report." Otherwise the allegation of inconsistency will discredit both.

We make this recommendation without implying that the text cited from the "Pullach Report" is a recognized or official expression of Anglican doctrine regarding the real presence of Christ or change in the eucharistic elements. We know that Anglicans and Lutherans have dealt with these same two subjects in other joint statements which deserve serious consideration.<sup>23</sup>

When it comes to a direct comparison of the descriptions of eucharistic change in the "Pullach Report" and that of ARCIC I, it may help to remember this. Not all statements that appear to be contradictory are so in fact. ARCIC II might be asked to determine whether the apparent contradiction in this instance is a real one. For our part we shall limit ourselves to tentative observations with regard to the "Pullach Report" and then comment further on relevant sections of "The Final Report."

The former notes obliquely that the bread and wine remain bread and wine. Perhaps the intent was to exclude some sort of magical change. This in turn might imply that by means of ordinary (or even sophisticated scientific) observation there is no difference in the state of the elements before and after their eucharistic consecration. Bread and wine would become heavenly food without ceasing to be earthly nourishment. This we could understand and affirm while wondering why the language employed might not have conveyed the meaning more clearly.

As far as "The Final Report" is concerned we are somewhat more confident about our interpretation of its intent. God's action in the eucharist is represented as bringing about a presence of Jesus Christ "through the action of the Holy Spirit, appropriating bread and wine so that they become the food of the new creation"<sup>24</sup> Earlier it had been put as follows: "By the transforming action of the Spirit of God, earthly bread and wine become the heavenly manna and the new wine."<sup>25</sup> The elements are clearly described as undergoing change; they do not remain the same. Independently of the faith of believer and therefore objectively, Christ's presence in the eucharist is a real gift of himself to the church. Clearly "The Final Report" maintains that in the eucharist the bread and wine become signs and not mere signs: since Christ's body and blood become really present and are really given." A change is thus posited — one

brought about by the Holy Spirit and linked with a presence of Christ that is, we note again, independent of the faith of the believer.

Previously (prior to the eucharistic celebration) the bread and wine were not so linked. Then they were not signs of Christ's real presence; that celebration makes them to be such and indeed to be more than mere signs because of the presence of the One they signify. At very least a radically new meaning is given to the elements as a result of their acquiring a life-giving function by God's action on them in the liturgy of the eucharist.

---

"We question whether apostolic succession has as yet found satisfactory treatment or agreement but do believe there is a new context which calls for discussion of this issue."

---

Is that acquisition of new meaning — like the real presence of Christ that accompanies it — a change in the elements that is objective and independent of the faith of the individual believer? We recommend that this question be submitted to ARCIC II. An affirmative answer would tell us this. The Roman Catholic Church has had recourse to ontological categories to describe the change in the eucharistic elements. "The Final Report" has done this by stressing the *meaning* rather than the *being* which is involved in that change. But it has done so in such a way that the becoming is no less profound, objective and real.

#### D. Eucharist as Sacrifice

We turn now to the sacrificial character of the eucharist. By recourse to *anamnesis* ARCIC I has sought to affirm that the eucharist can be called "a sacrifice in the sacramental sense"<sup>26</sup> without derogating from the uniqueness and unsurpassability of the historical sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The members of the commission note that in reaction to their ASED some "have doubted whether *anamnesis* sufficiently implies the reality indicated by traditional sacrificial language regarding the eucharist."<sup>27</sup> Even after the helpful elucidation they offered on this point we find that doubt still lingers in our own minds.

We applaud their introduction of memorial (*anamnesis*) and especially the following explanation they give to this term: "the making effective in the present of an event in the past."<sup>28</sup> We also understand how they can say this notion "has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist."<sup>29</sup> They are right in thinking this enables them "to affirm a strong conviction of sacramental realism and to reject mere symbolism."<sup>30</sup> All of this leads us to conclude that "The Final Report" acknowledges and gives good grounds for the sacramental character of the eucharist as memorial. The



significance of this common confession of faith should not be minimized. But does this strong attribution of sacramentality to the eucharist as memorial suffice to say what the Roman Catholic Church has meant by designating that effective memorial as a sacrifice? Not all sacraments have been so designated — even when as in baptism they have a clear reference to the present effects of God's reconciling action in the death and resurrection of Jesus. The eucharist is, says ARCIC I, "a sacrifice in the sacramental sense."<sup>1</sup> A good case has been made for the sacramental efficacy of the eucharist as memorial. But does *anamnesis* sufficiently imply the reality indicated by the church's use of *sacrifice* to designate the eucharist? Does ARCIC I itself point to more when it writes: "In the celebration of the memorial, Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people with himself in a sacramental way so that the church enters into the movement of his self-offering?"<sup>2</sup> We recommend that these questions be posed to ARCIC II. Answers are needed before we can responsibly say this source of past division need be one no longer.

For the same reason we recommend as well that ARCIC II be asked to examine the four official eucharistic canons of the Sacramentary approved by Pope Paul VI. If the members do so, we hope that special attention will be paid to the sacrificial imagery that is employed and to the prayers in each on behalf of the faithful departed. These canons express an understanding of the relation between Christ's sacrifice and that of the eucharist. Could the Anglican Communion — retaining its own rich heritage of piety and worship — enter into full communion with a sister church which might celebrate (and indeed feel bound to celebrate!) the eucharist in such a fashion? A variety of answers might be forthcoming. These answers would have to be considered seriously and prayerfully before asserting there is substantial agreement on this issue.

#### E. Eucharistic Devotion

As to the reception and reservation of the eucharist, we find ARCIC I indicating that "others find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable."<sup>3</sup> In context the *others* may include some members of the commission itself. Perhaps a fear that such adoration will depreciate the other presences of Christ (in his word when it is preached; in his disciples at his Supper; in the heart of the believer) underlies this position. If some Anglicans regard any adoration of the eucharist (and any reservation other than for those unable to participate in the liturgy) as dangerous for the reasons cited above, this is not automatically to say they see such adoration as idolatry. How would the Anglican Communion

officially view a church intent on reserving the eucharist as an extension of eucharistic worship — an extension also aimed at helping believers to be healed of the illness of sin and its effects as well as to grow in faith, hope and charity? Could the Anglican Communion remain faithful to the Gospel while not accounting such a eucharistic practice as either idolatrous or inevitably detrimental to the Christian life? We recommend that these questions be submitted to ARCIC II. Answers to them would have an importance in any overall judgment as to the adequacy of "The Final Report" to express Catholic faith regarding the eucharist.

#### III. Ministry and Ordination<sup>4</sup>

ARCIC I rightly judged that agreement on the nature of ministry is prior to a consideration of a mutual recognition of ministries.<sup>5</sup> It is also a fact (too well known to need more than mention) that among the historic difficulties between Anglicans and Roman Catholics that dealing with the ordained ministry (especially the office of priest) in relation to the doctrine of the eucharist as sacrifice has been among the foremost. In this context ARCIC I chose wisely in deciding to look to the New Testament as a hopeful basis of a common faith regarding the ordained ministry in the church. What is more, findings that result from an application of historical criticism to the New Testament witness were appropriately relied on when "The Final Report" listed traits that each of the two churches associates today with the offices of deacon, priest and bishop.<sup>6</sup>

We shall concentrate our attention on what is said of the ordained priest in relation to the eucharist. In particular we note the following:

"The statement (no. 13) explains that the ordained ministry is called priestly precisely because it has a particular sacramental relationship with Christ as high priest. At the eucharist Christ's people do what he commanded in memory of himself and Christ unites them sacramentally with himself in his self-offering. But in this action it is only the ordained minister who presides at the eucharist, in which, in the name of Christ and on behalf of his church, he recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper and invokes the Holy Spirit upon the gifts."<sup>7</sup>

We find this consonant in substance with the faith of the Roman Catholic Church regarding the role of the ordained minister in the eucharist. We think as well that the description of the ordained minister as acting in the name of Christ and on behalf of his church has implications with regard to the sacrificial character of the eucharist. We suggest that ARCIC II be asked to consider what those implications are.

The ordination of women in cer-

tain parts of the Anglican Communion is a fact of which ARCIC I took note. In so doing it expressed the conviction that where such ordinations do take place, "the bishops concerned believe that their action implies no departure from the traditional doctrine of the ordained ministry."<sup>8</sup> Indeed the members of the commission judge that agreement on the nature and origin of the ordained ministry is compatible with disagreement over the subject eligible for ordination. We suggest that ARCIC II be asked to consider whether this is too facile a separation of issues that are in fact more closely related theologically or even doctrinally. In so doing we are motivated at least in part by the realization that this issue is a focal point of considerable tension and pain in both churches.

ARCIC II has been given a mandate by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie. It must "study all that hinders the mutual recognition of the ministries of our communions" (cf. Joint Statement, Origins 12, June 10, 1982, p. 51). For this we are grateful. For its part "The Final Report" finds "agreement on the essentials of eucharistic faith with regard to the sacramental presence of Christ and the sacrificial dimension of the eucharist, and on the nature and purpose of priesthood, ordination and *apostolic succession* (italics ours)"<sup>9</sup>. This is said to provide a new context in which to discuss the validity of Anglican ordinations. We question whether apostolic succession has as yet found satisfactory treatment or agreement but do believe there is a new context which calls for discussion of this issue.

#### IV. Authority in the Church<sup>10</sup>

Given the divisive influence that the issue of church authority has had for centuries in the relations between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, what the members of ARCIC I have been able to affirm on this matter indicates notable progress. Mutual suspicion has been recognized as inimical to the discovery of the fact that both churches profess important truths in common even in this area.

It is altogether consonant with Catholic faith to find in divine providence the grounding for the primacy of Peter's successors in the church. We appreciate this approach of ARCIC I and encourage continued efforts on the part of ARCIC II along these lines.

God's plan, however, provides for events and institutions in varying ways. For Roman Catholic doctrine the association or linking of universal *episcopate* with the office of Peter's successors is not the result of a purely permissive providence.<sup>11</sup> It is rather something positively willed as a grace intended to benefit all Christ's lambs and sheep. Nor is that linkage a temporary



arrangement willed by God for a particular but limited period of the church's history. That *episcopate* exercised by Peter's successors will continue in God's providence as a ministry needed both to promote the unity of all Christians and to preserve the church in truth.

The concrete ways in which that universal ministry, which Roman Catholics recognize in the papacy, will be exercised in the future are by no means clear at this point. We are, however, convinced of this: For the goals it has been given in providence, the papal ministry and office will continue to need authority to carry out the risen Christ's commission to pasture his flock.

What ARCIC I has said of the primacy of the bishop of Rome (even as an ideal) comes closer to being consonant with Roman Catholic faith than might have been thought possible 25 years ago. To be sure, Catholic teaching acknowledges in the saving will of God a more positive and lasting foundation for the primacy of Peter's successors than the members of ARCIC I were able to affirm in common. This divergence is an item on the unfinished agenda that ought to be referred to ARCIC II.

So too, as items for further consideration, are the Lord's promises to preserve his church in truth. We are convinced these promises involve more than the assurance that no error will irretrievably overcome the truth. Those promises mean that at certain times the church may teach in a way that cannot, when measured by God's word, be erroneous. An assertion of the church's indefectibility in teaching the truth of salvation is consonant with Roman Catholic faith. Whether such indefectibility preserves in substance what is meant by the infallibility that results from Christ's promises is another matter. We hope that ARCIC II will give its attention to this question as well.

## V. Conclusion

We find the doctrine contained in "The Final Report" consonant in substance with Catholic faith when it comes to the Lord's real presence in the eucharist. The Roman Catholic Church

has reason to rejoice and be grateful for the efforts of ARCIC I, which have made such a conclusion possible and responsible.

An unfinished agenda precludes our saying at present that this doctrinal agreement in faith includes all that is essential for full communion between the two churches. We have suggested questions for ARCIC II which have to do with the eucharist, ordination and church authority.

We regard Pope Paul VI as one who will in due time be rightly recognized as a great prophet of reunion between the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches. ARCIC I has contributed greatly to making his prayerful wish a reality. Let no criticisms we have offered or questions we have raised detract from the praise we think "The Final Report" deserves.

Looking ahead to the future, we hope that ARCIC II will be asked to prepare its conclusions for a session of the Synod of Bishops with Anglican input and representation.

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> The date was Oct. 25, 1970. For the passage in context, cf. *Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations* (Washington: USCC, 1972) 42; AAS 62 (1970) 753.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 42-43.

<sup>3</sup> Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, Prot. No. 1169/82/b, March 17, 1982, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *The Final Report. Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission* (Washington: USCC, 1982) Introduction, 3, 5. References will be made first to sectional numbers of the text (when there are such) and then to the page or pages of this particular edition.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. co-chairmen's preface to "Ministry and Ordination" (1973) in "The Final Report," 29; Preface to the Final Report in "The Final Report," 2.

<sup>6</sup> Our reaction will be to both the Agreed Statement Eucharistic Doctrine (hereafter ASED) and the "Elucidation" (hereafter EED). The former appeared in 1971, the latter in 1979.

<sup>7</sup> ASED 10, 16, 6, 14.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 7, 15.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 8, 15.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 6, 14.

<sup>13</sup> Council of Trent, 13th Session: "Decree on the Eucharist": DS 1636-7, 1651.

<sup>14</sup> EED 6, 22.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 6, 21.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> ASED 7, 15.

<sup>21</sup> EED 6, 22.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> ASED 6, 14, footnote 2.

<sup>24</sup> EED 6, 21-22.

<sup>25</sup> "The Pullach Report" 68 in *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue-Report and Recommendations* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1981) 147. Italics ours.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. "On Eucharistic Presence" in *The Report of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue: Second Series 1976-80* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1981) 25-30; "Doctrinal Issues: Agreements and Convergences" in *Anglican-Lutheran Dialogue: The Report of the European Commission* (London: SPCK, 1983) 28, p. 12.

<sup>27</sup> EED 6, 21.

<sup>28</sup> ASED 11, 16.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 15.

<sup>30</sup> EED 5, 20.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 3, 18.

<sup>32</sup> ASED 5, 14.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> EED 5, 19.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 5, 20.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 24.

<sup>38</sup> Our reaction once again will be to both the statement "Ministry and Ordination" (1973 — henceforth MO) and the subsequent "Elucidation" (1979 — henceforth EMO).

<sup>39</sup> MO 17, 38.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 33-4. The Bible is shared heritage of the two churches; they are not at odds with regard to the use of historical criticism as an aid in the interpretation of the Scriptures.

<sup>41</sup> EMO 2, 41.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 3, 44.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 6, 44.

<sup>44</sup> In this final case as well our comments will refer to "Authority in the Church I" (1976) the later "Elucidation" (1981) and "Authority in the Church II" (1981).

<sup>45</sup> We introduce the notion of a purely permissive providence with the hope of clarifying Catholic teaching. We are not implying that "The Final Report" finds the source of the papacy in such a providence.

The committee wishes to express its gratitude for the help it has received from the National Association of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers and from the Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission, U.S.A.