

# Ecumenical Notes and Documentation

## RC Bishops' Conference of England and Wales: Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I\*

### A In General

#### I) BACKGROUND

1. In their Common Declaration at Canterbury Cathedral, 29 May 1982, Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury joined in 'thanking the members of the Commission for their dedication, scholarship and integrity in a long and demanding task undertaken for the love of Christ and for the unity of the Church'. In formulating this Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I, we, the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, wish to identify ourselves entirely with these sentiments. Members of the Commission who composed the Final Report were officially appointed for their theological competence and, coming from different countries, represented a wide variety of backgrounds and experience. After twelve years of work and prayer their integrity, dedication and, above all, the remarkable fruit of their dialogue must be fully acknowledged. Such respect for the work of ARCIC I is important for the process of consultation set in motion by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.

2. In responding to the questions addressed to us by Cardinal Willebrands in his letter of 17 March 1982, this Conference of Bishops is conscious that it does so in the light of considerable discussion and debate of these matters in England and Wales. Already in 1972 we were able to agree with our Theology Commission that 'the Windsor Agreement contains nothing contrary to the Catholic faith', and so commend the document to the Church in England and Wales for study and discussion. Now, after a number of meetings in which we have been able to study the Final Report as a whole and not merely as a series of separate, unrelated Statements, we respond to the request of Cardinal Willebrands 'to send a considered judgement on the work done, above all as to whether it is consonant in substance with the faith of the Catholic Church concerning the matters discussed' (Sections A and B) and express our views 'on the agenda for the next stage of this dialogue' (Section C).

3. In making this response we are conscious that as the Bishops of England and Wales we bear a special responsibility in this process of

\* The Response, available as a booklet from the Catholic Truth Society, 38/40 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PD, was approved by the Bishops at their Low Week meeting this Easter.

consultation which is taking place throughout the universal Church. We acknowledge that the people we serve belong to a 'privileged terrain of ecumenism' (Pope John Paul II, St Peter's Square, 10 June 1982). Our Response will have particular significance in the continuation of this dialogue between our two Communion, especially in this land in which the Anglican Communion finds its centre and where good relations between the Churches have become a matter of common experience. We commend the Final Report as a truly outstanding contribution to this dialogue, and we readily uphold the process undertaken by the Commission as an example of what can be achieved by joint study and of how these studies can be a practical basis for growth in unity.

4. At the outset we wish to state that we recognise in the final Report much that is an affirmation of our Catholic faith, especially in relation to the true nature of the Church. In our judgement as to how far these statements are in harmony with our faith, we will point out anything which we consider to be inadequate in its treatment or expression. However, we are fully committed to a resolution of these difficulties and offer our response as a contribution to this process.

## II) FUNDAMENTAL POINTS

### (a) 'Substantial Agreement'

5. The Final Report brings together documents published by ARCIC from 1971-1981. Fundamental to all the work of the Commission was the desire to reach a common understanding of central doctrines for which they used the term 'substantial agreement'. The Final Report claims that differing degrees of agreement have been achieved by the Commission. The measure of agreement claimed by ARCIC I in relation to the Eucharist and Ministry is that of 'substantial agreement' (Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 12; Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 17). In the matter of Authority in the Church, the documents claim to have achieved a consensus (Authority I, paragraph 24) and state that 'substantial agreement on these divisive issues is now possible' (Introduction, paragraph 2). These claims mean, according to the Final Report, that the documents represent not only an agreement reached between all the members of the Commission, but also an agreement 'on all essential matters where it (the Commission) considers that doctrine admits no divergence' (Elucidation 1979, paragraph 2). In coming to a judgement on these claims we wish to underline the importance of reading the Statements in the light of the Elucidations and of noting the sequence in which the documents were published in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings.

### (b) Methodology

6. Since Vatican II it is increasingly recognised that the truth of revelation can be expressed in a variety of ways. The substantial agreement achieved by ARCIC I has been possible because of the particular

methodology adopted by the Commission. This has been described as one of its most striking features. It was commended by Pope John Paul II when he said to the members of the Commission: 'Your method has been to go behind the habit of thought and expression born and nourished in enmity and controversy to scrutinise together the great common treasure, to clothe it in a language at once traditional and expressive of the insights of an age which no longer glorifies in strife but seeks to come together in listening to the quiet voice of the Spirit' (Pope John Paul II, Castelgandolfo, 4 September 1980).

7. We too welcome the emergence of this methodology. It is characterised by a joint endeavour to explore our 'common tradition', and achieves an understanding of the context in which concepts arose, how this coloured their meaning and what remains open to further development. It brings about a shared understanding of revelation as expressed in historically conditioned formulae. We commend this methodology, as entailing a serious attempt to develop patterns of thought and language which give profound and precise expression to our shared faith (cf. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, No 11).

8. There remains the delicate and difficult task of specifying the relationship between diverse theologies and the fundamental truths of faith to which Christians must be committed. We acknowledge 'a variety of theological approaches within both our Communion' (Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 12). These approaches need not be mutually exclusive in the expression of truth. Indeed, we perceive that, in our understanding of the Word of God, differing theological expressions often can be complementary. At the same time we are concerned to ensure that the relationship of authoritative formulae to the truths they seek to convey should not be weakened, despite the contingent element in all such formulae.

9. The methodology of the Commission has enabled it to claim a real convergence in doctrine. The Commission has presented this claim to the judgement of the two Churches. An open and continuing dialogue concerning matters of faith, such as the Commission itself conducted, will remain a vital part of the process of coming to this judgement. We pledge ourselves to the strengthening of the atmosphere of trust essential for such dialogue.

### (c) *Koinonia*

10. The introduction to the Final Report states clearly that the concept of *koinonia* is 'fundamental to all our statements' (Introduction, paragraph 4). In all its work the Commission has indeed demonstrated the richness and potential of this concept. In adopting it as central to an understanding of the Church, the Commission has emphasised 'that *koinonia* is grounded in the Word of God preached, believed, and obeyed' (Introduction, paragraph 8). We welcome this approach to the

ecclesiological question. We recognise its biblical roots and we point to the central role it plays in the Dogmatic Constitution of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*: 'This Church of Christ is truly present in all legitimate local congregations of the faithful which, united with their pastors, are themselves called Churches in the New Testament . . . In them the faithful are gathered together by the preaching of the gospel of Christ and the mystery of the Lord's Supper is celebrated, "that by the flesh and blood of the Lord's body the whole brotherhood may be joined together"' (*Lumen Gentium* 26). This is an appropriate context for consideration by the Commission of the vital questions covered by their Statements.

11. Emphasis on the local Church has greatly enriched our understanding of the mystery of the presence there of the Church of Christ. It gives rise to certain questions regarding universal primacy as a sign and source of unity in the universal *koinonia* which is the communion of communions. As is stated in the Introduction to the Final Report: 'Full visible communion between our two Churches cannot be achieved without mutual recognition of sacraments and ministry, together with the common acceptance of a universal primacy, at one with the episcopal college in the service of the *koinonia*' (Introduction, paragraph 9).

## B In Particular

12. In each section our Response is threefold.

- (a) We wish first of all to acknowledge and appreciate the ground on which the Commission builds up its statements. Though presented here in summary form, this foundation is extensive in its scope and provides a rich context in which to explore the more crucial areas of interest.
- (b) It is on these crucial areas that we then focus. Here, especially, we need to judge whether the substantial agreement claimed does in fact match the essential elements of our faith.
- (c) Under 'Further Considerations' we indicate points that need or could benefit from further elucidation or expansion.

### I) EUCHARIST

#### (a) Approach and Perspective

13. The starting point is God's reconciling act in Christ. Here the Church comes into being. 'Christ through the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist builds up the life of the Church, strengthens its fellowship and furthers its mission' (Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 3). The mystery of the Eucharist is seen at once to be Christocentric, ecclesial, eschatological, and missionary. The basis laid in the statement gives a very rich and dynamic view of the Eucharist and allows us to explore areas of past

controversy with a practical sense of the centrality of the Eucharist in the life of the Church.

#### (b) Critical Focus

14. *Eucharist as sacrifice* In this statement, the identity of Christ and his Church in offering sacrifice is secured both by the concept of *koinonia*: 'we are his members', and by the use of the notion of memorial (anamnesis) in its strong and traditional sense: 'his sacrifice recalled and proclaimed is made effective here and now'. This maintains the uniqueness, the once-for-all character, and absolute sufficiency of the historical sacrifice of Jesus and the presence of that unique sacrifice in a sacramental and mysterious manner in the eucharistic celebration (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 13). Thus 'we enter into the movement of Christ's self-offering' (Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 5), his self-giving to the Father and his fellow men. This is a true expression of catholic faith (cf No 17 infra).

15. *Real Presence* The statement clearly maintains the real and true presence of Christ. The substantial nature of the change of the bread and wine is clearly asserted by the repeated use of the word 'become' as in the statement that 'they become his body and blood', by reference to the transforming action of the Spirit, by use of the language of change in the footnote on transubstantiation, and by the careful description of the role of faith within the individual. In the light of this we accept the statement as an expression of Catholic faith in the real presence.

16. In a number of places the statements about sacrifice and real presence see the Church's celebration as an effective proclamation of God's mighty deeds in Christ. This is a further way in which Catholic faith is affirmed.

#### (c) Further Considerations

17. What needs to be said more forcibly is that the Eucharist is offered to the Father by the whole Christ, head and members, in the power of the Spirit. The present text, by concentrating on the Eucharist as gift to the Church, gives an emphasis that is too passive in tone.

18. In this treatment of the Eucharist there is also insufficient reference to the resurrection of Christ. Both in contemporary theology and in the Catholic tradition the resurrection is an important and enriching element in the understanding of the Eucharist. Reference to the resurrection as taking place 'once and for all in history' (Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 5) is inadequate both for the understanding of the Lord's pass-over to the Father and as a basis for appreciating the celebration of the Eucharist. In the Eucharist we assemble as the Body of Christ, the risen head, and worship through, with and in him. Reference to Calvary is secured by our present union with the risen Lord. The significance of memorial is strengthened by such considerations.

19. The question of reservation and adoration needs to be taken up again. We know that some Anglicans practise reservation. We know that others accord adoration to the sacrament within the celebration. But our unease at the lack of shared appreciation is intensified by the very negative statement, even after elucidations, that 'others still find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable' (Elucidation Eucharistic Doctrine, paragraph 8). The doctrinal implications of this position need to be examined closely. We say this because reservation for Catholics is a sign of Christ's abiding presence in the Church and a much loved focus of devotion.

20. This Elucidation goes some way in elaborating the footnote on transubstantiation. Many Catholics were unhappy about the relegation of this point to a footnote, because they felt it was only there that the explicit language of change was used. We do not insist on the language of transubstantiation nor advocate any one theological/philosophical attempt to explain it, but further examination of the notion, begun in this Elucidation, is important for the continuing dialogue between the two Churches.

## II) MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

### (a) Approach and Perspective

21. The historical method becomes more evident at this point. The study of the ordained ministry is rightly placed in the context of Christ's ministry, the source of all Christian ministry, and ministry in the total life of the Church. The Church of the apostolic age is seen to be a crucially important period of development, and the complexities of it are recognised. Nevertheless, it is possible to place there the origin and development of the ordained ministry and to see this as part of God's design revealed and put into effect by Christ. Christ is presented as the model of all ministry. Among his people there is a rich diversity of ministry which finds in him its source and inspiration and is intended to build up the Church as the 'community of reconciliation' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 4). We find in the early sections of the Statement a very good basis for a study of the ordained ministry which takes adequate account of the sources and puts positive content into the notion of Christian ministry.

### (b) Critical Focus

22. *Historical development of ordained ministry* That there has been 'episcopate' ('a focus of leadership and unity') in the Church from the beginning on the strength of a commission to the apostles seems as far as any Catholic needs to go in believing that 'the sacrament of orders was instituted by Christ'. The historical analysis (Ministry and Ordination, paragraphs 3-6) is brief but impressive. Any possible ambiguity in the phrase 'part of God's design for his people' is removed because that

design is explicitly linked to the revelation made by Jesus Christ and disclosed in the gift of the Spirit. Reference to God's design, therefore, includes those structures which are necessary for the Church's fidelity as the body of the risen Lord, among them the emergence of an ordained ministry. In view of that we believe the basis of Catholic faith is here secure.

23. *Ministerial Priesthood* Vatican II affirmed that 'though they differ essentially and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are none the less ordered one to another; each in its own proper way shares in the one priesthood of Christ' (*Lumen Gentium*, 10). This position is maintained in the Report where both the relationship and distinction are clearly established. Not only do Christian ministers 'share through baptism in the priesthood of the people of God, but they are – particularly in presiding at the Eucharist – representative of the whole Church in the fulfilment of its priestly vocation of self-offering to God as a living sacrifice. Nevertheless, their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 13). 'The word *priesthood* is used by way of analogy when it is applied to the people of God and to the ordained ministry. These are two distinct realities which relate, each in its own way, to the high priesthood of Christ, the unique priesthood of the new covenant, which is their source and model' (Elucidation Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 2). We welcome these very clear statements, as well as that which focuses so well the meaning of this ministerial priesthood when exercised in the celebration of Eucharist: 'the action of the presiding minister . . . is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 13).

24. *Sacramentality of Ordination* Here again we approve the position of the Report and have no reservations. The effect of ordination receives abundant testimony and we note especially: 'Not only is their vocation from Christ but their qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit (cf 2 Cor 3: 5-6) . . . This is expressed in ordination, when the Bishop prays to God to grant the gift of the Holy Spirit and lays hands on the candidate as the outward sign of the gifts bestowed . . . In this sacramental act, the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers . . . , the ministry of Christ is presented to them as a model for their own; and the Spirit seals those whom he has chosen and consecrated . . . the gifts and calling of God to the ministers are irrevocable. For this reason, ordination is unrepeatable in both our Churches' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraphs 14-15).

### (c) Further Considerations

25. On the question of the ordination of women, the Report explains

that it is concerned 'with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question of who can or cannot be ordained' (Elucidation Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 5). We do not believe the distinction is as clearcut as the Commission maintains and a problem remains that will have to be taken up. The ordination of women is a fact in the Anglican Communion and already it is regarded as a grave obstacle to the reconciliation of our Churches. For us in England the issue has been further sharpened by the process initiated in the General Synod of the Church of England.

26. In the Common Declaration signed by Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury in May 1982, ARCIC II is given the task of continuing the work already begun and 'to examine, especially in the light of our respective judgements on the Final Report, the outstanding doctrinal differences which still separate us, with a view towards their eventual resolution; to study all that hinders the mutual recognition of the ministries of our Communion; and to recommend what practical steps will be necessary when, on the basis of our unity of faith, we are able to proceed with the restoration of full communion'. The Final Report indicates that the question of Anglican orders is unresolved. 'We are fully aware of the issues raised by the judgement of the Roman Catholic Church on Anglican Orders. The development of the thinking in our two communions regarding the nature of the Church and of the ordained ministry has, we consider, put those issues in a new context' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 17). It is clear that this question must remain on the agenda for our two Churches. Going over the old historical ground may not be a very profitable exercise, but we need to explore the implications of this 'new context'. We must ask whether such an exploration could advance the judgement previously made and whether an agreed act of public convalidation or reconciliation could resolve the present situation. Centring the discussion there, with due discretion and sensitivity, will be a more helpful aim in this ongoing dialogue.

### III) AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH

#### (a) Approach and Perspective

27. One of the most outstanding achievements of the Commission is the progress made in tackling the question of authority in the Church, through patient and exacting dialogue. The framework for this understanding has been an appreciation of the dynamic nature of authority in the Church, based on the mandate of Jesus Christ to proclaim his Word. The work of the Holy Spirit is to maintain the Church in unity of faith and to lead it into an ever deeper appreciation of the truth. His presence is a gift to the whole Christian community.

28. Due emphasis is given to the unique role of the ordained ministries in the exercise of authority in the Church. This authority is 'a service of the Church, officially entrusted only to ordained ministers, intrinsic to

the Church's structure according to the mandate given by Christ and recognised by the community' (Authority I, paragraph 5). The role of the bishop in the exercise of this authority is clearly recognised by the Report, but care is taken to stress collaboration between all the ordained ministers who share in the mandate of Christ.

29. The historical approach adopted by the Commission to the development of episcopal authority in the Church continues the emphasis on *koinonia* as the keynote of ecclesiology. This approach does, however, underline some of the difficulties encountered. It is not easy to come to substantial agreement about the nature and exercise of jurisdiction when the record of past centuries includes periods of conflicts and hostilities. We admit the need to reflect constantly on the actual working of jurisdiction in our Church, while upholding its validity and true place. Similarly we wish to recognise the achievement of the Final Report in developing an understanding of the need for both Conciliar and Primatial authority in the elaboration of doctrine from the deposit of faith (Authority I, paragraphs 15, 16, 17), and in acknowledging some of the balances and tensions between them.

30. This historical approach to episcopal authority leads readily into the question of universal primacy, and gives a helpful framework in which to discuss it. We are pleased to note that the exercise of this authority is seen not only in relation to the episcopal college but also in relation to the faith of the whole Church (Authority I, paragraph 12 and Elucidation Authority, paragraph 8).

31. Similarly the question of apostolic succession of the episcopal college and primate is approached in a most encouraging manner, for it is a problem which might seem at first to be intractable. The ordination of a bishop is seen as an authentic expression of the significance of apostolic succession. Speaking of the presence of a number of ordaining bishops, the Final Report says 'because they are representatives of their churches in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles and are members of the episcopal college, their participation ensures the historical continuity of this church with the apostolic Church and of its bishop with the original apostolic ministry' (Ministry and Ordination, paragraph 16). The need in the Church for continuity of ministry and therefore of episcopal authority is clearly stated in these documents. Difficulties over agreement about the actual historical exercise of this authority, especially with regard to universal primacy, are approached in such a way as to hold real promise for the future.

#### (b) Critical Focus

32. *Universal Primacy* For us the treatment by the Commission of the role of the universal primate is one of crucial importance, given the history of our two Churches. Therefore, we welcome the statements: 'it seems appropriate that in any future union a universal primacy such as

has been described should be exercised by that see (Rome)' (Authority I, paragraph 23) and 'if any Petrine function and office are exercised in the living Church of which a universal primate is called to serve as a visible focus then it inheres in his office that he should have both a defined teaching responsibility and appropriate gifts of the Spirit to enable him to discharge it' (Authority in the Church II, paragraph 33).

33. We believe that although difficulties remain about the concrete expression of this universal primacy, and about the importance attributed to this role in the structure of the Church, the Final Report has provided the firm basis for future substantial agreement in understanding and practice.

34. *Infallibility* It is here that we have to speak of the possibility of substantial agreement rather than its achievement. The statements on Authority go a long way in their evaluation and acceptance of this doctrine. In their consideration of the universal primate, his office, ministry and teaching responsibility, and of 'appropriate gifts of the Spirit to enable him to discharge it' (Authority II, paragraph 32), they build up the positive groundwork. They recognise that there are times and issues when the Church has to make judgements that are decisive. When the Church commits herself to such judgements in fundamental matters of faith, she is guided by the Spirit and judgements are by the same Spirit protected from error (Authority I, paragraph 19). A universal council and the universal primate, presiding over the *koinonia* and speaking with authority, are both agencies through which the Church can so act (Authority II, paragraph 26). Questions that remain seem to relate more to the practical working out of this primacy. How does the universal primate speak out of the faith of the Church? How are the conditions that apply (Authority II, paragraph 29) to be verified? In what manner does reception of the doctrine complete the process of verification (cf *infra* No 36)? We are convinced that the Commission has come very close to agreement on the central issue and to the dispelling of the fears that exist. With regard to the former we would hope that agreement can be reached. With regard to the latter we would add that legitimate anxieties have been exaggerated by a history in which disagreement and division have undermined trust. The magisterium is exercised for the strengthening of faith and its infallible exercise brings a certitude that enables the faithful to adhere more serenely to that faith. There remains the task of clarifying and demonstrating still further the way in which the various instruments of authority in the Church can interact and complement one another without any of them being diminished.

35. *Jurisdiction* If the exercise of authority in the Church is assisted by the Spirit, it needs also to be effective, to be recognised and followed. Canon law speaks of the power of governance or jurisdiction. The Report deals with this in relation to episcopate and especially to the way

primatial jurisdiction relates to other levels of authority. Jurisdiction is defined as 'the authority or power (*potestas*) necessary for the exercise of an office'. Difficulty is envisaged in this matter, for it is acknowledged to be 'a source of anxiety to Anglicans' when the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome as universal primate is called universal, ordinary and immediate (Authority II, paragraph 16 and 18). The Report gives a fair explanation of jurisdiction and of the scope of the primate's pastoral office. By speaking of the moral limits that arise from the nature of the Church and of that office, it offers on the level of theory an appropriate answer to the anxieties expressed. The specific nature and corresponding functions of each office in the Church are the basis for determining the way in which the jurisdiction attached to each office is to be used for the building up of the Church. Special cases may call for intervention by the primate, but in general he will act in collegial association with his fellow bishops in seeking to serve both the unity and the catholicity of the universal church. Canon Law here speaks of the Roman Pontiff's power as one which 'reinforces and defends the proper, ordinary and immediate power which the Bishops have in the particular churches entrusted to their care' (Canon 333§1). This may not provide all the assurances Anglicans are looking for. We agree with the Report that 'the problem is not basically that of jurisdiction but of the complementary and harmonious working of these different forms of episcopate in the one body of Christ' (Elucidation Authority, paragraph 6).

36. *Reception* The Final Report presents the exercise of authority in the Church with due and balanced emphasis on the reception of teaching. The basis for this emphasis is a clear understanding that doctrinal definitions draw their authority both from the inner truth which they proclaim ('*id quod docetur*') and from the authority of the person or persons who proclaim them ('*a quo docetur*'). The response to these two aspects of authority is by faith and by obedience, and such reception of teaching is the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. In the Final Report the Commission has sought to express the essential complementarity of both elements in reception.

37. The Final Report also develops the role of reception in the definitive proclamation of teaching. It successfully avoids the extremes of either making reception the criterion of doctrinal truth, or excluding it totally from the conditions needed to be sure that teaching is in accordance with the truth. When the commission declares 'although it is not through reception by the people of God that a definition first acquires authority, the assent of the faithful is the ultimate indication that the Church's authoritative decision in a matter of faith has been truly preserved from error by the Holy Spirit' (Authority II, paragraph 25), we believe that its thinking is compatible with Catholic teaching.

38. Reception may indeed be the only grounds for complete assurance that all the conditions for the exercise of infallible magisterium have been

present. We would wish to add, however, that in the lived faith of the Church such reception may take some considerable time to emerge.

*(c) Further Considerations*

39. *Universal Primacy* While appreciating the quality of scriptural scholarship displayed by the Commission in its treatment of the Petrine texts (Authority II, paragraphs 2–9), we would question whether such an approach is capable of appreciating the full weight of meaning attributed to these texts by the lived tradition of the Catholic Church. We are convinced that doctrinal formulations emerge from such a lived tradition, and that when approached from within the tradition which has received that doctrine, the development of the teaching can be seen to be rooted in Scripture. The principle of development in our concept of tradition would allow us to claim more for the primacy in that tradition than the Final Report allows. We would wish to see more joint work devoted to this point.

40. We have already expressed our deep appreciation of this historical method as employed by the Commission in its discernment of the faith of the Church. At this point, however, we wish to register a doubt. In its appreciation of the position and role of a universal primate, the Final Report can be interpreted as giving insufficient weight to this primacy as intrinsic to the nature of the Church. The presence of an actual universal primate we believe to be of necessity to the Church and it is not clear that agreement has been reached on this point. While we share the ideal of universal primacy put forward by the Commission and their concern that the reality has not always measured up to this ideal (Authority I, paragraph 12), we are anxious lest this distinction be taken too far. We wish to stress the need for an actual and identifiable centre or expression of universality, and to state that a potential openness of the local Church to the universal is not an adequate safeguard of this vital aspect of our understanding of the Church.

41. *Reception* While accepting as sound all that the Commission says about the nature and role of the reception of teaching, we also wish to comment that, in our view, both Communion would benefit from a continuing dialogue on this point. The importance of the reception of teaching is not well understood in the Catholic community and on-going study would help to clarify the differences evident in the treatment of this theme.

42. *Marian Doctrine* Examples of the difficulties encountered between our two Churches in the exercise of teaching authority are dogmas concerning Mary. On reflection it is clear with regard to the content of teaching about Mary there is a large measure of agreement. We are encouraged by the clear and appropriate devotion given to Mary by many Anglicans. The divergence exists much more in the matter of how some teaching, especially the dogma of the Immaculate Concep-

tion, has been authoritatively defined (cf Authority II, paragraph 30). These and other matters need further consideration. We are confident that with an increase in our understanding of the nature of the primate's teaching function in the Church, as well as of the Christological content of Marian dogmas, this divergence could indeed be overcome.

## C Recommendations and Conclusions

### I) SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

#### *(a) Church and State*

43. It is difficult to comment briefly on the matter of Church/State relationships in so far as these affect the Anglican Communion. For the provinces of that Communion vary greatly in their relationships with the states in which they live. In England (only) the Church of England is established and the sovereign is its Supreme Governor. In countries of the Commonwealth which acknowledge the British Sovereign as their head, the Act of Settlement (establishing the Protestant Succession of the British Crown) remains in force and would need to be repealed. We note that these matters are being kept under review by the English Anglican/Roman Catholic Committee. Many leading members of the Church of England are aware of this 'hurtful anomaly'. Legislative action will be necessary before the state of communion between the two Churches is established. We recognise that these matters will have to be given serious consideration nearer the time of unity.

#### *(b) Importance of the Anglican Evangelical Voice*

44. We are glad to see that the doctrine of salvation, with particular reference to justification by faith, is central to the work of ARCIC II. In this future dialogue, it is important that the Anglican evangelical voice be heard to great effect. Similarly, priority needs to be given to the various ways in which we are called together by the Word of God. If the initiative, presence and guidance of the Word of God were so presented, not only would it help to overcome some evangelical hesitations, but it would also do full justice to one of the most profound emphases of Vatican II.

45. Further, a strong representation and consideration of Anglican evangelical concerns would secure a more welcome response from other Churches which share the evangelical tradition. Bilateral conversations must reach out in many ways to the total Christian community. The achievements of such conversations must be offered as a contribution to the wider ecumenical endeavour and be open to the particular contributions of other Christian Churches.

#### *(c) Partnership in Prayer and Action*

46. We wish to endorse, in particular, the spirit of the last sentence of the Final Report: 'We suggest that some difficulties will not be wholly

resolved until a practical initiative has been taken and our two Churches have lived together more visibly in one *koinonia*'. It is the widespread experience of many people in our countries that the work of ecumenism must be carried on at all levels and in all the dimensions of Church life. Doctrinal discussions alone are not sufficient. We urge all concerned with the work for Christian unity to press forward in a continuing dialogue of prayer, social action and study. For many this means joint action at local level. This is the essential foundation for the reception of the achievements of ARCIC I and for the eventual more formal expression of the growing sense of the unity which is taking place between our two Churches.

*(d) Conclusion*

47. The words and actions of Pope John Paul II in Canterbury in 1982 introduced a new dimension on the symbolic plane, which presents a challenge we must not fail. We wish to identify ourselves with the Common Declaration signed by him and the Archbishop of Canterbury. In particular we support their hopes and expectations for ARCIC II, and we accept their call to us all:

'While this necessary work of theological clarification continues, it must be accompanied by the zealous work and fervent prayer of Roman Catholics and Anglicans throughout the world as they seek to grow in mutual understanding, fraternal love and common witness to the Gospel. Once more, then, we call on the bishops, clergy and faithful people of both our Communion in every country, diocese and parish in which our faithful live side by side. We urge them all to pray for this work and to adopt every possible means of furthering it through their collaboration in deepening their allegiance to Christ and in witnessing to him before the world. Only by such collaboration and prayer can the memory of the past enmities be healed and our past antagonisms overcome.'