

**REPLY OF THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE OF CANADA
TO THE VATICAN RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT
OF THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In the continuing hope of that unity of the Church for which Christ prayed, the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada receives the response of the Vatican to *The Final Report* of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission.

2. We welcome the *Vatican Response* for what it is: a step on the journey toward the full, visible unity of the Roman Catholic and the Anglican communions. We share the commitment "to the restoration of visible unity and full ecclesial communion"¹ renewed by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie in their 1989 meeting in Rome, and renewed once again in the visit of Archbishop George Leonard Carey to Pope John Paul II in 1992, who agreed on the "urgent necessity of the theological dialogue, whose aim is to ensure agreement in the content of faith, although there may be diversity in its expression."² Together with them and with the whole of our sister communions, we are fellow pilgrims on the road toward unity. Together with them we say: "No pilgrim knows in advance all the steps along the path."³ But on this path, we find, with the *Vatican Response*, that *The Final Report* stands as a "significant milestone,"⁴ not a roadblock.

3. We are encouraged at the many areas of agreement that the *Vatican Response* notes, especially in the areas of eucharist, ministry, and the primacy of the bishop of Rome. We are sobered and even puzzled in other places: where we thought agreement had been reached, the *Vatican Response* finds need for further clarifications or even seems to overlook the amount of genuine agreement already in the ARCIC text, especially on reception and on the relation of Scripture and tradition. Finally, we are spurred to a deeper level of dialogue at points where the *Vatican Response* shows us that further work is necessary before

¹ John Paul II and Robert Runcie, "Common Declaration" (2 October 1989), *Origins* 19 (1989-90), p. 316.

² "A Meeting of the Pope and Canterbury's Archbishop [John Paul II and George Leonard Carey] 25 May 1992," *Origins* 22 (1992-93), p. 51.

³ John Paul II and Robert Runcie, "Common Declaration," p. 317.

⁴ *Vatican Response to "The Final Report" of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission* [as "Vatican Responds to ARCIC I Final Report"], *Origins* 21 (1991-92), 441-448. All page references to the *Vatican Response* are to this version; this first citation is to p. 441.

a substantial agreement can truly be reached, such as the exercise of authority by the papacy.

4. In our reply, we want to probe just a few areas in order to contribute to the ongoing discussion to overcome our divisions. We do so in response to the hope expressed that the *Vatican Response* "will serve as an impetus to further study in the same fraternal spirit that has characterized this dialogue in the past."⁵

⁵ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

II. GENERAL CONCERNS

A. A Significant Milestone

5. In the *Vatican Response*, the work of *The Final Report* is recognized as a "significant milestone," not only in relations between our two communions but "in the ecumenical movement as a whole."⁶ Recognizing "notable progress" in many areas of former disagreement, the *Vatican Response* emphasizes that such progress is an occasion for rejoicing and consolation.⁷ It lists a significant number of agreements on the eucharist, ministry, and authority. Even on some areas where agreement is not found, the *Vatican Response* sees "certain signs of convergence that do indeed open the way to further progress in the future."⁸ It offers its reflection in the hope that its "reply will contribute to the continued dialogue."⁹

B. Requests for Clarification

6. While areas of agreement are recognized and appreciated by the *Vatican Response*, at the same time further clarification is requested, even in these same areas. We asked ourselves as we read: what kind of clarification is requested?

7. While the 1982 *Observations* of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith more frequently cited "ambiguities," this *Vatican Response* more often calls for "clarifications." This shows the progress of the discussion. But what kind of clarifications would be suitable? A large number of Roman Catholic episcopal conferences, including the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, have responded to *The Final Report*. We had thought that, as they interpreted *The Final Report* in their responses, these bishops' conferences had actually provided some of the clarifications now sought by the *Vatican Response*. Furthermore, the published episcopal responses concluded that *The Final Report* had achieved a more substantial agreement than is acknowledged in the *Vatican Response*, and these episcopal responses did not ask for many clarifications. What part did these episcopal conference responses play in the preparation of the *Vatican Response*? We would ask a similar question about the part played by the *Emmaus Report*,¹⁰ a response of the provinces of the Anglican Communion to *The Final Report* presented in preparation for the 1988 Lambeth Conference. It would not be difficult to amplify further the kinds of insights in

⁶ *Vatican Response*, p. 441.

⁷ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

⁸ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

⁹ *Vatican Response*, p. 447.

¹⁰ Anglican Ecumenical Consultation, ed., *The Emmaus Report* (London: Church House, 1987).

these responses with the clarifications they can provide, using historical, liturgical, exegetical and theological reflections. If the nature of the clarifications sought by the Vatican could be specified, it would assist the work of ecumenical dialogue commissions and theologians requested to work on these matters.

C. Teaching and Practice

8. But perhaps the *Vatican Response* seeks another kind of clarification. Does the Vatican fear that the teaching in *The Final Report* is not always expressed in Anglican practice? This is a fear that some Anglicans also express: that assurances in *The Final Report* about Roman Catholic teaching are not consonant with certain practices in the Roman Catholic communion. If this is the kind of clarification sought by the Vatican, perhaps it is time to heed again the last words 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 the one *koinonia*."¹¹ Could such a practical initiative be taken in a new step on our journey so that our two communions could seek clarifications through a deeper practice of faith together as we prepare for fuller communion? This might be the best way to find the clarifications sought by the *Response*. In Canada, our two communions collaborate closely in areas such as pastoral care, seminary education, and social ministries. In addition, many Anglicans and Roman Catholics intermarry, with each spouse remaining faithful and active within their own communion. These many Canadian experiences of life together help to give us concrete knowledge of the practice as well as the theory of our ecumenical partners. They also help each communion see weaknesses in its own practice of the common faith.

D. Doctrinal Statements and the Faith of the Church

9. Another area that puzzled us was the search undertaken by the *Response* to judge "as to the identity of the various statements with the faith of the Church."¹² The original mandate of Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey in establishing the commission asked its work to be "founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions."¹³ In its preface, ARCIC claims to have followed this method. "From the beginning we were determined, in accordance with our mandate, and in the spirit of Philippians 3:13, 'forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead', to discover each other's faith as it is today and to appeal to history only for enlightenment, not as a way of perpetuating past

¹¹ Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II" (London: SPCK and Catholic Truth Society, 1982), #33, p. 98; henceforth *The Final Report*.

¹² *Vatican Response*, p. 447.

¹³ Paul VI and Michael Ramsey, "Common Declaration by Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury" (24 March 1966), reprinted in *The Final Report*, p. 118.

controversy," it claims.¹⁴ It sought "the avoidance of the emotive language of past polemics and ... the restatement of doctrine which new times and conditions are, as we both recognize, regularly calling for...."¹⁵

10. And yet many of the criticisms made by the Vatican, especially on questions related to authority, come from a comparison of *The Final Report* with traditions particular to the language and conceptual framework of Roman Catholic theology since the sixteenth century divisions. Do such criticisms constitute an exhortation to ecumenical workers to study more carefully the distinctive traditions of each communion since our division, in addition to the Gospels and the ancient common traditions that we share? If such additional sources are to be studied more carefully, still "for enlightenment, not as a way of perpetuating past controversy,"¹⁶ we urge also the study of "the new context"¹⁷ in which Vatican II and theology since then have set all of the topics studied. As ARCIC comments, "we are not dealing with positions destined to remain static."¹⁸ Can deeper study of the richness of each of our distinctive traditions since the sixteenth century be harvested for "straining forward to what lies ahead,"¹⁹ rather than for perpetuating controversy?

11. If dialogue partners study the period of their separated traditions in order to overcome division, they may also find a way to distinguish between the substantial agreement necessary for communion in faith and the plurality of theological opinions and expressions that always characterize the one Church. We share with the *Vatican Response* the conviction that ambiguity of expression must be overcome. But we recognize that the same faith can be expressed in a variety of ways without undermining the bond of faith. How can churches distinguish between ambiguity and the pluralism of expression that is part of the catholicity of the one Church of Christ? We suggest more attention be paid to establishing criteria by which to judge the distinction between these two.

12. In addition, words can express our faith with accuracy and depth, and practice can reflect the understanding these words express. But no words or practice can exhaust the mystery revealed to us in Jesus Christ, and Christians should not expect the words or practice of any one ecumenical partner to achieve an exhaustive clarity that is unavailable to the Church on earth.

¹⁴ *The Final Report*, "Preface," pp. 1-2.

¹⁵ *The Final Report*, "Preface," p. 2.

¹⁶ *The Final Report*, "Preface," pp. 1-2.

¹⁷ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination," #17, p. 38.

¹⁸ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II," #33, p. 98.

¹⁹ *The Final Report*, "Preface," p. 1.

E. The Urgency of Unity for Evangelization

13. Our churches feel keenly the urgency of the mandate of Christ for the unity of his Church "so that the world may believe..." (John 17:21). In Canada, the division of our two communions directly undermines the task of evangelization. Christians in Canada face many challenges from the secular sphere and many responsibilities in interreligious relationships. In many areas of Canada, there are insufficient numbers of ordained and lay ministers from one or both of our communions to serve congregations. The commission to evangelize in Christ's name impels us to find ways in which we can live our faith more deeply together and draw on the pluralism of expressions to proclaim the one faith of the Church.

III. EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

A. An Area of Notable Progress

14. We find the official response of the Roman Catholic Church on the Eucharistic Doctrine section of *The Final Report* generally positive. The *Vatican Response* acknowledges that "it is in respect of Eucharistic Doctrine that the members of the Commission were able to achieve the most notable progress toward a consensus."²⁰ The issues identified in the *Vatican Response* are not so much differences or disagreements as they are requests for clarification. The *Vatican Response* states:

It is clear, as already affirmed, that on questions of Eucharist and the Ordained Ministry, greater progress has been made. There are, however, certain statements and formulations in respect of these doctrines that would need greater clarification from the Catholic point of view.

With regard to the Eucharist, the faith of the Catholic Church would be even more clearly reflected in *The Final Report* if the following points were to be explicitly affirmed...²¹

Like the earlier 1982 "Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC" of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the *Vatican Response* deals with Eucharistic Doctrine under three headings: eucharistic sacrifice, the presence of Christ, and reservation of the sacrament.

B. Eucharistic Sacrifice

i. The role of the church and *anamnesis*

15. On the issue of eucharistic sacrifice, the authors of the *Vatican Response* request two affirmations which would more clearly reflect the Catholic faith. First,

-- that in the Eucharist, the church, doing what Christ commanded His Apostles to do at the Last Supper, makes present the sacrifice of Calvary. This would complete, without contradicting it, the statement made in *The Final Report*, affirming that the Eucharist does not repeat the sacrifice of Christ, nor add to it...²²

16. The request for an affirmation that the "church...makes present the sacrifice of Christ" comes as a surprise. Do not both churches already affirm that it is Christ through the Holy Spirit in the church, who "makes present the sacrifice of Calvary"? Since both

²⁰ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

²¹ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

²² *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

churches agree with this, neither would have difficulty in affirming the church's role in making present the sacrifice of Calvary.

17. The concern of making "present the sacrifice of Calvary" seems to have been met in ARCIC's use of the term *anamnesis*. *The Final Report* states:

The notion of *memorial* as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ -- i.e., the making effective in the present of an event in the past -- has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance, but the Church's effectual proclamation of God's mighty acts.²³

18. It is significant that the *Vatican Response* did not take issue with ARCIC's use of the term *anamnesis*. We recall that nine years earlier, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith expressed concern about the adequacy of the term in its "Observations". Though cognizant of ARCIC's use of the term *anamnesis* in understanding the eucharistic sacrifice, the *Observations* expressed concern about its sufficiency:

.... ARCIC has explained the reason for its use of the term *anamnesis* and has recognised as legitimate the specification of *anamnesis* as sacrifice, in reference to the tradition of the church and her liturgy. Nevertheless, insofar as this has been the object of controversy in the past, one cannot be satisfied with an explanation open to a reading which does not include an essential aspect of the mystery.²⁴

Since no such concerns are raised in the *Vatican Response*, we assume that its authors are now satisfied with the use of the word *anamnesis* as an explication of the mystery of the eucharistic sacrifice. If this is correct, it indicates a significant movement towards agreement.

ii. propitiation and the dead

19. Associated with the concept of *anamnesis* is the propitiatory nature of the eucharist. It is on this point that the *Vatican Response* requests a second affirmation:

the sacrifice of Christ is made present with all its effects, thus affirming the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased. For Catholics "the whole Church" must include the dead. The prayer for the dead is to be found in all the Canons of the Mass, and the propitiatory character of the Mass as the sacrifice of Christ that may be offered for the living and the dead, including a particular dead person, is part of the Catholic faith.²⁵

²³ *The Final Report*, "Eucharistic Doctrine" #5, p. 14.

²⁴ Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Observations on the ARCIC Final Report*, [Origins 11 (1981-82) 752-756], p. 753; henceforth *Observations*.

²⁵ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

20. The *Vatican Response* does not request propitiatory language, but rather an assertion confirming the propitiatory nature of the eucharist. This is a more positive attitude than that taken by the authors of *Observations* who virtually claim that the propitiatory nature of the eucharist is absent in *The Final Report*. The *Observations* stated that:

.... the propitiatory value that Catholic dogma attributes to the eucharist ... is not mentioned by ARCIC....²⁶

21. *The Final Report* states that through the Eucharist "the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective"²⁷.

22. The understanding of the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice has, and continues to have, a place in Anglican sacramental theology, though it is affirmed in different terms. Anglican members of the Canadian ARC dialogue recall the words of John Bramhall (1594-1663), the seventeenth century archbishop of Armagh:

We acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative Sacrifice or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of his Passion by way of real prayer; and, lastly, an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His Merits unto our souls. Let him that dare go one step further than we do; and say that it is a suppletory Sacrifice, to supply the defects of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Or else let them hold their peace and speak no more against us in this point of sacrifice for ever.²⁸

This classical seventeenth century statement continues to be cited by Anglicans.

23. By requesting an explicit affirmation of the propitiatory value of the eucharistic sacrifice for the *dead*, does the *Vatican Response* implicitly suggest that ARCIC has adequately dealt with the propitiatory nature of the eucharist for the *living*? We recall the assessment of the Canadian ARC Dialogue on this question in its evaluation of *The Final Report*:

Roman Catholic members have been satisfied that concerns they might once have described in propitiatory language have been adequately presented in other ways. The use of *anamnesis* is effective in showing how "the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective" (ED 5) and the Church continues to "entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf

²⁶ *Observations*, p. 754.

²⁷ *The Final Report*, "Eucharistic Doctrine" #5, p. 14.

²⁸ John Bramhall, from *A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England from the Criminous Schism* IX. 6, in P. E. More and F. L. Cross, editors, *Anglicanism* (London: SPCK, 1951), p. 496.

of the whole Church, participates in these benefits and enters into the movement of his self-offering" (Eucharistic Doctrine 5).²⁹

Surely when *The Final Report* speaks of the "whole church" it is synonymous with the "communion of saints", which includes the living as well as the dead.³⁰

24. The propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice "applied" to the dead is a new issue raised in the *Vatican Response* -- it is dealt with neither in *The Final Report* itself nor in *Observations*. Perhaps the intent of the *Vatican Response* on the point of the application for the deceased of the propitiatory sacrifice is to draw attention to a perception about the place prayer for the departed plays in Anglicanism. Since this question is not addressed in *The Final Report*, it may be of value to address it here.

25. The *Vatican Response* states that prayers for the dead "are to be found in all the canons of the Mass." Anglicanism is not opposed to intercessions, including petitions for the departed, in the eucharistic prayer. For instance, eucharistic prayer #6 in Canada's *The Book of Alternative Services* provides an opportunity for intercessions, including petitions for the departed.³¹ Intercessory petitions, however, are not a typical feature of Anglican eucharistic prayers; prayers of intercession in Anglican eucharistic rites are normally found in the general intercession ("prayers of the people"). The invariable intercession in the Canadian *The Book of Common Prayer* contains a petition for the departed.³² The prayers of the people in *The Book of Alternative Services* are to include petitions for the departed,³³

²⁹ "Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada's Response to ARCIC's *The Final Report*" (July, 1985), pp. 4-5.

³⁰ We recall a petition from the Prayer of Consecration in the Canadian Prayer Book eucharistic rite: "And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all *thy whole Church* may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion" [*The Book of Common Prayer (Canada)* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1962), p. 83 (emphasis ours)].

³¹ "Remember all who have died in the peace of Christ, and those whose faith is known to you alone; bring them into the place of eternal joy and light." Eucharistic Prayer # 6, *The Book of Alternative Services* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985), p. 210; henceforth *BAS*.

³² *The Book of Common Prayer (Canada)* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1962), p. 76: "We remember before thee, O lord, all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; and we bless thy holy Name for all who in life and death have glorified thee; beseeching thee to give us grace that rejoicing in their fellowship, we may follow their good examples, and *with them be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom*" (emphasis added).

³³ *BAS*, pp. 53, 70, 190, *et passim*.

and models are provided in the litanies.³⁴ While intercessions, including petitions for the departed, are not narrowly confined to the eucharistic prayer in Anglican liturgies, they are constitutive of the eucharistic rite as a whole.

Roman Catholic members of the Canadian ARC dialogue recall that in fact not all eucharistic prayers in the Roman rite contain prayers for the departed. The first ICEL editions of eucharistic prayers for Masses with Children and Masses of Reconciliation omit prayers for the departed in the canon. For example, both eucharistic prayer #3 of the Mass with Children and eucharistic prayer #2 for the Mass of Reconciliation lack such petitions.³⁵

26. Within Anglicanism there is some hesitation about praying for the dead. Many evangelical Anglicans, in particular, are apprehensive about intercession for the departed. Perhaps the authors of the *Vatican Response* are cognizant of this tension within the Anglican Communion.

27. We recognize, however, that since the Reformation prayer for the dead has been a continuous element of Anglican liturgical formularies, in particular *The Book of Common Prayer*. We note the following collect from the Burial Office of the Prayer Book of 1552:

Almightie God, with whom doe lyue the spirites of them that departe hence in the lord, and in whom the soules of them that be elected, after they be deliuered from the burden of the fleshe, be in ioye and felicitie: We geue thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliuer thys N. our brother out of the myseryes of this sinneful world: beseeching thee, that it maye please thee of they gracious goodnesse, shortely to accomplyssh the noubre of thyne electe, and to hasten thy kingdome, that we with this our brother, and al other departed in the true faith of thy holy name, maye haue our perfect consummacion and blisse, both in body and soule, in thy eternal and euerlasting glory. Amen.³⁶

Anglican burial liturgies since 1552 have retained this collect; many supplementary prayers for the departed have been added to the Burial Office. For instance, the Burial Office in *The Book of Common Prayer (Canada)* ends with the ancient petition common to both our traditions: "Rest eternal grant unto *him*, O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon *him*."³⁷

³⁴ For example, litany #1, *BAS*, p. 111: "For all who have died (especially...), let us pray to the Lord"; litany #18, *BAS*, p. 127: "We pray for those who have died in the peace of Christ, and for those whose faith is known to you alone, that they may have a place in your eternal kingdom."

³⁵ *Masses with Children, Masses of Reconciliation* (Ottawa: Canadian Catholic Conference, 1975), pp. 98-102; 109-113.

³⁶ "The Ordre for the Buriall of the Dead", *The Book of Common Prayer 1552*, in *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (London: Everyman, 1952), p. 427.

³⁷ *The Book of Common Prayer (Canada)* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1962), p. 601.

28. The *Vatican Response* requests the affirmation that the "sacrifice of Christ is made present with all its effects, thus affirming the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased. For Catholics 'the whole Church' must include the dead". We find the language of "application" curious, since the liturgical texts of neither of our traditions employ such terminology. We recognise that in the context of the eucharistic liturgy in general, and in the eucharistic prayer in particular, both our traditions pray for 'the whole Church'. Moreover, both Anglicans and Roman Catholics understand 'the whole Church' to include the living as well as the departed. When our churches pray liturgically for particular individual Christians, living or dead, such petition is always understood to be in the context of the Church.

C. Christ's Presence in the Eucharist

29. The *Vatican Response* acknowledges the affirmations in Eucharistic Doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. For example, they note: "the bread and wine 'become' the body and blood of Christ". Moreover, the *Response* maintains that these affirmations

.... can certainly be interpreted in conformity with Catholic faith. They are insufficient, however, to remove all ambiguity regarding the mode of the real presence which is due to a substantial change in the elements. The Catholic Church holds that Christ in the Eucharist makes himself present sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of his body and blood, soul and divinity.³⁸

The *Vatican Response* is wary about the adequacy of the affirmations in Eucharistic Doctrine to *remove all ambiguity* pertaining to the mode of Christ's presence. Yet in spite of the negative tone of this judgement, it is a more positive evaluation of the Eucharistic Doctrine section of *The Final Report* than that in the *Observations*.

30. Like the *Vatican Response*, the *Observations* cite instances in Eucharistic Doctrine where affirmations of the presence of Christ are consistent with Roman Catholic teaching. However, *Observations* list several instances where expressions of the real presence can be perceived with the understanding that after the Eucharistic Prayer the bread and wine "remain as such in their ontological substance even while becoming the sacramental mediation of the body and blood of Christ."³⁹ These affirmations, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith says, "do not seem to indicate adequately what the church understands by 'transubstantiation.'"⁴⁰ Yet the *Vatican Response* cites no such instances in *The Final Report* where affirmations of the presence of Christ are judged inadequate.

³⁸ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

³⁹ *Observations*, p. 754.

⁴⁰ *Observations*, p. 754.

31. The shift in language from "inadequacy" to "ambiguity" reveals a more positive appreciation of Eucharistic Doctrine on the part of the authors of the *Vatican Response*. Presumably the texts once cited by *Observations* as "inadequate"⁴¹ can now be understood to be merely "ambiguous". Moreover, the *Response* affirms that all of the ARCIC statements on the eucharistic presence of Christ "can certainly be interpreted in conformity with Catholic faith".

32. While the *Vatican Response* speaks of Christ's presence in terms of "substantiality" and "substantial change", unlike *The Final Report* it does not actually use the term "transubstantiation". We would find it helpful to know whether the authors of the *Vatican Response* agree with the understanding of transubstantiation offered in *The Final Report*:

The word *transubstantiation* is commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements. The term should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place. In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining *how* the change takes place.⁴²

33. It seems to us that like the *Observations*, the *Vatican Response* is anxious about the *mode* of Christ's presence, no doubt out of concern that his presence in the sacrament be clearly stated. But we think that affirmations of his presence are made unequivocally in *The Final Report*. We wonder why the authors of the *Vatican Response* seem to expect the members of ARCIC to say more about *how* Christ is present than the Fathers of the Council of Trent were able to say.⁴³ It is the reality of Christ's presence which is the primary matter of faith, not the precise mode of that presence.

⁴¹ E.g., "sacramental presence *through bread and wine*" (*Observations*' emphasis added); "his body and blood are given through the action of the Holy Spirit, *appropriating bread and wine* so that they become the food of the new creation" (*Observations*' emphasis); "the association of Christ's presence with the consecrated elements...." We note in passing the response of the Roman Catholic members of the Canadian ARC on the use of these examples: "It is true that if certain words are taken in isolation from the whole context (e.g. appropriating bread and wine, associating Christ's presence with the consecrated elements, etc.), they could be misunderstood. But after ARCIC's indication of its true belief in the presence of Christ at several places in *The Final Report*, such words cannot mean other but that central belief about the Eucharist that Christ is truly and really present in the elements". The Roman Catholic members of ARC Canada, "Canadian ARC: Remarks on the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's 'Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC', April 1983" *One in Christ* (20) 1984, p. 277.

⁴² *The Final Report*, "Eucharistic Doctrine" #6, note 2, p. 14.

⁴³ For Trent, Christ is at the right hand of the Father according to his natural mode of existence (*iuxta modum existendi naturalem*), and he is sacramentally present to us in his substance in a way we can scarcely express in words (*ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus*) [Denzinger-Schönmetzer, 1636].

D. Reservation of the Eucharist

34. Again, like the *Observations*, the *Vatican Response* expresses concern on the issue of the reservation of the eucharistic elements:

On the question of the reservation of the Eucharist, the statement that there are those who "find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable", creates concern from the Roman Catholic point of view. This section of Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidations seeks to allay any such doubts, but one remains with the conviction that this is an area in which real consensus between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is lacking.⁴⁴

35. In spite of the Elucidations on Eucharistic Doctrine, the *Vatican Response* is left with a "conviction" that there is a lack of consensus on this point. In the context in which the word "conviction" appears, it is clear that here the word has more to do with "opinion" and "supposition" than with "judgement". This is in marked contrast to the section on "Reservation and Adoration of the Eucharist" in *Observations*. The authors of *Observations* have interpreted Elucidation #9 on reservation as admitting not only a difference in practice, but also in "theological judgements" relating to it.⁴⁵ The *Vatican Response* does not mention "theological judgements" on the issue; rather, a concern is expressed and a supposition is voiced.

36. Moreover, the *Observations* contrasted the Tridentine statement on the adoration of the blessed sacrament to the "Black Rubric" of earlier editions of the *Book of Common Prayer*. In the *Vatican Response* there is no reference to either Trent or the "Black Rubric" on the matter. Is this a tacit recognition of the reality of Anglican attitudes towards the reserved sacrament?⁴⁶

We recall the statement within the Canadian ARC Dialogue evaluation of *The Final Report* on this point:

⁴⁴ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

⁴⁵ *Observations*, p. 754. Cf. *The Final Report*, "Eucharistic Doctrine", Elucidation 9: "That there can be a divergence in matters of practice and in *theological judgements* [emphasis ours] relating to them, without destroying a common eucharistic faith, illustrates what we mean by substantial agreement" (p. 24).

⁴⁶ The "Black Rubric" is a rubric found in the 1552 *The Book of Common Prayer* [hereafter *BCP*], which denied "any real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" in the eucharistic elements. It was inserted at the last moment, without Parliamentary authority. It lasted as long as the *BCP* of 1552: one year. Elizabeth I had it removed from the 1559 *BCP*. The 1662 *BCP* inserted a greatly modified version at the end of the Communion Office which merely denied the "Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood". In an amended form of the 1662 rubric, the Canadian *BCP* of 1959/62 adds: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner" (*BCP*, p. 92). Cf. the tenet of the catechism which teaches that the outward sign of the Lord's Supper is bread and wine, and the inward part, or thing signified, is the Body and Blood of Christ. (*BCP*, p. 551). The Black Rubric is not included in modern Anglican liturgical rites.

While the sacrament is reserved in our churches for distribution to the sick, each of our communions contains a range of different forms of eucharistic piety related to the reserved sacrament. In Canada, evangelical Anglicans and Eastern rite Catholic parishes do not regularly practice eucharistic devotion that focuses on the reserved sacrament, while some Anglo-Catholic and Western rite Roman Catholic parishes have sometimes made such devotional practices a valued part of their parish worship.⁴⁷

E. A Convergence

37. The *Vatican Response* is clear that until ARCIC is able to endorse or incorporate the requested clarifications, it will be difficult for the Roman Catholic Church to speak of "substantial agreement" between our two communions on Eucharistic Doctrine.

38. Nevertheless, the *Vatican Response*, at least with respect to Eucharistic Doctrine, already recognises and affirms a remarkable convergence. Rather than register objections, the *Response* merely invites "more explicit clarifications" which would reflect more clearly the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. While calling for greater clarifications, the *Vatican Response* positively affirms that the faith of the Catholic Church is reflected in the agreed statement on Eucharistic Doctrine.

39. The General Evaluation at the beginning of the *Vatican Response* states that the Explanatory Note, the lengthier section of the Response, is intended to give a "detailed summary of the areas where differences or ambiguities remain which seriously hinder the restoration of full communion in faith and in the sacramental life."⁴⁸ Where clarifications are not requested in the Explanatory Note, we must assume that there exists an implicit endorsement of *The Final Report's* treatment of eucharistic doctrine; in particular we note the use of the term *anamnesis* as a way of understanding the sacrificial and propitiatory nature of the eucharist. Considering the treatment of Eucharistic Doctrine in the *Final Report* as a whole, the Canadian ARC Dialogue finds no reason to consider our churches divided on this great sacrament so intimately linked with the unity of the Church.

⁴⁷ "Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada's Response to ARCIC's *The Final Report*" (July 1985), p. 6.

⁴⁸ *Vatican Response*, "General Evaluation," p. 443.

IV. MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

A. "Significant Consensus"

40. It is encouraging to read in the *Vatican Response* the areas of Ministry and Ordination in which 'significant consensus' has been achieved by ARCIC I in *The Final Report*. The *Vatican Response* details these areas as: the clear distinction between the priesthood of all the baptised and that of the ordained; the recognition that the ordained priesthood belongs "to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit"⁴⁹; the sacramental nature of ordination; the necessity of ordained ministry to the nature of the Church and the sacramental nature of the Church as a whole. The *Response* also positively affirms that "it is only the ordained minister who presides at the eucharist".⁵⁰ It should be noted however that Ministry and Ordination actually says, "Hence it is right that he who has oversight in the church and is the focus of its unity *should* preside at the celebration of the eucharist."⁵¹ The nuance represented by the actual text, while certainly indicating the expectation that only the priest presides may be the reason for some concern as expressed later in the *Response*.

The *Vatican Response* then proceeds to detail the areas where 'complete agreement' or even 'convergence' has eluded the Commission.

B. Ordination and Sacraments

41. The *Vatican Response* calls for a clearer articulation that "only a validly ordained priest can be the minister who, in the person of Christ, brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist."⁵² Throughout *The Final Report's* Ministry and Ordination sections, the responsibility for the sacraments is assigned to the ordained minister. The precise actions of the minister noted in the *Response* are not detailed in Ministry and Ordination statement but are noted in the "Elucidations" section following,

The Statement (par. 13) explains that the ordained ministry is called priestly principally 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.⁵³

⁴⁹ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

⁵⁰ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

⁵¹ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #12, p. 35 (emphasis added).

⁵² *Vatican Response*, 445.

⁵³ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", Elucidation #2, p. 41 (emphasis added).

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.⁵³

The *Elucidation* is clear that there is a special relationship between the priest and Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist.

42. Some confusion may be evident in the use of the word 'ministers' in The Final Report in as much as deacons are included in those who share in the oversight of the church. However, *The Final Report*, after detailing the responsibilities of the presbyter, including presiding at the eucharist and pronouncing absolution, also states, "Deacons, although *not so empowered* are associated with bishops and presbyters in the ministry of word and sacrament and assist in oversight."⁵⁴ A look at the practice of both communions would assist here in allaying fears, as neither Church allows any other than presbyters and bishops to preside at the eucharist. The preface to the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican Church of Canada affirms that the offices of deacon, priest and bishop

...were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority...according to the form hereafter following or has had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.⁵⁵

The 'form hereafter' designates the Bishop as the only lawful authority.

43. However, the concern may also lie in the desire for a clear articulation that the priest 'brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist' and thus 'offers sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ'. These actions are certainly implied in *The Final Report* when it states,

Because the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, the action of the presiding minister in reciting again the words of Christ at the last supper and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts is seen to stand *in a sacramental relation* to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice.⁵⁶

Further clarity about the exact nature of the concern for the authors of the *Response* would be helpful.

⁵³ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", Elucidation #2, p. 41 (emphasis added).

⁵⁴ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #9, p. 34 (emphasis added).

⁵⁵ *The Book of Common Prayer (Canada)* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre: 1962), p. 637.

⁵⁶ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #13, p. 35, (emphasis added).

C. The Institution of Orders

44. A second area of concern for the *Vatican Response* is the origin of orders, asking for a clear statement "that it was Christ himself who instituted the sacrament of orders"⁵⁷ and pointing specifically to the absence of any reference to the character of priestly ordination. We would want to affirm the wider context of priestly ministry which, in both our communions, points to the unity of Word and Sacrament, with the priest as presider at both.⁵⁸ As noted above, and affirmed by the *Response*, the priest stands 'in sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice'. Later in the same section of the *Report* this is reiterated,

There is in the eucharist a memorial (*anamnesis*) of the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ, who *through his minister* presides at the Lord's Supper and gives himself sacramentally.⁵⁹

Though the word 'character' is not used in *The Final Report* the reality of the indelible character of ordination is noted,

In this sacramental act (ordination), the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers, ...and the Spirit seals those whom he has chosen and consecrated ...so the gifts and calling of God to the ministers are irrevocable. For this reason, ordination is unrepeatable in both our churches.⁶⁰

45. This should be reassuring to the authors of the *Response*, as it does affirm the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the common priesthood of the baptised and is consistent with the positive affirmations made earlier by the *Response*. We wonder what additional clarifications are needed in the link between the priesthood of Christ and that of the ordained ministry.

46. The link between Christ and the institution of the sacrament of orders is implied in *The Final Report* when it states:

[j]ust as the original apostles did not choose themselves but were chosen and commissioned by Jesus, so those who are ordained are called by Christ in the Church and through the Church.⁶¹

⁵⁷ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

⁵⁸ Vatican Council II describes the ministry of the presbyter as originating in the gospel message and deriving its power and force from the sacrifice of Christ; hence, the priestly ministry finds expression in the ministry of word and sacrament (Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, nn. 2-5). Cf. "The part of the ministers in the celebration of the sacraments is one with their responsibility for ministry of the word" (*The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", # 11, p. 35).

⁵⁹ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination" #13, pp. 35-36 (emphasis added).

⁶⁰ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #15, p. 37.

⁶¹ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #14, p. 36.

The desire to see a clearly stated link between Christ and the institution of Orders echoes, by implication, the concern noted later in the *Response* regarding the historical-critical method. In the comments of this dialogue on the *Observations* by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith the Roman Catholic sub-committee notes:

[p]resent day Roman Catholic sacramental theology sees the institution of the sacraments in a different light than was possible at Trent. Institution of a sacrament by Christ does not necessarily imply a direct and explicit act in the course of the earthly life of Jesus by which he singled out certain words and actions and gave a mandate to his apostles to repeat these words and actions as a sacrament.⁶²

Also, the response of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops to *The Final Report* notes,

That the threefold pattern of ministry emerged only gradually,..., presents no more difficulty for the Catholic faith than does the similarly gradual formation of the New Testament canon itself.⁶³

47. *The Final Report* is clear, "we believe that the provision of a ministry of this kind is part of God's design for his people".⁶⁴ In addition, the *Report* speaks of ordination as an expression of the continuing apostolicity and catholicity of the whole church carrying on the commissioning of the apostles by Jesus Christ to those he calls in and through the Church. "Not only is their vocation from Christ but their qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit...".⁶⁵ Given the newer formulations of the nature of the dominical institution accepted in current Roman Catholic theology, which are in accord with *The Final Report* formulation, we wonder what language or formulation would be acceptable to the authors of the *Response*?

⁶² Canadian Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue, "Remarks on the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's 'Observations on The Final Report of ARCIC' (April 1983)" *One In Christ* 20 (1984), pp. 278-279. There are good grounds for holding that the Council of Trent itself did not teach that Jesus explicitly mandated the seven sacraments. When Trent says, for example, that the anointing of the sick was "instituted" by Christ truly and properly as a sacrament of the New Testament, this is understood as follows: it was "insinuated" in Mark [6:13], and "commended and promulgated" to the faithful through the Apostle and brother of the Lord, James [James 5:14-15] (Denzinger-Schönmetzer, 1695). The medieval understanding of "institution by Christ" "includes the development of sacramental life in the church after Easter, no difference of principle being seen between Christ's institution and the action of the Holy Spirit in the church. This way of expressing the matter is behind can. 1 of the Council of Trent's *Decree on the Sacraments* (Denzinger-Schönmetzer, 1601)" -- Karl Lehmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg, eds., *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era: Do They Still Divide?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 73.

⁶³ Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, "Response of the Canadian Catholic Bishops to *The Final Report* of ARCIC-I," *Ecumenism/OEcumenisme* (December 1987), p. 13.

⁶⁴ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #6, p. 32.

⁶⁵ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #14, p. 35.

D. The Ordination of Women

48. Certainly the greatest difficulty lying between our two communions in regard to Ministry and Ordination concerns the ordination of women. The *Vatican Response* notes the important differences in our communions concerning the subject of ordination and its link with the nature of the sacrament of orders. This may underlie the concern in the previous section noting the relation of the priesthood and its 'configuration with the priesthood of Christ'.

49. The thorough discussion of the eucharist in *The Final Report* emphasizes the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice and the work of the Holy Spirit in uniting people with Christ and his self-giving.

Because the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, the action of the presiding minister in reciting again the words of Christ at the last supper and distributing to the assembly the holy gifts is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice.⁶⁶

If the identification of the presider with Christ is the primary concern in the discussion of the ordination of women, we must ask, to what extent is the male gender of the presider a necessary condition for that sacramental relationship? Or to what degree does the institution of orders by Christ require the identity of present-day subjects with the original 'ordinands'?

50. The *Vatican Response* notes, "[d]ifferences in this connection must therefore affect agreement reached on Ministry and Ordination."⁶⁷ The experience of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue in Canada on this issue has shown that our agreement has not been undermined in this area while we continue our dialogue. Areas of further dialogue and study are indicated for the future including the interpretation of scripture and the place of tradition and culture. In the discussion by ARC-Canada of the experience of women's ministries it has been proposed that "the issue of women's ordination be approached as a disputed question about the enculturation of the Gospel"⁶⁸ as a way forward in our ongoing dialogue.

E. Apostolic Succession

51. The last area of concern noted by the *Response* is that of Apostolic Succession, an area of critical importance, as seen in its statement:

⁶⁶ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", #13, p. 35.

⁶⁷ *Vatican Response*, p. 446.

⁶⁸ Canadian Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue, "Reflections on the Experience of Women's Ministries," *Origins* 21:38 (February 27, 1992), p. 616.

This question, then, lies at the very heart of the ecumenical discussion and touches vitally all the themes dealt with by ARCIC I: the reality of the Eucharist, the sacramentality of the ministerial priesthood, the nature of the Roman primacy.⁶⁹

It is however difficult to determine the exact nature of the concern. As noted in *The Final Report* [Elucidation]:

"We both maintain that *episcopate* must be exercised by ministers ordained in the apostolic succession. Both our communions have retained and remain faithful to the threefold ministry centred on the episcopate as the form in which this *episcopate* is to be exercised."⁷⁰

There is nothing in *The Final Report* that contradicts *Lumen Gentium* (Vatican Council II's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church), n. 20. Our churches seek to heal our division, and as the *Final Report* anticipates, full communion with the Bishop of Rome will be a sign of its realization.

52. *The Final Report* and *Lumen Gentium* 20 each speaks of both the apostolic line of bishops in fidelity to the apostolic tradition and of the historical continuity with the same. The *Response* speaks of a 'causal' relationship between unbroken lines of episcopal succession' and 'apostolic teaching'. For example, is the concern a reflection of a deeper worry in recognising the apostolic teaching in a particular communion while unable to recognize an 'unbroken' line of succession? Or in being unable to recognize apostolic teaching because of a broken line of succession? If the latter, this would be a cause for deep concern in ecumenical discussion.

53. We are grateful for the positive appreciation by the *Response* of a number of areas in Ministry and Ordination, particularly in reference to the priesthood. However, some of the requests for clarification by the *Response* remain unclear in themselves and we would look for a more sharply articulated indication of the concerns expressed. Further work certainly remains, particularly concerning the ordination of women, and we look forward to ongoing dialogue in these areas.

⁶⁹ *Vatican Response*, p. 446.

⁷⁰ *The Final Report*, "Ministry and Ordination", Elucidation #4, p. 43.

V. AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH

A. Remarkable Progress

54. The *Vatican Response* judges that "quite remarkable progress. . .has been made in respect of authority in the church,"⁷¹ and it singles out *Authority in the Church II*, 24-27 as offering "a very positive presentation" of "the magisterial authority of the Church."⁷² "[D]espite considerable convergence," however, "full agreement on the nature and the significance of the Roman primacy has not been reached."⁷³

55. The *Response* begins its assessment of ARCIC's statement on authority by pointing out that the *Final Report* "makes no claim to substantial agreement" on the question of authority. "The most that has been achieved is a certain convergence, which is but a first step along the path that seeks consensus as a prelude to unity."⁷⁴ It is true that the *Final Report* does not claim full agreement on authority, but the *Response* overlooks the very clear claim by ARCIC that *Authority in the Church I*, 1-23 "amounts to a consensus on authority in the Church and, in particular, on the basic principles of primacy. This consensus is of fundamental importance."⁷⁵

B. Papal Infallibility and Reception

56. As an example of areas essential to Catholic doctrine on which complete agreement or even convergence is still lacking, the *Response* cites, as did the 1982 *Observations*, a statement by Anglican members of ARCIC:

In spite of our agreement over the need of a universal primacy in a united Church, Anglicans do not accept the guaranteed possession of such a gift of divine assistance in judgement necessarily attached to the office of the bishop of Rome by virtue of which his formal decisions can be known to be wholly assured before their reception by the faithful.⁷⁶

The *Response* seems to assume that what Anglicans are opposing here is what Roman Catholics actually believe. Some Roman Catholics may hold the view that Anglicans reject,

⁷¹ *Vatican Response*, p. 446.

⁷² *Vatican Response*, p. 444.

⁷³ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

⁷⁴ *Vatican Response*, p. 443.

⁷⁵ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", #24, p. 64.

⁷⁶ *Vatican Response*, p. 444, citing "Authority in the Church II", #31, pp. 96-97.

but Roman Catholic teaching does not oblige Catholics to make such an interpretation.⁷⁷ As ARC-Canada put it in 1985:

Do Roman Catholics really differ from Anglicans here? If Roman Catholics were proposed a definition for assent that did not seem to have explicit or implicit grounding in the Bible and seemed foreign to the faith they had been taught, would they not also have not just the right but the duty to make serious enquiries before considering receiving the definition?⁷⁸

57. The *Response* judges that the crucial section, "Authority in the Church" II, 24-27, is a "very positive presentation", and it welcomes the "clear statement" that reception of a defined truth by the People of God "does not create truth nor legitimize the decision."⁷⁹ It would seem, however, says the *Response*, that the *Final Report*:

sees the "assent of the faithful" as required for the recognition that a doctrinal decision of the Pope or of an Ecumenical Council is immune from error (A II, 27 and 31). For the Catholic Church, the certain knowledge of any defined truth is not guaranteed by the reception of the faithful that such is in conformity with Scripture and tradition, but by the authoritative definition itself on the part of the authentic teachers.⁸⁰

It seems to us that in the latter sentence the *Response* is opposing something that the *Final Report* is not affirming, the idea that reception by the faithful "guarantees ... the certain knowledge of defined truth." The *Final Report* does not see reception as a "guarantee," but as "the ultimate *indication* that the Church's authoritative decision ... has been truly preserved from error by the Holy Spirit."⁸¹

58. We are disappointed that the carefully nuanced expression of the *Final Report's* view of reception found in *Authority in the Church II*, 25 and the accompanying *Elucidation* is not directly addressed by the *Response*. The *Response's* own formulation, that "the certain knowledge of any defined truth is ... guaranteed ... by the authoritative definition itself on the part of the authentic teachers," seems, on the other hand, to leave no place for the

⁷⁷ Roman Catholic theologians today know that even the *ex sese* clause of Vatican I's definition of papal infallibility did not exclude all forms of reception. Vatican Council II makes this clear when it says in the *relatio* to *Lumen Gentium*, 25: The definitions of popes, the Body of Bishops, or of Councils which are preserved from error by the assistance of the Holy Spirit "are irreformable of themselves and do not require the approbation of the people...but carry with them and express the consensus of the whole community," *Schema Constitutionis DE ECCLESIA* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1964, p. 98, N, [e]).

⁷⁸ Reception of the *Final Report* of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission by the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada (Toronto, 1985), paragraph 75.

⁷⁹ *Vatican Response*, p. 444, citing "Authority in the Church I", *Elucidation* #3, pp. 71-72.

⁸⁰ *Vatican Response*, p. 444. We note that the text in *Origins* uses "tradition", whereas the text released in Rome (4 December 1991) has "Tradition."

⁸¹ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II," #25, p. 92 (emphasis added).

consensio ecclesiarum that is a "rule of faith even for papal definitions,"⁸² for the *assensus ecclesiae* which can never be lacking in doctrinal definitions, or for the *consensus totius communitatis* that is expressed in such definitions.⁸³

59. As ARCIC notes, Vatican I lays down "very rigorous conditions" for the exercise of papal infallibility.⁸⁴ For Roman Catholics, the judgment that the conditions have been fulfilled is decisive for the reception of a definition. We thus reaffirm what ARC-Canada stated in its Reception Statement of the *Final Report* in 1985: "The assent of the faithful is not necessary for the gift of divine assistance to be operative but for it to be recognized"⁸⁵.

C. Marian Dogmas

60. The *Response's* view that ARCIC "has not been able to record any real consensus on the Marian dogmas" overlooks the fact that ARCIC did not undertake to study the dogmas themselves, but looked at them more as an illustration of the exercise of papal teaching authority. We are pleased to note how much Anglicans and Roman Catholics have in common with regard to Mary, as is clear from the *Response's* own citation of *Authority in the Church*: "Catholics and Anglicans can agree in much that the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption are designed to affirm."⁸⁶ We think it is also noteworthy that both Anglicans and Roman Catholics observe festivals honouring Mary and recognize her place in the communion of saints, as well as in finding in Mary "a model of holiness, obedience and faith..."⁸⁷

61. ARCIC is well aware that many Anglicans still have problems with the Marian definitions. Part of the reason for this, as the *Response* points out, is that more study needs to be done on the Petrine ministry itself. We are pleased that ARCIC II is continuing to work on these matters. We join with the suggestion of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops that, in view of the important role the liturgy has played in enabling Catholics to

⁸² According to Bishop V. Gasser's official exposition of the meaning of the proposed dogma on papal infallibility at Vatican I: J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, ed. L. Petit and J.B. Martin, tome 52 (Paris, 1926) cols. 1213 ff.

⁸³ For the Vatican Council II reference to the latter two phrases, see footnote 58 (above).

⁸⁴ Cf. *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", #24c (p. 65) and "Authority in the Church II", #29 (pp. 94-95).

⁸⁵ Cf. footnote 78 (above), paragraph 56.

⁸⁶ Cf. *Vatican Response*, p. 444 and *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #30 (pp. 95-96). The Anglican members of ARC-Canada had already expressed their disappointment that the 1982 *Observations* were "perhaps unfair in failing to acknowledge the positive affirmations about Marian dogma which are present in" the *Final Report* in *One in Christ* 20 (1984) 268.

⁸⁷ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #30, p. 96.

develop a deep love for the Mother of God, attention to the richness of our different liturgical traditions might help Anglicans and Roman Catholics to move forward on a matter where full consensus does not yet exist.⁸⁸

D. The Petrine Ministry

62. The incomplete accord on the Marian dogmas, says the *Response*, "illustrates the need for much further study to be done in respect of the petrine ministry in the Church."⁸⁹ The *Response* finds examples which it believes "illustrate the reservations that still exist on the part of the Anglican community" concerning the Petrine ministry. One example is that "[m]uch Anglican objection has been directed against the manner of the exercise and particular claims of the Roman primacy rather than against universal primacy as such."⁹⁰ Devout and faithful Roman Catholics throughout the centuries, including canonized saints, have had and continue to have reservations about certain examples of the exercise of the Roman primacy that are judged to be harmful to the well-being of the Christian people. Roman Catholics likewise do not want to make exaggerated or otherwise misleading claims concerning the Roman primacy. While they are grateful for the primatial ministry of the Bishop of Rome, Roman Catholics know that it, too, is summoned by Christ to the continual reformation of which the Church always has need.⁹¹

63. Another example mentioned by the *Response* seems to us to be stating a simple question of fact, namely, that less than cordial relations between our two communions in the past "have not encouraged reflection by Anglicans on the positive significance of the Roman primacy...."⁹² Moreover, far from illustrating "reservations that still exist" on the part of Anglicans, the quotation actually refers to *affirmations* by Anglican theologians that "in changed circumstances, it might be possible for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to recognise the development of the Roman primacy as . . . an effect of the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the Church."⁹³

⁸⁸ "Response of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops to the ARCIC I *Final Report* of ARCIC I (1982), *Ecumenism/OEcumenisme* (1987) p. 19.

⁸⁹ *Vatican Response*, p. 444.

⁹⁰ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", Elucidation #8, p. 77.

⁹¹ Vatican Council II Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 6.

⁹² *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #13, p.87.

⁹³ *Vatican Response*, p. 444, citing *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church," II, 13.

E. The Scope of Doctrinal Definitions

64. The *Response* repeats an objection against *Authority in the Church* about the scope of doctrinal definitions by Councils that was already contained in the *Observations* of 1982. The objection seems to attribute to ARCIC a reductive understanding of the scope of doctrinal definitions -- that is, that they are "concerned with 'fundamental doctrines' or 'central truths of salvation'." In apparent opposition to this view, the *Response* notes:

The Catholic Church believes that the Councils or the Pope, even acting alone, are able to teach, if necessary in a definitive way, within the range of all truth revealed by God.⁹⁴

Setting aside the question of the Pope "acting alone,"⁹⁵ ARC-Canada does not see any real opposition here. ARCIC nowhere excludes what the *Response* affirms in the sentence just cited. In fact, the text of ARCIC, in places other than the one cited by the *Response*, clearly supports the *Response's* affirmation.⁹⁶ "Authority in the Church" recognizes not only the need "for a universal primate who, presiding over the *koinonia*, can speak with authority in the name of the Church" but also states that the purpose of this primatial ministry is:

to recall and emphasize some important truth; to expound the faith more lucidly; to expose error; to draw out implications not sufficiently recognized; and to show how Christian truth applies to contemporary issues.⁹⁷

F. Status of a Church Not In Full Communion With The See of Rome

65. We agree with the *Response* that, according to Vatican II, "a church outside of communion with the Roman Pontiff lacks more than just the visible manifestation of unity with the Church of Christ which subsists in the Roman Catholic Church."⁹⁸ ARCIC itself recognizes that the universal primate is not only the sign of the visible communion of the churches, but also "an instrument through which unity in diversity is realized."⁹⁹ For ARCIC, then, as well as for Vatican II, a church not in full communion with the universal

⁹⁴ *Vatican Response*, p. 444, citing *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", Elucidation #3 (p. 71).

⁹⁵ The danger of using such expressions was pointed out to Pope Paul VI by the Theological Commission during Vatican Council II; cf. Karl Rahner in, Herbert Vorgrimler, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), p. 202.

⁹⁶ Cf. *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", #9, 14-15, 18-19; "Authority in the Church II", #24, 26 and especially 27. See also the separate responses to the similar objection by the 1982 "Observations by the Anglican and Roman Catholic members of ARC-Canada" in *One in Christ* 20 (1984) 269 and 283-284.

⁹⁷ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #26-27, p. 93.

⁹⁸ *Vatican Response*, pp. 444-445, citing *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #12, pp. 86-87.

⁹⁹ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #11, p. 86.

primate, would lack not only a visible sign of universal Christian communion, but also a God-given means by which that communion is to be maintained.¹⁰⁰

G. The Foundation of the Universal Primacy By Jesus

66. In its strongest negation of anything the *Final Report* has to say on the question of authority, the *Response* states:

[I]t is not possible ... to accept the interpretation given in "Authority in the Church II" concerning the *ius divinum* of the First Vatican Council, namely that it "need not be taken to imply the universal primacy as a permanent institution was directly founded by Jesus during his life on earth" (n. 11). The Catholic Church sees rather in the primacy of the successors of Peter something positively intended by God and deriving from the will and institution of Jesus Christ.¹⁰¹

But this is not opposed to what the *Final Report* affirms. For the *Final Report*, the primacy is part of God's design for the universal communion.¹⁰² The sentence from *Authority in the Church II* that caused difficulty for the *Response* does not deny that it is from Jesus that the Petrine ministry derives. The ARCIC statement can be understood to mean that the special commission given to Peter was made only after the resurrection, a view supported by New Testament scholarship.¹⁰³

H. The Interpretation of Scripture in Relation to Tradition

67. In its final substantive critique concerning authority, the *Response* suggests that ARCIC "seems to ignore" the Catholic affirmation

¹⁰⁰ In the first sentence of the paragraph of the *Response*, p. 7 [*Origins*, p. 444], which we are discussing the authors of the *Response* have inadvertently omitted the word "full" when speaking about the incorporation of a Christian community "into Catholic communion through union with the See of Rome." For *Unitatis Redintegratio*, nn. 3-4, including the *Expensio Modorum*, it is clear that Christians, their Churches, and their ecclesial communities are already in a real, though perhaps imperfect communion with the Catholic Church as a result of their faith and baptism.

¹⁰¹ *Vatican Response*, p. 445.

¹⁰² *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", #24 (p. 65) and "Authority in the Church II", #15 (p. 88).

¹⁰³ For the question of the New Testament grounding of the Petrine ministry in the context of the *Final Report* see *One in Christ* 20 (1984) 279-280 and ARC-Canada's statement of reception of the *Final Report* (1985), nn. 52-58. For the specific question of Peter's role during the earthly ministry of Jesus and his later role in the post-resurrection Church, and for an answer which recognizes the unity of the earthly ministry of Jesus and that of the post-resurrection New Testament witness, see Raymond E. Brown, Karl P. Donfried and John Reumann, eds. *Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Minneapolis: Augsburg / New York: Paulist Press, 1973), pp. 157-168.

that the historical-critical method is not sufficient for the interpretation of Scripture. Such interpretation cannot be separated from the living tradition of the Church which receives the message of Scripture. The Final Report seems to ignore this when dealing with the interpretation of the Petrine texts of the New Testament, for it states that they "do not offer sufficient basis" on which to establish the primacy of the bishop of Rome.¹⁰⁴

We find this objection puzzling inasmuch as the *Final Report* acknowledges the insufficiency of the historical-critical method by saying that the New Testament texts by themselves, isolated from the later interpretation by the Church, are not sufficient to establish the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. One of the reasons Anglican members of ARCIC were able to accept the Roman primacy was their belief in the providential guidance of the Church by the Holy Spirit, which is another way of speaking about the living Tradition of the Church.¹⁰⁵ For "Authority in the Church," just as the *homoousion* of Nicaea is not found explicitly in the New Testament, but is a genuine development of it,¹⁰⁶ so, too, the development of the Petrine ministry of the Roman See is not grounded solely on history or solely upon explicit New Testament testimony, but also on "the providential action of the Holy Spirit."¹⁰⁷ We thus find in *The Final Report* a consensus rather than a disagreement on this important issue.

68. A second instance where the *Response* thinks the *Final Report* is deficient in its understanding of the interpretation of Scripture is the *Final Report's* statement that proposed definitions of faith need to be "manifestly a legitimate interpretation of biblical faith and in line with the orthodox tradition".¹⁰⁸ The *Response* does not make clear what is objectionable about the quoted phrase. Perhaps the problem lies with the term "manifestly". Definitions are surely unnecessary where there is no controversy about the meaning of a particular biblical teaching. To this extent the Scripture is not manifestly clear. For Roman Catholics as well as for Anglicans, however, doctrinal definitions must be grounded in the teaching of Scripture; to that extent there must be some clear, if only implicit, biblical basis for the definition. For both churches, as well, a doctrinal definition would be problematical if it were not "in line with orthodox tradition."

¹⁰⁴ *Vatican Response*, p. 446. We have already dealt with this difficulty in the statements mentioned in note 103 above.

¹⁰⁵ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #7-8 (p. 84).

¹⁰⁶ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church I", Elucidation #2 (p. 70).

¹⁰⁷ *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #8 (p. 84) and "Authority in the Church I", Elucidation #8 (p. 76).

¹⁰⁸ *Vatican Response*, p. 446, with reference to *The Final Report*, "Authority in the Church II", #29 (p. 95).

I. Further Study Needed

69. In view of ARCIC's own recognition that more study is required before full agreement is reached on the question of Authority in the Church, we are not surprised that the *Response* also calls for further study of some points. We are encouraged by the *Response's* appreciation of the fact that "quite remarkable progress" and "considerable convergence" have already been achieved on the question of authority. We think that some of the objections raised by the *Response* are based on a misreading of *Authority in the Church*, while others seem to result from a disregard for the range of legitimate theological opinion that exists within the Roman Catholic Church. We are confident that there is a deeper and broader area of agreement than the *Response* has recognized.

VI. CONCLUSION

70. In this reply, we have spoken of how encouraged we are by some parts of the *Vatican Response*. We have also spoken of how sobered or puzzled other parts have made us. We look forward to our continuing cooperation with ARCIC and to continuing dialogue with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity as well as the provinces of the Anglican Communion coordinated through the Anglican Consultative Council.

71. At their 1989 meeting, Archbishop Runcie and Pope John Paul II urged those who long for the unity of the Church "not to abandon either their hope or work for unity."¹⁰⁹ We pledge ourselves with willing hearts to collaborate in the work of further study in areas where it is necessary to achieve the goal of full communion. For our hope in the dialogue between our two communions we rely on the help of Jesus Christ whose prayer "that all might be one ... so that the world may believe..." (John 17:21) cannot fail.

THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE OF CANADA

Anglican Members

The Rt. Rev. John Baycroft, Bishop of Ottawa, Co-Chair

The Rev. Alyson Barnett-Cowan, Ecumenical Officer, The Anglican Church of Canada, Toronto

*The Rev. Canon Dr. Eugene R. Fairweather, Keble Professor of Divinity (*emeritus*), Trinity College, Toronto

The Rev. John Gibaut, Ecumenical Officer, Diocese of Toronto

The Rev. John Hill, Rector, St. Augustine of Canterbury Church, Toronto

The Rev. Dr. Patricia G. Kirkpatrick, Associate Professor of Old Testament Studies, McGill University, Montreal

The Rev. Linda Nicholls, Rector, Holy Trinity Church, Thornhill, Ontario

The Rev. Dr. Donald Thompson, Provost of Thornloe College, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario

Roman Catholic Members

Most Rev. Bernard Hubert, Bishop of Saint-Jean-Longueuil, Quebec, Co-Chair

Sr. Dr. Donna Geernaert, SC, Ecumenical Officer, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Ottawa

The Rev. Dr. Brian Clough, Judicial Vicar, Marriage Tribunal, Archdiocese of Toronto

Dr. Harry McSorley, Professor of Systematic Theology, Faculty of Theology, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto

Dr. Margaret O'Gara, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, Faculty of Theology, University of St. Michael's College, Toronto

The Rev. Dr. Thomas Ryan, CSP, Director, Canadian Centre for Ecumenism, Montreal

*The Rev. Dr. Jean-Marie Tillard, OP, Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Collège dominicain de philosophie et théologie, Ottawa

* *Non-voting on this topic*

Ottawa and Toronto,
Feast of Saints Peter and Paul,
29 June, 1993.

¹⁰⁹ John Paul II and Robert Runcie, "Common Declaration," *Origins* 19 (1989-1990), 317.