STUDY GUIDE

to The Final Report

The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has finished the task given to it by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Ramsey, with *The Final Report* (jointly published by the CTS and SPCK) is now being considered by Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Should the Report be generally accepted by both Churches, the way would be open for a new relationship between them as the next stage in the journey towards Christian unity.

A first contribution towards the evaluation of *The Final Report* has been circulated to Roman Catholic bishops' conferences by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and published by the CTS under the title 'Observations on *The Final Report*' (Reference Do351); this 'Study Guide' appears under the auspices of the committee set up in 1970 specifically to promote relations at a theological level in England between Anglicans and Roman Catholics: it is designed to assist clergy and laity to take the fullest possible part in the evaluation and reception of the work of our theologians.

ISBN 0 85183 511 2 (CTS)
ISBN 0 281 04035 4 (SPCK)

United Kingdom	50p
United States of America	$1.00
Australia	$1.50*

**recommended price*

CTS/SPCK

50p
Do542

ENGLISH ANGLICAN/ ROMAN CATHOLIC COMMITTEE

STUDY GUIDE

to
THE FINAL REPORT
of the
Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission

First published 1982 by the
Incorporated Catholic Truth Society
38-40 Eccleston Square
London SW1V 1PD
and
SPCK
Holy Trinity Church
Marylebone Road
London NW1 4DU

ISBN (CTS) 0 85183 511 2
ISBN (SPCK) 0 281 04035 4
AC

Printed by Tee & Whiten (The Lincoln's Inn Press Ltd.), Standard House, Bonhill Street, London EC2A 4DA

STUDY GUIDE TO THE FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

We are much in the debt of Canon Roger Greenacre and Canon Dennis Corbishley whose joint efforts have resulted in this Study Guide to *The Final Report* of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. That Report is a document whose importance to our Churches cannot be overestimated. Those who wish to study it will no doubt wish to take into account the reservations expressed, for example, by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the one hand and certain Anglican evangelicals on the other. However the authors of this Study Guide have focussed attention primarily on the text of *The Final Report* itself, for it is that which is before our Churches for decision. They have wisely taken the opportunity to provide the text and some discussion of the Common Declaration which the Pope and the Archbishop signed on that memorable Saturday in Canterbury.

As co-chairmen of the English Anglican/Roman Catholic Committee, we would warmly encourage the setting up of study groups at every level of church life to study *The Final Report,* for we believe that no Christians, however inadequate they may feel their understanding or contribution might be, should feel disqualified from taking some part in the work of theological 'reception' and 'evaluation' for which our church leaders are now calling. We should like to see groups of clergy, of theological students and seminarians, and of religious of both our Churches meeting together to discuss the Report, but it is more particularly for the needs of study groups drawn from the parishes that this Study Guide is designed. We seriously commend this booklet therefore to the clergy and laypeople of our parishes and ask that in every deanery and parish careful consideration should be given to the setting up of local study groups, ideally in consultation with the local Council of Churches. Our committee has a continuing responsibility for assessing the progress of Anglican / Roman Catholic relations in this country and we therefore look forward to hearing reports from such study groups on the lines indicated in *Suggestions for Group Leaders* at the end of this pamphlet.

† B. C. Butler
Bishop of Novabarbara

† John Chelmsford;

Bishop Butler is an auxiliary bishop in the Roman Catholic diocese of Westminster and the Anglican chairman is the Rt Rev. John Trillo, Bishop of Chelmsford.

1. THE UNITY WE HAVE

To a fanfare of trumpets the Archbishop of Canterbury and Pope John Paul II entered the West Door of Canterbury Cathedral on Saturday, 29th May, 1982, and proceeded up the aisle to the Nave Altar, where they knelt in silence before God. The Archbishop led the whole congregation in saying the Lord's Prayer. The Archbishop and the Pope rose and gave each other the sign of peace. The congregation burst into spontaneous applause.

Good relations between church members, whether between Pope and Archbishop or at the local level, are an essential foundation for ecumenical work, but they should not become a substitute for it. Where there is warm friendship, people are more ready to listen as well as to talk, and listening is vital for understanding. Where there are still real differences, friendship creates the best atmosphere for trying to resolve them.

But Christians have much more in common than friendship. This chapter is called 'The Unity We Have' because Christian unity really does exist already in part. Christians should always speak of praying and working for *full* unity. The work is that of building on solid foundations, not that of putting the first spade into the ground. Christians are united with one another because they are already united with Christ by their common faith and their common baptism.

Sixty years earlier, at the Lambeth Conference in 1920, the Bishops of the Anglican Communion had declared: 'We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body.'[1] More recently, the Second Vatican Council has taught that 'Baptism constitutes a sacramental bond linking all who have been reborn by means of it,' and that 'men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are brought into a certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church.'[2]

The service in Canterbury Cathedral continued with a celebration of Common Faith. The Canterbury Gospels were solemnly enthroned in the Chair of St Augustine and reverenced by Pope and Archbishop. There followed readings from the New Testament, which all Christian Churches share. Then there was a re-affirmation of baptismal vows, including a common recital of the Creed, led by the Pope, the Archbishop and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council.

That which Christians have in common far exceeds that on which they differ. This applies to all Christians. However there is a special

1. An Appeal to all Christian People, (The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920).
2. Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council, 1964 (CTS Do 351. nn. 22, 3).

degree of closeness between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. The second Vatican Council's Decree on Ecumenism speaks of the 'special place' of the Anglican Communion, words echoed by Pope Paul VI when he spoke of the Anglican Church as the Roman Catholic Church's 'ever beloved sister' at the 1970 canonization ceremony for the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales. Later, the Common Declaration by Pope Paul and Archbishop Donald Coggan of Canterbury in 1977 mentions 'our common Christian inheritance for many centuries with its living traditions of liturgy, theology, spirituality and mission' *(The Final Report,* p. 119).

The introduction to the *Final Report* focusses attention particularly on the Greek word *koinonia* (communion or fellowship). It draws out some of the senses in which this work is used in the New Testament (pp. 5-8). 'Union with God in Christ Jesus through the Spirit is the heart of Christian *koinonia.' Koinonia* signifies 'a relation between persons resulting from their participation in one and the same reality'. 'By the eucharist all the baptized are brought into communion with the source of *koinonia.'* Ministerial oversight *(episcopé)* 'exists only to serve *koinonia'*. Primacy is seen 'as a necessary link between all those exercising *episcopé* (oversight) within the *koinonia.* All ministers of the Gospel need to be in communion with one another, for the one Church is a communion of local churches.'

> Christ's will and prayer are that his disciples should be one. Those who have received the same word of God and have been baptized in the same Spirit cannot, without disobedience, acquiesce in a state of separation. Unity is of the essence of the Church, and since the Church is visible its unity also must be visible. 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.*
>
> *The Final Report,* p.8

Questions for Discussion

1. What are the relationships between churches in your locality? Are they based merely on warm human friendship, or do they go deeper?
2. Do you agree that our common baptism into Christ is the basis of the unity of all Christians? If so, what ought to be the consequences of this?
3. List the things that Anglicans and Roman Catholics have in common (noting which of them are shared by other Christians, and which are not).
4. 'Unity is of the essence of the Church, and since the Church is visible its unity also must be visible' *(The Final Report* p. 8). What

do you think a fully united Church would be like? Does it entail uniformity?

Prayers

The following form of the re-affirmation of baptismal vows, used in the Papal Visit to Canterbury Cathedral, may be used, either at the end of the first meeting of the group, or at a later stage.

Pope: Let us now together renew the promises made in our baptism, affirming our allegiance to Christ and our rejection of all that is evil.
Do you turn to Christ?

All: I turn to Christ.

Archbishop: Do you repent of your sins?

All: I repent of my sins.

Moderator: Do you renounce evil?

All: I renounce evil.

Archbishop: Let us now proclaim our faith in the words of the Apostles' Creed.
Do you believe and trust in God the Father, Who made the world?

All: I believe in God, the Father Almighty,
Creator of heaven and earth.

Pope: Do you believe and trust in His Son, Jesus Christ, Who redeemed mankind?

All: I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.
He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary.
He suffered under Pontius Pilate,
was crucified, died, and was buried.
He descended to the dead.
On the third day He rose again.
He ascended into Heaven,
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
He will come again to judge the living and the dead.

Moderator: Do you believe and trust in the Holy Spirit, Who gives life to the people of God?

All: I believe in the Holy Spirit,
the holy catholic Church,
the communion of saints,
the forgiveness of sins,
the resurrection of the body,
and the life everlasting. Amen.

Pope, Archbishop and Moderator: This is the faith of the Church.

All: This is our faith.
We believe and trust in one God,
Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Pope: Almighty and Eternal God,
You keep together those You have united.
Look kindly on all who follow Jesus Your Son.
We are all consecrated to You by our common baptism;
Make us one in the fullness of faith,
And keep us one in the fellowship of love;
Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE GIVING OF THE PEACE

Pope: The peace of the Lord be always with you.

All: And with your spirit.

All present are invited to greet their neighbours.

2. THE ROOTS OF OUR DIVISIONS

Have you ever had the feeling that your own most cherished convictions have become totally unrecognizable in other people's description of them? It may have happened to your religious convictions or to your views on politics or the bringing up of children, but whatever the subject the experience will have been similar. Why have they got you so wrong? Is it deliberate distortion and caricature, or is there some block which prevents them from hearing what you are really saying? Are they so far out of sympathy with what you stand for that they have become radically incapable of understanding it, let alone agreeing with it? You must have sat watching unhappily one of those hard-hitting television debates (on Northern Ireland, for example) in which the opponents never really *listen* to the other side: they are just waiting eagerly for their chance to get a word in, waiting too for some careless slip that will enable them to pounce and score an easy debating point.

The differences between our two Churches — indeed, between all the Churches — were forged, deepened and perpetuated in a spirit of *polemic.* They can only be healed in a spirit of *dialogue.*

Polemic

Polemic is an aggressive method of controversy which aims at winning points and at proving your own side right and your adversary

wrong. It calls for cleverness, quick wittedness, a sharp and even cruel tongue (or pen) and a familiarity with the art of the intellectual duel we call debate. It is the method which — with some notable but, alas, very few, exceptions — has characterized the exchanges on doctrinal subjects between Anglicans and Roman Catholics from the sixteenth century until (to fix a rather arbitrary date) the year 1958, when John XXIII (who was to summon the Second Vatican Council) became Pope. The physical violence we did to one another had ceased centuries before, but the verbal violence together with mutual distrust, fear, suspicion, ignorance and prejudice continued. Polemic can sometimes be conducted with courtesy; it may sometimes win converts from one side to the other: it can never bring the two sides together.

Dialogue

Dialogue is the opposite of polemic, both in spirit and method. It is sometimes accused of being soft and woolly, of seeking consensus at the expense of truth; but its true aim is to 'speak the truth in love' (Eph. 4. 15). Dialogue is a patient effort to get to the roots of our divisions and indeed to get behind them to the even deeper roots of our unity and so be able to heal and resolve our differences. It involves a rigorous spiritual discipline that calls for humility, penitence and prayer.

Mistakes, indeed sins against unity, have been committed on both sides, and both sides have exaggerated the differences and caricatured the views of the other side. So dialogue must begin with a real effort to listen to what our partner is trying to say, not to allow unfamiliar language to lead to misunderstanding but to put ourselves in one another's shoes by an effort of imaginative sympathy. Dialogue calls for patience, for respect for our partner, indeed for love; it also calls for the kind of radical revision of our former attitudes that will issue in practical decisions to remove barriers and effect changes that will make reconciliation possible. It is a method that really works, as the arduous labours of ARCIC surely prove. It discovers for example that some of our disagreements are no deeper than the language we use. Sometimes we have used different words but meant the same thing; sometimes the same word and meant different things. For example we have used the words 'transubstantiation' and 'real presence' as if they meant quite different things. Later on, we shall try to discover whether in fact they describe the same reality. We have also used a word like 'catholic' in different senses. Is there any way we can come to agree on its meaning?

Henry VIII and All That!

The break between the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England came in the sixteenth century, first under Henry VIII and then again under Elizabeth I.

Behind that break lay the earlier break-up (or *schism)* between the Churches of the Greek East and the Latin West, and it can be argued that this earlier split made the Reformation inevitable. By the sixteenth century, tensions and frustrations within Western Christianity had built up to such a degree that the flaming brand of Martin Luther's historic protest, thrown into straw as dry as tinder, could only cause a major conflagration. In England the shape of the conflict was modified by a number of features of a largely political character. If the major doctrinal issues however were substantially the same, Anglican answers were by no means always identical with those given by the Lutherans or the Calvinists. Hence, when ARCIC began its work in 1969 it had to deal with three principal doctrinal questions, seen as constituting the main obstacle to full communion between our two Churches. Those questions we shall be looking at in the following four chapters; they are:

i) *Eucharistic Doctrine* (the subject of the Agreed Statement from Windsor in 1971),
ii) *Ministry and Ordination* (the subject of the Agreed Statement from Canterbury in 1973),
iii) *Authority in the Church* (the subject of Agreed Statements from Venice in 1976 and Windsor in 1981).

At the end of twelve years the Commission believes it has been able to reach the goal of substantial agreement. That is in itself a great achievement. By this is meant not only genuine and whole-hearted agreement but 'the consensus of the Commission on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence' (Elucidation 2, page 17). This agreement is at the level of faith and by no means excludes 'a variety of theological approaches within both our communions' *(Eucharistic Doctrine* 12, page 16. cf. Elucidation 9, page 24). Such a substantial agreement is claimed to be complete on the questions of the Eucharist and the Ministry; with regard to Authority, where not all the important differences have yet been fully resolved, the Commission can still affirm that it is convinced that substantial agreement 'is now possible' (Introduction 2, page 5).

This achievement is impressive, but in the long run it can have no positive result unless not only the respective authorities but all the members of the two Churches concerned can travel the same road themselves and find at the end that they share one and the same faith and can thank God for it.

Questions for Discussion

1. Do we agree that the ecumenical quest is fundamentally spiritual, and calls for an examination of our motives and presuppositions? Have we grasped the essential difference between polemic and dialogue?

2. With regard to the *past,* do we still feel some degree of bitterness and resentment against each other because of the terrible injuries we inflicted on each other during the persecutions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries?

   It might help us here to apply to our situation in this country these words from the 1979 Joint Declaration of Pope John Paul II and Dimitrios I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople:

   > The dialogue of charity has opened up the way to better understanding of our mutual theological positions and . . . a new attitude with regard to the common past of our Churches. This purification of the collective memory of our Churches is an important fruit of the dialogue of charity and an indispensable condition of future progress.

3. With regard to the *present,* do we still misunderstand each other's traditions? It might be useful here to try an experiment: let an Anglican describe what Roman Catholics believe, and a Roman Catholic describe what Anglicans believe — and then discover to what extent both have got it wrong.
4. With regard to the *future,* are we prepared to stress the full positive reality of Christian hope, remembering the quotation from St Paul which Pope Paul VI and Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, cited in their Common Declaration of 24th March, 1966?

   > Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ. (Phil. 3. 13-14).

Prayer

Heavenly Father,
you have called us
in the Body of your Son Jesus Christ
to continue his work of reconciliation
and reveal you to mankind.
Forgive us the sins which tear us apart;
give us the courage to overcome our fears
and to seek that unity
which is your gift and your will;
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

3. EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

'Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread' (1 Cor. 10. 17). In these words of St Paul we find cause for thanksgiving and cause for sorrow; thanksgiving, since it is through the eucharist that our baptismal unity with our Lord and one another in the one Body of Christ is constantly renewed and strengthened, and sorrow (and shame), since it is precisely in our separate celebrations of the sacrament of unity that our disunity is experienced most painfully. We should not be surprised that ARCIC began its task with a consideration of the eucharist. In the first place it was acknowledging that 'controversy between our two communions has centred on the eucharist, on the meaning and function of the ordained ministry, and on the nature and exercise of authority in the Church' (Introduction 2, p 5). In the second place it was recognizing that for many Christians today no issue has become more urgent than 'the question of accepting some measure of sacramental intercommunion' and that a prior condition for this must be 'a true sharing of faith' in the eucharistic mystery (Malta Report 18 and 19, p. 114).

The first of the Agreed Statements, the so-called Windsor Agreement of 1971 on *Eucharistic Doctrine,* reminds us that 'an important stage in progress towards organic unity is a substantial consensus on the purpose and meaning of the eucharist' (section 1, page 12). It was such a consensus — 'substantial agreement on the doctrine of the eucharist' — that ARCIC believed it had reached in this Statement. Now it is for Roman Catholics and Anglicans throughout the world to examine that claim and confirm that agreement, if they find it to be justified.

The Mystery of the Eucharist

Concentrating exclusively on the two aspects of eucharistic doctrine which have aroused controversy makes eventual agreement more unlikely; it also distorts and narrows our understanding of the wholeness and richness of the eucharistic mystery. So sections 3 and 4 of the Statement invite us to contemplate 'the mystery of the Eucharist', for it is important that we should approach the eucharist as a mystery to be apprehended by faith rather than an intellectual problem to be argued over and defined in terms of logical propositions. The understanding of the eucharist which has developed in recent years within both our traditions accounts for a number of emphases which may be new or unfamiliar.

One example is the insistence on the truth that 'the identity of the church as the Body of Christ is both expressed and effectively proclaimed' in the eucharist. This is emphasised by the way in which

the eucharist is now celebrated in our two traditions.

Another example is the stress on the forward looking, anticipatory, 'eschatological' character of the eucharist. In it we not only look back to what Christ has done in the past and greet him present among us now, but look forward to his coming again. In this reminder that the fullness of Christ's Kingdom lies still in the future we find the urgency of our commitment to 'the mission of the Church in the world'.

The much misunderstood word *Mass* comes from the final bidding of the Latin rite, *Ite, missa est* (Go, it is the dismissal). The modern liturgies of both our Churches end with this strong sense of being sent out in mission.

The Eucharist and the Sacrifice of Christ

In the bitter quarrels of the sixteenth century one of the issues that divided Catholics and Protestants most sharply was the sacrifice of the mass. So Anglicans came to see Archbishop Cranmer's sonorous and emphatic language in the Prayer Book Communion Service:—

> Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world. . . .

as a direct challenge to Roman Catholic doctrine which, in asserting the sacrificial character of the eucharist and in identifying the sacrifice offered there with the sacrifice of the Cross, must — so it was thought — be asserting both that Calvary by itself was not sufficient to redeem us and that the original sacrifice had somehow to be repeated or added to in every mass. Roman Catholics for their part considered that the Anglican Communion Service had been reduced to a mere subjective remembering of an absent Christ and of his sacrifice upon the Cross.

The Final Report suggests that our original understanding of each other's positions was seriously mistaken and that neither side has always been able to find the happiest language to describe the nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the eucharist. This section begins with the clearest affirmation — in language which echoes Cranmer's — of the unrepeatable nature of the 'one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice' accomplished by Christ upon the Cross. It goes on to find a way forward to real agreement in the very strong, full and positive character of the word *memorial* (in Greek *anamnesis*) in its biblical usage. It means neither repetition nor mere calling to mind but 'the making effective in the present of an event in the past'. It is only in the light of this richer understanding of the idea of memorial that we can see how the memorial of a sacrifice can itself be described as a sacrifice (Elucidation 5, p. 20). The effective sacramental presence of Christ's unrepeatable sacrifice allows us to be united with it and so to 'enter into the movement of his self offering' (Section 5, p 14, and

Elucidation 5, p 20).

Christ's Presence in the Eucharist

In the past there was a tendency to define the difference between Roman Catholics and Anglicans over the nature of Christ's presence in the eucharist in one or other of the following ways. Some Anglicans believed that their Church taught that Christ was truly present in the celebration but that this presence was not to be identified, as in Roman Catholic teaching, with an objective change of the elements of bread and wine.

Other Anglicans were convinced that their Church indeed taught that such a change takes place in the eucharist but that this belief in the 'real presence' was very different from the doctrine of transubstantiation which, so they believed, defined a particular explanation of the method of this change in terms which required the prior acceptance of a particular philosophy.

We have not only misinterpreted each other's teaching: we have often misunderstood the teaching of our own Church. Roman Catholics have not always realised that transubstantiation excludes a grossly physical understanding of the real presence, or Anglicans that their formularies insist that the Body and Blood of Christ 'are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' (Prayer Book Catechism).

ARCIC's way forward through this historic battlefield is to affirm very clearly the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the consecrated bread and wine, but to set this equally clearly in the context of the ultimate purpose of the eucharistic gift, which is the encounter of the crucified and risen Christ with his people, and of the need for faith — for eating and drinking in faith — to effect this lifegiving encounter in which Christ transmits his life to his people. So it is that we have in the eucharist no longer just a presence *for* the believer, but also a presence *with* him. Again, though it is made clear that Christ is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration and that his presence is not limited to the consecrated elements, it is made equally clear that bread and wine *become* the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ (Elucidation 6, p 21), though the footnote on page 14 disclaims any intention on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to define *how* this change takes place.

Finally, we should note the very strong emphasis on the action and power of the Holy Spirit in making Christ present for us and with us in this mystery. It is surely a bond of unity that so many of the new eucharistic prayers in both our rites use very similar language to ask the Father to grant that by the power of the Holy Spirit the gifts of bread and wine 'may be to us' or 'become for us' the Body and Blood of Christ.

Questions for Discussion

1. Would you agree that a closer approach to a 'common faith' in the eucharist must involve some degree of liturgical sharing — studying each other's liturgies and indeed attending them? What is the place of the eucharist in the life of our communities? Is it central or marginal? Do we agree about the value of frequent communion?
2. What are the remaining difficulties?

   a) Is language a problem? It is interesting to note that though the term 'eucharist' is becoming widely accepted, especially in an ecumenical context, the new Roman Missal (in its General Instruction) can talk of 'the Lord's Supper or Mass' just as the first Prayer Book of 1549 could talk of 'the Supper of the Lorde and the holy Communion, commonly called the Masse'. More fundamentally, do we have any difficulties with the language of the eucharistic prayers in each other's rites or in our own?

   b) Is the Roman Catholic practice of communion in one kind a serious problem for Anglicans? Since Vatican II communion in both kinds is becoming increasingly familiar to Roman Catholics.

   c) Is reservation of the blessed sacrament (and even more the devotion which accompanies it) a question that needs further study? See Elucidation 8 and 9, pp. 23 and 24.

   d) Some in both churches believe that intercommunion should begin without delay, while others disagree. What do you think? Elucidation 10, pp. 24 and 25, explains ARCIC's own standpoint on this issue.

Prayer

We give you thanks, Father,
for this holy meal in which Christ is received,
the memory of his passion is renewed,
our lives are filled with grace,
and a pledge of future glory is given to us.
To him with you and the Holy Spirit be glory for ever.

(based on an antiphon for the office of Corpus Christi, attributed to St Thomas Aquinas).

David Silk: Prayers for Use at the Alternative Services, (A. R. Mowbray & Co Ltd)

4. MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

A priest is being ordained. This of course is a most important event in his life, but it is no mere private occasion for it involves the whole people of God. In their recently revised ordination rites both the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England make unmistakably clear their understanding of the nature of ministry, priesthood and ordination and give expression also to the involvement of the laity.

Have you ever been to an ordination in your own Church? Have you attended one in the other Church? In both Churches it is the Bishop who presides and who confers ordination in the course of a celebration of the eucharist. If you compare the ordination rites of the two Churches you will be struck by the similarities:

i) In both rites the ordination is performed after the Liturgy of the Word.

ii) The rite begins with the presentation of the candidate (who is already in Deacon's Orders) to the Bishop and to the people. His name is called out and he steps forward before the Bishop. Both rites too now provide for the people to give their explicit assent to the Bishop's decision to proceed with ordination.

iii) The Bishop solemnly declares to the candidate and the people the duties of priesthood. He then examines the ordinand in a series of searching questions.

iv) The Bishop commends the candidate to the prayers of the people and a litany of intercession is sung or said. Both rites include an invocation of the Holy Spirit (the singing of the hymn *Veni Creator)* but at different points.

v) The actual ordination is conferred by the laying on of hands by the Bishop and by a solemn Prayer of Consecration. It is interesting that in both rites the presbyters present join the Bishop in the laying on of hands, to signify the shared nature of the commission entrusted to them (cf. 'Ministry and Ordination' *The Final Report* p. 37). In the Roman rite the laying on of hands is performed in silence and is followed by the prayer; in the Anglican rite the laying on of hands takes place in the course of the prayer.

vi) There now follow certain ceremonies of investiture. In both Churches the deacon, if he wears a stole, wears it on the left shoulder and fastened under his right arm. Its position is now changed so that the newly ordained priest is seen to be vested as such. In the Anglican rite he is given a Bible and may sometimes also be presented with paten and chalice; in the Roman rite the palms of his hands are anointed with chrism and the paten and chalice are handed to him.

vii) The Peace is now given and the eucharistic celebration resumed at the Offertory. In the Roman rite newly ordained priests concelebrate with the Bishop and this may also take place in the Anglican rite, since the Alternative Service Book declares that 'it is appropriate that the newly ordained should be invited by the bishop to exercise their new ministry in the course of the service'.

If you have time you may want to examine and compare some of the most significant texts of the two rites. It would be helpful to have (a) the texts in both rites in which the Bishop sets out the nature and duties of the priestly office, and (b) the texts of the actual Prayers of Consecration or Ordination used in conjunction with the laying on of hands. The Anglican ordination rites are printed in the official Prayer Books, (cf ASB, p. 338 & pp. 351-364) while the Roman Catholic rite is available from the CTS (The Ordination of Priests, D519 35 pence).

1. Before we go any further, it is vitally important to set all our thinking about the ordained ministry firmly in the context of the ministerial activity of the whole people of God. The liturgies of both Churches have a collect on Good Friday which is a prayer for the whole people and goes on to speak of 'each in his vocation and ministry' (Book of Common Prayer; Alternative Service Book, p. 558; Romas Rite, General Intercession, n. 3: For the clergy and laity of the Church). Look at the Introduction and at sections 3 to 6 (Ministry in the Life of the Church) of *Ministry and Ordination,* pp 30-32.
2. If the whole people of God has a true ministry, what place does this leave for the ordained ministry? *The Final Report* describes the development of a ministry of oversight (*episcopé*) over the various unstructured ministries in the primitive Church. That such an *episcopé* is essential for the existence of the Church and derives ultimately from Christ's commission to the Apostles would gain wide acceptance by the Christian Churches. The form in which this *episcopé* developed is the threefold ministry (centred on the episcopate) which both our Churches have maintained. Would you agree that the clear emergence of universal threefold ministry, although it took place after the New Testament era, can still be discerned as God's will for his Church?
3. Look at the Roman Catholic and Anglican ordination rites. Would you agree with *Ministry and Ordination* that, whatever may have been the case in the past, both Churches now intend the same thing in ordination and have the same basic understanding of the ordained ministry? Look at sections 14 to 17, and in particular at the first four sentences of section 17 (pp 36-38).
4. The claim to be within the apostolic succession is common to both our Churches, who see the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests (or Presbyters) and Deacons as part of this continuity (section 16). How do you understand this succession? How do you understand the distinctive ministries of Bishop, Priest and Deacon? Do you agree that the word 'Priest' can properly be applied to Presbyters, and indeed to Bishops? If so, how do you understand the distinctive priesthood of the ordained ministry, bearing in mind that the priesthood of the whole people of God and that of the ordained ministry relate, each in their own way, to the unique priesthood of Christ? Look at Elucidation section 2 (p. 40). Would you agree that in neither of our Churches have we really done justice to the specific and distinctive character of the ministry of the Deacon? Look at sections 7 to 13 (The Ordained Ministry), pp. 32-36.
5. At this point we have to face the fact that the Roman Catholic Church does not recognize the 'validity' of Anglican Orders. *Ministry and Ordination* was not running away from an embarrassing problem when it declared (section 17) that 'agreement on the nature of Ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries'; it was merely putting that problem in its proper context. ARCIC does believe that the time is now ripe for reconsideration of Pope Leo XIII's condemnation of Anglican Orders. This conviction has been given formal recognition for the first time in the *Common Declaration* signed by Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Eve of Pentecost 1982, after the great service in Canterbury Cathedral. The Declaration announces the setting up of a new International Commission to continue and complete the work of ARCIC and specifies that one of its tasks will be to study 'all that hinders mutual recognition of the ministries of our Communions'. The wording here is positive and helpful, since today it is not so much a question of any one Church pronouncing a juridical verdict on the ministry of another as of mutual recognition and mutual reconciliation of two Churches in ministry and membership. It does however leave entirely open precisely how that recognition could be effected. As far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned, this need not necessarily involve the withdrawal of Pope Leo XIII's bull *Apostolicae Curae* (CTS H311) as mistaken; it could take the form of a declaration that, whatever may have been the case in the past, it could, in the new context now created, recognize the validity of Anglican Orders in the present. Look at *Ministry and Ordination:* Elucidation section 6 (p. 44-45) and *The Common Declaration,* section 3 (pp. 26-7 of this booklet).

Questions for Discussion

1. What do you expect from your priests?
   Do Anglicans and Roman Catholics look for the same things?

What kind of partnership between priest and lay people exists in your parishes?

2. Are there any aspects of priesthood as expressed in the other Church which you find quite unacceptable?
   Are our different disciplines — e.g. on priestly marriage — a real obstacle? What are the positive values of both married and celibate ministries?
3. Is the ordination of women to the priesthood in some provinces of the Anglican Communion an insuperable obstacle to 'the mutual recognition of ministries'? Look at *Ministry and Ordination:* Elucidation, section 15 (p. 44).
4. What practical difference would it make to Anglican-Roman Catholic relations if the validity of Anglican Orders were now to be affirmed by Rome?
5. Any Free Church participants in the study group may be feeling uneasy about the ARCIC Statement on Ministry and Ordination and any discussion of it so far, since they will be aware that both Roman Catholics and Anglicans 'have retained and remained faithful to the three-fold ministry centred on episcopacy' (p. 43), and therefore have in common a similar experience and a number of assumptions about the ordained ministry which they may not wholly share. Yet ARCIC's own discussion of *episcopé* was carried out both with genuine respect for 'the different forms that ministry has taken in other traditions' (p. 29) and also with the specific disclaimer of any intention of entering 'into the question whether there is any other form in which this *episcopé* can be realized' (p. 43). At this point Free Church participants could be invited both to express their response to Anglican-Roman Catholic agreement on the Ministry and to say what distinctive insights their traditions have to contribute to the dialogue.

Prayer

Almighty and everlasting God,
by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church
is governed and sanctified:
Receive our supplications
and prayers, which we offer before thee
for all estates of
men in thy holy Church,
that every member of the same,
in his vocation and ministry,
may truly and godly serve thee;
through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Book of Common Prayer,
A Collect for Good Friday

5. AUTHORITY 1

When we read the Acts of the Apostles, and especially its first five chapters, we notice several things about the first Christians. One of the most remarkable is their sense of the continuing presence of the risen Christ in their midst; there is no feeling of looking back to the 'good old days' when he was on earth. The followers of Jesus were a fellowship, a community, sharing not only their prayers but their goods. But it was a community with authority, the authority of Peter dealing with Ananias and Sapphira and, later, the authority exercised by Peter and James in settling the serious controversy recorded in Acts 15.

In St Paul's letters we find him writing, for instance, to the church of God in Corinth. Not many people nowadays think of the word 'church' in quite that way. If asked which church they belong to, they mostly answer either by speaking of their local parish or by saying that they are Roman Catholics, or members of the Church of England, or the United Reformed Church, or Methodists, or whatever. Very few indeed would talk about themselves as belonging to the church of London or Westminster, of Salford or Manchester, and some even have forgotten that our remote ancestors in the faith once spoke of the church of Corinth or Ephesus.

But now *The Final Report* has reminded everybody that 'the one Church is a communion of local churches'.

On pp 49-78, ARCIC painstakingly traces how authority has developed in the Church, and then outlines the large measure of agreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on this matter.

Both Anglicans and Roman Catholics agree that the Holy Scriptures are the 'normative record of the authentic foundation of the faith' (para. 2). The early Church was guided by the Holy Spirit in the writing of the New Testament texts and in forming the canon of Scripture. The same Holy Spirit has been at work in the Church ever since, helping Christians to discern the meaning of the Gospel for each new age, and guarding the Church from falling into fatal error. When we come to think of authority exercised by men and women, it is important to recall that this does not belong only to those in high places. The Holy Spirit can and does give his gifts to anybody that he chooses: the 'prophet' in the proper biblical sense of the word — someone who speaks the word of God to his contemporaries — lives in the Church of today and may be a person of any sort at all, just as in old days Amos was a farmer and Isaiah a man of influence at court. But one of the gifts of the Spirit is the ordained ministry of those who have pastoral charge of others.

From the earliest times the Holy Spirit gave the Church gifts of oversight (*episcopé*) for the whole of its life and witness, including an

oversight of the Word for teaching. The whole community of the local churches needed to respond to and assess the teaching of the ordained ministers. Ever since the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) it was realized that local churches could not go their separate ways in teaching the faith. Contentious issues arose and councils of leaders from many local churches gathered to settle disputes, especially disputes about the teaching of the faith. Anglicans and Roman Catholics alike attach great importance to the great General Councils of the early centuries. Early in the history of the Church the see of Rome was looked to for guidance by other churches, and the bishop of Rome was asked to support other bishops in their ministry of oversight. Yet a universal primacy of jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome (Papal Supremacy) is not accepted by the Eastern Orthodox Churches and was repudiated by Anglicans and Protestants at the Reformation.

The Final Report makes much of the idea of indefectibility, that is the inability of the Church universal to depart so far from the truth as to cease to be the Church of Christ. It thus makes much of the confident expectation of guidance by the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles, and of the record of Jesus' promise in the Gospel of St Matthew that the gates of hell will not prevail against the Church. The Roman Catholic Church has not hesitated to ascribe infallibility to the Church. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England however point out that even ancient Churches such as those of Rome and Jerusalem have erred in the past (Article XIX). Are these positions compatible? (See Elucidation, pp. 71-72)

Few aspects of Church life have been so deeply affected by polemic as the understanding of how the Church is maintained in the truth. Roman Catholics have tended to caricature the Protestant position (and for this purpose Anglicans have often been lumped together with Protestants) as follows: Anglicans give honour and authority to Scripture, but allow each individual to be his or her own pope in interpreting Scripture however he likes. Especially after Vatican I in 1870 many Anglicans believed that the Pope was free to dictate to Roman Catholics what they should believe, irrespective of Scripture. The group may wish to discuss these two caricatures in the light of *The Final Report.* How widely are they still believed to be true? How would members of the group set about correcting them? Is there any truth in the idea of the Pope imposing his views on the Church? Do Anglicans have any agreed means of distinguishing truth from error in contemporary Christian teaching?

The Final Report speaks of the development of Councils and Primacy as two complementary ways in which the Church is maintained in the truth. In our two traditions one has usually been emphasized at the expense of the other, but unity requires that a proper balance be preserved between the two with the responsible participation of the whole people of God (paras 19-23, pp. 62-64).

Questions for Discussion

1. Can the Church as a whole become so distorted in its proclamation of the Gospel, that it ceases to be the Church of Christ?
2. By what different means has the Church been preserved in the truth of the Gospel? Does *The Final Report* do justice to the authority of Scripture?
3. Is there any need for a living means of settling disputes about Christian teaching today? If so, what are those means?
4. What is the proper relationship between the authority of Councils, the authority of a universal primate, and the authority of the whole people of God?
5. ARCIC says that our communion as Christians (and this means *all,* not just Anglicans and Roman Catholics) 'is founded on faith in Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, crucified, risen, ascended, and now living through his Spirit in the Church'.
   Can you think of examples of the way in which understanding and expression of these basic truths has been affected by our divisions?
6. Do you think that a Church should be able to say with authority that some statements are not in harmony with Christian doctrine?
7. Do you agree that the Church needs a universal primate (working in fellowship with the other bishops)? If so, does he need to be the bishop of Rome? And are Anglicans being asked to accept the papacy as it has functioned in the past; as it functions now; or as it might function ideally?
8. What sort of diversity would you like to see in the united Church of the future?

Prayer

Lord,
hear the prayers of your people
and bring the hearts of believers together in your praise
and in common sorrow for their sins.
Heal all divisions among Christians
that we may rejoice in the perfect unity of your Church
and move together as one
to eternal life in your kingdom.

Grant this through our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son,
who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit,
one God, for ever and ever.

Roman Missal, Mass for Christian Unity

6. AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH II

In chapter 5, the topics mentioned were those on which ARCIC had been able to produce an Agreed Statement in 1976.

There remained four big questions that had not been settled. Quite recently, in the summer of 1982, one of the Anglican members of ARCIC pointed out that this was not so much because they had discussed these topics and failed to agree but because they had not had time to discuss them fully. Hence several years of hard work and the publication of *Authority in the Church II* five years after *Authority I.* The four questions are the topics of this chapter, and not surprisingly they are closely connected with many of the things discussed in Chapter 5.

Petrine Texts

It is tempting to write '*The* Petrine Texts', but there is an excellent reason for omitting the article. For we are not concerned with all the references to St Peter in the New Testament but with a selection of the most important ones. *The Final Report* itself gives a summary which is as concise as any (p. 82): 'The most important are: the bestowal on Simon of the name Cephas, his being mentioned first among the Twelve and in the smaller circle of the three (Peter, James and John), the faith which enabled him to confess Jesus' Messiahship (Matt. 16.16; Mark 8.28; Luke 9.20; and John 6.69), and the answer of Jesus (Matt. 16.18) in which he is called rock, the charge to strengthen his brethren (Luke 22.31-32) and to feed the sheep (John 21.16-17) and the special appearance to him of the risen Lord (e.g. Luke 24.34; 1 Cor. 15.5). Although the author of Acts underlined the apostolic authority of Paul in the latter part of his book, he focussed in the first part on Peter's leadership. For instance, it is Peter who frequently speaks in the name of the apostolic community (Acts 3.15, 10.41), he is the first to proclaim the Gospel to the Jews and the first to open the Christian community to the Gentiles. Paul seems to have recognized this prominence of Peter among the apostles as well as the importance of James (Gal. 1.18-19). He appears also to have accepted the lead given by Peter at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), even though he was prepared to oppose Peter when he held Peter to be at fault (Gal. 2.11).'

It is very clear that Peter was never regarded as a man apart from his fellow apostles. Far from it, they were all commissioned by Christ to preach the Gospel, to bind and to loose; all were seen by St Paul (Ephesians 2.20) as, along with the prophets, the foundations of God's building. In spite of his human failings, Peter was empowered by God's grace to serve, not to dominate, others. (Among other events, we notice the lesson given pointedly to him when Jesus washed the feet of

the disciples.) Not least, our Lord made it clear that Peter's ministry was to be a service of love.

ARCIC stresses that not everything said about the apostles as witnesses to Christ's saving work, and especially his resurrection, can be said of their successors. The apostles were in a unique situation. Chapter 5 mentioned that Rome came to have a position of leadership among the churches, and here it is useful to quote the comment that ARCIC makes: 'It is possible to think that a primacy of the bishop of Rome is not contrary to the New Testament and is part of God's purpose regarding the Church's unity and catholicity, while admitting that the New Testament texts offer no sufficient basis for this.' Some Roman Catholics may feel that it is not strong enough about the connection between Peter and the bishops of Rome in later times. Others may think that the Report is the more convincing because of its very restraint.

Jus Divinum

The Final Report gives a Latin title to this section because both the usual English translations, 'divine law' and 'divine right', give one the uneasy feeling that the nail is not being hit quite on the head. The question is about the primacy of the bishop of Rome, the universal primacy that was talked about in the previous chapter. At the least, the Report says, the use of the words 'jus divinum' means that this primacy expresses God's providential purpose for his church. Indeed, it goes on to say in the end that the language of divine right used by the First Vatican Council 'need no longer be seen as a matter of disagreement between us.'

Before reaching this conclusion, the writers of the Report take pains to show that many of the misunderstandings, to use no stronger word, between the two Churches in the past were due to some ideas being badly expressed and to the general lack of friendship in their relationship. Nowadays the atmosphere is quite different, and both parties are more relaxed, the Catholics in stating their point of view and the Anglicans in responding to it.

Jurisdiction

There are some Christians who are impatient at the mention of words like this. Yet Jesus from the first not only spoke with authority himself but gave authority to his disciples. The formation of these disciples was as much a part of his public ministry as was the work of healing and teaching. And today all Churches have authority structures — and use them. The Methodist Conference, for example, exercises an authority in a way that is no less real than that of the episcopal Churches, for all that things may be done in a different way. Christian Churches, in a word, continue to be like those of the earliest times described in chapter 5, at once a fellowship of brothers and sisters in the Lord and a people who recognize authority as a reflection of that of

Christ.

The Final Report defines jurisdiction in the Church as 'the authority or power necessary for the exercise of an office'. As different offices and functions vary, so does the authority that goes with them. Anglicans and others have sometimes been put off by the formidable words in which the First Vatican Council referred to the universal, ordinary and immediate jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome. The words 'ordinary' and 'immediate' (i.e. not mediated) mean that his authority comes from his office, and the word 'universal' simply means that he is enabled to serve the whole fellowship and to promote its unity (cf. p. 89).

There are fears, and they do not exist only outside the Roman Catholic Church, that having such a central authority has led to centralization in the bad sense, with too little regard for the rights of conscience and for local needs. On the other hand there is the most important development of National Conferences of Bishops which move away from a Roman centralization towards a more balanced picture of 'the bishop of Rome among his brother bishops'. One of ARCIC's central themes has been the balance of the 'primatial' and 'the conciliar'.

Infallibility

It is a sobering thought that the section of *The Final Report* which bears this title is quite a bit longer than the whole Statement on the Eucharist. And while the main objections on this matter have come, and continue to come, from the Anglican side, it has to be said that not too many Catholics would like to try and pass an examination on what papal infallibility actually means.

It may be helpful to begin by remembering that the word 'infallible' can only be used fully of God himself, and of a man only by God's gift and on conditions. Christ, the Son of God, promised that the Holy Spirit would be with his Church and that he will, to quote the Report, 'enable it to fulfil its mission so that it will neither lose its essential character nor fail to reach its goal'. Earlier, mention was made of the way in which general councils defined the faith and settled doubts and controversies; their decisions, when they were seen to be properly 'ecumenical councils' were accepted as binding by the faithful.

The Early Church also furnishes us with examples of 'primatial' initiatives on important matters of faith, such as the 'Tome' of Pope Leo the Great, which gave to the Church its understanding of the two 'natures' of Christ, human and divine, in one 'person'.

But in comparatively modern times statements have been made by popes regarding the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of the Mother of Jesus. There was no council of the Church involved in either case, but it must be noted that the popes concerned consulted their fellow bishops beforehand, bishops who

were able to state that these beliefs about Mary were in fact held by the faithful of the Roman Catholic Church. Anglicans have been more concerned with the content of the doctrines and their relation to Revelation. Even though this setting of papal infallibility in the context of Christ's gift to his Church, and its use in solemnly declaring the belief of the faithful, may make papal infallibility somewhat less controversial, this remains a subject on which ARCIC has not been able to agree completely. The following extract from *The Final Report* shows the difference of approach:

> . . . The judgement of the bishop of Rome must satisfy rigorous conditions. He must speak explicitly as the focus within the *koinonia;* without being under duress from external pressures; having sought to discover the mind of his fellow bishops and of the Church as a whole; and with a clear intention to issue a binding decision upon a matter of faith or morals. Some of these conditions were laid down by the First Vatican Council. When it is plain that all these conditions have been fulfilled, Roman Catholics conclude that the judgement is preserved from error and the proposition true. If the definition proposed for assent were not manifestly a legitimate interpretation of biblical faith and in line with orthodox tradition, Anglicans would think it a duty to reserve the reception of the definition for study and discussion (p. 95).

It is clear that neither tradition simply accords acceptance to a solemn papal utterance without question. But the Roman Catholic first looks at the conditions under which the Statement is made, whereas the Anglican tends first to look at the relation of the Statement to Scripture and tradition. The two approaches are not totally incompatible but they are different. The situation has been made more complex by the fact that the two Marian dogmas have assumed a certain spirituality and ethos and have been expressions of more *basic* Christian doctrines: God's call and election, with his bestowal of appropriate gifts of Grace for vocation, and the resurrection of the body and the communion of saints. These basic doctrines are held in common by Anglicans, Roman Catholics and other Christians. For Anglicans there is the question of whether their 'Marian' dress is necessary for Christians who have other traditions of spirituality and theology.

The incomplete agreement on this last topic is not papered over, but the last words in this section must be noted: '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.*'

No doubt initiatives on a grand scale can only come from those in authority, but there is much more that can and must be done locally, in prayer and study and mission. ARCIC seems to be saying, 'Over to you'.

Questions for Discussion

1. What light does Jesus' teaching about leadership as service (Luke 22 vv. 24ff) throw upon the exercise of authority in the Church?
2. What kind of leadership did St Peter give to the Apostolic Church? Is the same kind of leadership in the world Church God's will today?
3. Is moral authority enough in the Church? Or is some degree of juridical authority necessary for maintaining unity at the local, regional and world levels?
4. To what extent does the incomplete nature of ARCIC's agreement on papal infallibility stand in the way of a closer relationship between the Churches?
5. Do you agree that the New Testament shows Peter to have had a primacy, and if so, of what kind?
   Does the New Testament show that Peter must have successors in this primacy? If not, would you agree with ARCIC that 'a primacy of the bishop of Rome is not contrary to the New Testament and is part of God's purpose regarding the Church's unity and catholicity'?
6. How do you think that, in practice, the Anglican Communion could be made one with the Roman Catholic Church? Does Pope Paul VI's quotation to Archbishop Coggan of Cardinal Mercier's phrase 'The Anglican Church united not absorbed' point the way? (Address of welcome, 28 April 1977.) What effect can you envisage this sort of union having on the Churches locally?
   Another topic to discuss at this point is that of the establishment of the Church of England (not outside England, one must note) and the position of the Queen.
7. Even though ARCIC does not claim complete agreement about infallibility, do you think it has succeeded in expounding the Church's freedom from error? (What has been written in Chapter 6 above is a summary for those who have not got *The Final Report* in front of them).
8. Bearing in mind the words quoted above about a practical initiative being taken, what initiative(s) would you suggest, and how would this be put into practice locally?

Prayer

Almighty Father,
who inspired Simon Peter, first among the apostles,
to confess Jesus as Messiah and Son of the living God;
keep your Church steadfast upon the rock of this faith,
so that in unity and peace
we may proclaim the one truth and follow the one Lord,
our Saviour Jesus Christ;
who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.

Collect from the American Book of Common Prayer.

7. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Any discussion of the next stage of our common pilgrimage towards unity must take serious account of the Common Declaration signed by Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury after the great service in Canterbury Cathedral on the eve of Pentecost 1982. We reproduce the text here, paragraph by paragraph, adding our own comments and suggested questions after each.

1. In the Cathedral Church of Christ at Canterbury, the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury have met on the eve of Pentecost to offer thanks to God for the progress that has been made in the work of reconciliation between our Communions.
   Together with leaders of other Christian Churches and Communities we have listened to the Word of God; together we have recalled our one baptism and renewed the promises then made; together we have acknowledged the witness given by those whose faith has led them to surrender the precious gift of life itself in the service of others, both in the past and in modern times.

Do you agree that the service in Canterbury Cathedral, witnessed by millions on television, has created an irreversible turning-point for relations between the two Churches? Has it driven home to people that the deep personal commitment of our leaders to the search for unity is one in which we are all inescapably involved?

Is it not significant that the Pope and the Archbishop and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council led that great congregation in a solemn re-affirmation of baptismal vows precisely in the context of the celebration of our common faith and our prayer for its fuller and more visible expression?

Looking at the Pope's visit to this country as a whole, has it said something to non-Roman Catholic Christians about the potential role in a reunited Christendom of the Bishop of Rome ("A Pope for all Christians?") or only about the personal charisma of John Paul II?

2. The bond of our common baptism into Christ led our predecessors to inaugurate a serious dialogue between our Churches, a dialogue founded on the Gospels and the ancient common traditions, a dialogue which has as its goal the unity for which Christ prayed to his Father 'so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me' (John 17. 23).
   In 1966 our predecessors Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey made a Common Declaration announcing their intention to inaugurate a serious dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion which would 'include not only

theological matters such as Scripture, Tradition and Liturgy, but also matters of practical difficulty felt on either side' (Common Declaration, paragraph 6).

After this dialogue had already produced three statements on Eucharist, Ministry and Ordination and Authority in the Church, Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Donald Coggan in their Common Declaration in 1977, took the occasion to encourage the completion of the dialogue on these three important questions, so that the Commission's conclusions might be evaluated by the respective authorities through procedures appropriate to each communion.

The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has now completed the task assigned to it with the publication of its Final Report, and, as our two communions proceed with the necessary evaluation, we join in thanking the members of the commission for their dedication, scholarship and integrity in a long and demanding task undertaken for love of Christ and the unity of his Church.

Many people will find it very useful to have this summary of the two earlier Common Declarations both of which are seen to relate directly to the work of ARCIC which we are now studying. This work has now to be evaluated by the two Churches, and quite rightly the Declaration makes no attempt to anticipate the results of that evaluation, though it thanks the members of the Commission warmly for all that they have done.

In view of the commitment of the two Churches to work for full visible unity, can our groups agree that we must not be content with a relationship of friendly co-operation but must work towards complete unity? And meanwhile, how can Anglicans and Roman Catholics and others give expression locally to the unity that already exists?

A 'matter of practical difficulty' which affects many peoples' lives is the question of mixed marriages, especially where these are 'interchurch', that is where they involve *committed* members of different Churches. Groups will almost certainly want to take up this matter, remembering what the Pope said at York about such people as living in their marriages 'the hopes and difficulties of the path to unity', and how he urged them to pray together. Many people in our groups will want first to discuss how in practice interchurch couples can be helped to take a positive view of their marriage as a contribution to unity, and second, to explore the way forward in one particular aspect of prayer together where there is difficulty at present, the shared reception of holy communion.

3. The completion of this Commission's work bids us look to the next stage of our common pilgrimage in faith and hope towards the unity for which we long. We are agreed that it is now time to set up a new international Commission.

Its task will be continue the work already begun; 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 Communions; and to recommend what practical steps will be necessary when, on the basis of our unity in faith, we are able to proceed to the restoration of full communion.

We are well aware that this new Commission's task will not be easy, but we are encouraged by our reliance on the grace of God and by all that we have seen of the power of that grace in the ecumenical movement of our time.

ARCIC is being replaced by a new commission because it has finished the work it was given to do and a rather different body is now needed for a rather different job. One can expect that the new commission will be more broadly based than the old one whose members are overwhelmingly from the British Isles, the Commonwealth and North America, all male and, with one exception, all ordained ministers. The new commission will have a theological job to do in working to resolve remaining doctrinal differences (those acknowledged in *The Final Report* and those which emerge from other sources). It must also work towards the mutual recognition of ministries and recommend the practical steps to be taken when the restoration of full communion is in sight. Note that the text deliberately says *when,* not *if.*

This is the most weighty paragraph in the Declaration, and several important questions suggest themselves. Some groups might like to suggest remaining theological differences which they consider important, and how to resolve them. Others may prefer to concentrate on how the two Churches can overcome the difficulty created by Pope Leo XIII's condemnation of Anglican Orders and to discuss the difference it will make when the ministries of the two Churches are reconciled. Finally, we believe it is not far-fetched to start thinking of the practical steps needed for full communion, for such a discussion might help our collaboration now.

4. 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 communions 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 past enmities be healed and our historical antagonisms overcome.

The setting up of a new commission does not mean that the rest of us can sit back. Some work no doubt will have to be done by the experts, but the rest of us are called not only to pray for the work of reconciliation but to 'adopt every possible means' of fostering it. Would the group agree that this does not exclude theological study at every level of church life? Surely what ARCIC itself says about the role of the faithful in the reception of doctrine (cf. p. 60 and p. 72) means that ultimately any authority *The Final Report* will acquire must derive not only from its reception by Church leaders but also from its reception by the faithful of both communions? Will both Anglicans and Roman Catholics be able to say in the end that nothing in the Report seems to them to betray the faith as they have learned it but, on the contrary, that their vision of the faith has been enlarged and confirmed? (NB We say 'in the end', because the immediate reaction of many people to a new way of expressing things may be unfavourable.)

5. Our aim is not limited to the union of our two Communions alone, to the exclusion of other Christians, but rather extends to the fulfilment of God's will for the visible unity of all his people. Both in our present dialogue and in those engaged in by other Christians among themselves and with us, we recognise in the agreement we are able to reach, as well as in the difficulties which we encounter, a renewed challenge to abandon ourselves completely to the truth of the Gospel. Hence we are happy to make this declaration today in the welcome presence of so many fellow Christians whose Churches and Communities are already partners with us in prayer and work for the unity of all.

The Common Declaration is signed by the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury since it is concerned with the bilateral dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion, but it followed a service in Canterbury Cathedral in which representatives of all the major Christian traditions in this country took a full part and was signed in their presence. Bilateral dialogues and negotiations are perfectly valid and indeed necessary, provided that they are undertaken not only with the other Churches in mind but also with a degree of sympathetic but critical participation on their part. It was no empty gesture on the part of ARCIC to have had a distinguished German Lutheran theologian working with them as an Observer from the World Council of Churches, and his contribution was by all accounts valued as important and positive.

Christians in England were divided in their assessment of the *Proposals for a Covenant,* but all would surely agree that the failure of

these proposals to win the required majority in the General Synod of the Church of England presents an urgent challenge to all the Churches in this country to find a new way forward to the goal of visible unity. Study groups, formed in the first place to study *The Final Report* of ARCIC, can perhaps be the spearhead of a new initiative.

6. With them we wish to serve the cause of peace, of human freedom and human dignity so that God may indeed be glorified in all his creatures. With them we greet in the name of God all men of good will, both those who believe in him and those who are still searching for him.

It has been said that ecumenical dialogue is twofold. It consists first of the Churches listening to one another and trying to answer the questions which they put to one another. It consists also of the Churches together listening to the questions and challenges put to them by the world — not only listening but trying to answer these questions, in words and in common service and witness.

Clearly, the question arises of finding ways in which this can be done locally. Groups who discuss this might like to refer back to the latter part of paragraph 4. Some words of Archbishop Donald Coggan in a sermon preached in Rome in 1977 are relevant here: 'When Christians belonging to different communions of the Church go out on evangelistic work together, they discover, in the course of that work, a measure of unity of which they had no inkling before'. Perhaps some people can quote their own examples of this?

7. This holy place reminds us of the vision of Pope Gregory in sending St Augustine as an apostle to England, full of zeal for the preaching of the gospel and the shepherding of the flock. On this eve of Pentecost, we turn to ask the Father to give us another Advocate to be with us for ever, the Spirit of truth (cf John 14. 16), to lead us to the full unity to which he calls us. Confident in the power of this same Holy Spirit, we commit ourselves anew to the task of working for unity with firm faith, renewed hope and ever deeper love.

Groups might at this stage discuss some arrangements for more prayer together in their parishes, whether formally or informally; certainly for something going well beyond the annual keeping of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. But, much more important than talking about prayer, more important than any further discussion, is a common attentive submission to the Word of God, leading into prayer and some form of commitment. We cannot come to the end of a time of joint study without trying to discover to what precise form of continued partnership God is calling the local Christian communities we represent. This may well be the time to take up the suggestion, raised at the end of Chapter 1, to renew our baptismal vows together.

At the very least we should try to share the confidence in the power of the Holy Spirit shown by our leaders as we follow them in committing ourselves to work for unity.

Prayer

Come, Holy Spirit,
fill the hearts of your faithful,
and enkindle in them the fire of your love;
though the peoples spoke different tongues
you united them in proclaiming the same faith, alleluia.

The Roman Office,
antiphon for Pentecost Eve.

SUGGESTIONS FOR GROUP LEADERS

1. Group leaders should have read *The Final Report* of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, and have a copy available at each meeting of the group. Ideally, all members of the group should have read it. It was jointly published by SPCK and the Catholic Truth Society in March 1982, price £1.95.
2. It is suggested that groups comprise not less than six and not more than twelve people. It would be helpful if not only Anglicans and Roman Catholics joined groups, but also members of other Churches. Where this occurs special care will need to be taken to draw them into the discussion.
3. The Statement from the World Council of Churches' Faith and Order Commission, although it was published after this Study Guide was written, could well be studied alongside *The Final Report* of ARCIC. It is entitled *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* and is available from the British Council of Churches, 2 Eaton Gate, London SW1W 9BL, price £1.95.
4. Groups will vary considerably on the familiarity of their members with each others' churches. Especially where there is little familiarity, it is suggested that the group meetings be *preceded* by *guided* visits to each others' church buildings. Before the third study session it is suggested that members should attend each other's eucharists, and that there should be an opportunity for the service to be explained and questions asked.
5. It is anticipated that group sessions will last about 1½ hours. Care should be taken that they do not drag on too long. Some of the issues tackled are enormous, and the group should not expect to clarify every issue and solve every problem in the time allotted. If the group has time, there is no reason why the subject matter should not be split up further and more sessions held.

6. The group leader's task is not to do all the talking, but to encourage each member to contribute, and to see that no person dominates. It is obviously important that there are strong contributions from both Anglicans and Roman Catholics.
7. As the Introduction by the co-chairmen indicates, the English Anglican / Roman Catholic Committee has among its tasks that of monitoring reactions to *The Final Report.* We invite study group leaders to send in brief reports to the joint secretaries of the Committee, concentrating particularly on the question which is posed in the commentary on paragraph 4 of the Canterbury Common Declaration above: 'Will both Anglicans and Roman Catholics be able to say in the end that nothing in the Report seems to them to betray the faith as they have learned it but, on the contrary, that their vision of the faith has been enlarged and confirmed?' The secretaries are: The Very Reverend Canon P. D. Corbishley, Ecumenical Commission, 38/40 Eccleston Square, London SW1V 1PV; The Reverend David Johnson, Board for Mission & Unity, Church House, Dean's Yard, London SW1P 3NZ.

A SHORT GUIDE TO FURTHER READING

GENERAL (and first two chapters)

A. C. Clark & Colin Davey: *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue:* The Work of the Preparatory Commission. O.U.P., 1974.
Bernard & Margaret Pawley: *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries.* Mowbrays, London & Oxford, 1974.
J. C. H. Aveling, D. M. Loades, H. R. McAdoo: *Rome and the Anglicans.* De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, 1982.
Robert Hale: *Canterbury & Rome: Sister Churches.* Darton, Longman & Todd, London, 1982.
Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: *Observations* on The Final Report of ARCIC. CTS, London, 1982.
Robert Runcie, Alan Clark, Henry Chadwick, Christopher Butler, Edward Knapp-Fisher: *Towards Unity in Truth.* Church Literature Association and Fowler Wright Books, 1982.
Julian Charley: *Rome, Canterbury and the Future.* Grove Books, Nottingham, 1982.
John Stott: *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report.* Grove Books, Nottingham, 1982.
James Atkinson: *Rome and Reformation Today.* Latimer House, Oxford, 1982.
R. T. Beckwith: *Rome and Canterbury. The Final ARCIC Report — A Study Guide.* Latimer House, Oxford, 1982.

Jean Tillard, O.P.: *The Bishop of Rome,* translated John de Satgé SPCK, London, 1983.

CHAPTER 3

Modern Eucharistic Agreement (Documents) SPCK, London, 1973.
A Critique of Eucharistic Agreement (Essays) SPCK, London, 1975.

CHAPTER 4

Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry SPCK, London, 1974.

CHAPTERS 3 & 4

Baptism, Eucharist & Ministry: Faith & Order Paper 111. World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982.

CHAPTER 5

E. J. Yarnold & Henry Chadwick: *Truth & Authority* (Commentary on *Authority in the Church* 1) CTS/SPCK, London, 1977.
Robert Runcie and others; edited Mark Santer: *Their Lord and Ours: Approaches to Authority, Community and the Unity of the Church,* SPCK, London, 1982.

CHAPTER 6

Peter in the New Testament (Essays by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars) Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1974.
ed. Peter J. McCord: *A Pope for All Christians?* SPCK, London, 1977.
John de Satgé: *Peter and The Single Church.* SPCK, London, 1981.

CHAPTER 7

The Pope in Britain — the complete texts (Special edition of monthly *The Pope Teaches*) CTS, London, 1982.
Anglican-Roman Catholic Marriages (Report of an International Commission). Church Information Office / Catholic Information Office, London, 1975.

CTS/SPCK JOINT PUBLICATIONS

Praying Together Philip Caraman S. J.

For All God's People Ecumenical Prayer Cycle

What is this 'Week of Prayer for Christian Unity'? Robert Mercer S. A.

Unity in Prayer Martin Reardon

Truth and Authority Commentary on the third Agreed Statement of ARCIC by E. J. Yarnold S. J. and Henry Chadwick

Elucidations (of the first two Agreed Statements) by ARCIC

The Final Report of the Anglican / Roman Catholic International Commission