The extent to which the ordination of women by some churches of the Anglican Communion may have negatively influenced the future of Anglican-Roman Catholic relations, a point mentioned in the text appearing on these pages, was addressed in the common declaration of Pope John Paul II and Anglican Archbishop Robert Runcie of Canterbury at the time of their meeting at the Vatican Sept. 29-Oct. 2, 1989. Coverage of the meeting appeared in Origins, vol. 19, pp. 316ff.

"We here solemnly recommit ourselves and those we represent to the restoration of visible unity and full ecclesial communion," the pope and Canterbury's archbishop said. But, they added, "this is by no means to be unrealistic about the difficulties facing our dialogue at the present time.... The question and practice of the admission of women to the ministerial priesthood in some provinces of the Anglican Communion prevents reconciliation between us even where there is otherwise progress toward agreement in faith on the meaning of the eucharist and the ordained ministry. These differences in faith reflect important ecclesiological differences, and we urge the members of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission and all others engaged in prayer and work for visible unity not to minimize these differences. At the same time we also urge them not to abandon either their hope or work for unity."

Letters exchanged earlier by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie of Canterbury on the problem posed by the ordination of women in some Anglican churches appeared in Origins, vol. 19, pp. 63ff.

ARC/USA

Anglican Orders: The Dialogue's Evolving Context

"'A new context' is now affecting the discussion of Anglican orders within the Roman Catholic Church because of the development of the thinking in the two communions regarding the nature of the eucharist and ordained ministry," says a report issued by the Anglican/Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States of America. Titled "Anglican Orders: A Report on the Evolving Context of Their Evaluation in the Roman Catholic Church," ARC/USA discusses and outlines "the positive dimensions of this 'new context,'" particularly the ongoing study of Pope Leo XIII's 1896 apostolic letter "Apostolicae Curae," which concluded that "the orders conferred with the use of the Anglican ordinal were not valid according to the standards of the Roman Catholic Church." However, "one key element in the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders," the report says, is that "in 1978 the Vatican archives were opened through the year 1903," showing that "in 1896 Vatican opinion on the invalidity of Anglican orders was not as solidly negative as we once imagined." The report discusses the "changing climate" between the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches from 1897 to the present. This topic was taken up at the request of the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. Co-chairs of ARC/USA are Episcopal Bishop Theodore Eastman of Maryland and Roman Catholic Archbishop John Whealon of Hartford, Conn. The ARC/USA report, released July 6, follows.

Introduction

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States has since 1986 addressed the question of the evaluation by the Holy See of Anglican orders. In 1985 Cardinal Jan Willebrands, using a phrase taken from the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's Final Report, had recognized that "a new context" is now affecting the discussion of Anglican orders within the Roman Catholic Church because of the development of the thinking in the two communions regarding the nature of the eucharist and ordained ministry. It has been the purpose of ARC/USA to discuss and to outline the positive dimensions of this "new context."

We wish to underline at the outset the limits of this study. We have focused our attention on factors that seem most to encourage the reconciliation of our two communions. Other observers may point to additional features of Anglican-Roman Catholic relationships in the last century such as an interpretation of *Apostolicae Curae* as an infallible pronouncement of the Holy See, the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of 1928 or the reluctance of some Anglicans to move toward belief in the eucharistic celebration as a sacrifice.

And there are recent developments which have been omitted from consideration in this statement such as the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate within the Anglican Communion. No realistic observer can exclude these events from "the new context." Yet we have acted on the suggestion of Cardinal Willebrands in his 1985 letter that it is the negative judgment of Pope Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) against the validity of Anglican ordinations that is still "the most fundamental" issue that hinders the mutual recognition of ministries between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion. Here we stress only the manner in which the themes addressed in *Apostolicae Curae* have been a point of departure for dialogue and debate between our two communions for almost a century, and we record the progress made on these issues.

1. Overview

The question of the validity of orders conferred according to the Anglican ordinal has come up occasionally in Roman Catholic theology since the period of the Reformation. In 1550 the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, issued a new ritual of ordination that was destined to replace the medieval rituals hitherto in use in England, of which the rite of Sarum (Salisbury) was the most widespread. When Cardinal Reginald Pole, under Queen Mary, tried to restore the old religion in England,

he received instructions from Popes Julius III and Paul IV regarding the mode of reconciliation of schismatic priests and bishops. Nonetheless, the exact meaning and scope of these instructions, as well as the actual decisions of Reginald Pole, have been a matter of scholarly debate.

In the late 19th century, Pope Leo XIII, acceding to urgent pleading from some unofficial groups of Anglicans and from a few Roman Catholics, commissioned a team of scholars to examine the problem. This resulted in the pope's apostolic letter *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), in which Leo XIII concluded that the orders conferred with the use of the Anglican ordinal were not valid according to the standards of the Roman Catholic Church.

And yet the aspiration for Christian unity between Anglicans and Roman Catholics did not come to an end in 1896. Almost immediately, this aspiration found expression in private talks, mutual friendships and scholarly exchanges which bore witness to a slow and gradual convergence. This quiet convergence was nurtured by theological renewal, and it was reinforced in both communions by somewhat similar liturgical reforms derived from a wider knowledge of early Christian worship. Gradually there was official recognition of an evolution toward a new context quite different from the one of 1896. On the Anglican side the Lambeth Conferences of 1908, 1920, 1930, 1968 and 1988 gave official voice to this movement, and on the Roman Catholic side the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) was the most important event that signaled a new context.

Following Vatican Council II, developing ecumenical relations between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church have called attention again to the question of Anglican orders. The conditions of our times have become quite different from what they were in 1896. Theology and style of leadership have evolved in the two churches. It is now not uncommon to think that the position of the problem of Anglican orders is no longer what it was under Pope Leo. A fresh examination of the data has shed new light on the subject.

2. How the Question Was Raised at the End of Vatican Council II

The question of Anglican orders was brought to the attention of Pope Paul VI on Nov. 20, 1965, before the Secretariat for Christian Unity, that was still occupied by the work of Vatican Council II and busy with the composition of the Ecumenical Directory and the preparation of international bilateral dialogues, was able to face the problem. This was in a private audience with the bishop of Huron, Ont., George Luxton, of the Anglican Church of Canada.

According to the bishop, the pope invited him "to add to our personal conversation." This was done in a long letter to Paul VI that the bishop released to the public in English and Latin in February 1966. The letter begins with a summary of the papal audience. In their meeting the bishop of Huron gave information on projects of reunion between Anglicans and other Christians in Nigeria, Ghana, East Africa, Sri Lanka, North India, Pakistan and Canada. The pope asked if these would be "new" churches. The bishop answered that there would be continuity of ministry in "the historic episcopate." As the bishop of Huron reminds Pope Paul in his letter, "you mentioned the bull of Leo XIII as a definitive statement of your church on Anglican orders and noted that it was given after a careful study of historical events and related documents."

One may note the word *definitive*. What is the implication of this term in the context of a private conversation? It comes naturally to the mind of a Roman Catholic referring to a solemn statement made by a pope. It seems to fit naturally in a reference made by Paul VI to a decision taken by his predecessor Leo XIII. But the use of the term does not amount to a doctrinal declaration that the decision in question, while it was definitive in the mind of Leo XIII, must always remain definitive.

> "We wish to underline at the outset the limits of this study. We have focused our attention on factors that seem most to encourage the reconciliation of our two communions."

The bishop of Huron then "expressed the hope that these same events and documents, when studied in the new climate of our interchurch relationships, might possibly allow other interpretations than those that were apparent at the close of the 19th century. It was then that you expressed yourself as willing to receive from me and to consider any related material that I might be able to send."

The bishop also included three requests in his letter: 1) that a review of Anglican orders be made, 2) that Pius V's sentence of excommunication on Queen Elizabeth be revoked, on the model of the recent decision concerning the excommunication of the patriarch of Constantinople, and 3) that, as a long-range project, there be envisaged an eventual "intermingling of the orders of the Roman Catholic Church with our own orders and with the orders of other communions which are in full intercommunion with us."

The first request deserves to be quoted at length:

"That you ask one of your commissions to review the matter of Anglican orders, to compare afresh the Anglican ordinal with the early ordinals, with the Roman one described by Hippolytus ...; the Eastern rite of St. Serapion ...; the later Byzantine rite, the Gregorian and the Gelasian Sacramentaries, as well as the Spanish Mozarabic rite. *In all these the matter and form*

The current vitality of the ecumenical movement was questioned in a 1986 speech by the Rev. Albert Outler, a Methodist theologian. Outler, now deceased, called himself a "grizzled ecumaniac with a wealth of golden memories" in that address, which appeared in Origins, vol. 16, pp. 253ff.

Said Outler: "The reign of God looks to the unity of God's people because he is one and his people are one in a far deeper sense than they are 'many.' My plea, therefore — that of an ecumenical wanderer who is now unlikely even to ascend Mt. Nebo, much less to view the Promised Land — is that in your zeal for God's reign ('on earth as in heaven') you should never ease the cause of Christian unity over to the margins of your commitments, never rank it as a deferred priority, never rest content with the ecumenical status quo, which is still a scandal — in God's eyes and even in the eyes of the world.

"The uprush of ecumenical hopes and expectations (it was a golden half century) has been receding (and who knows when the tide will rise again?). An ecumenical apathy has settled in, as dangerous as partisan bigotry and triumphalism used to be. What is still at stake, however, is not a certain tidiness in the Christian scene (as if unity were a matter of cosmetics) but the effective survival of the Christian mission in the world. At the very least, therefore, Christians such as you, bound as you are 'to the pursuit of perfect charity,' must include the cause of Christian unity in all your visions of your Christian mission — not as a desideratum, but as essential to that final triumph of the kingdom-consummate that Christ is destined to deliver to the Father, that God may be all in all" (p. 257).

A 1985 letter from Cardinal Johannes Willebrands calling for a new study of Anglican orders appeared in Origins, vol. 15, pp. 662f. Agreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on the eucharist and ordained ministry could create a new context for a discussion of Anglican orders, he said at that time.

Willebrands, then the Vatican's chief ecumenical officer, said the study of Anglican orders in the international Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue group should not proceed in isolation from "the whole process of reconciliation." Again, he said, such a study cannot be a wholly historical one. While history cannot be ignored, it would be the dialogue group's task to discover each other's faith as it is today and to appeal to history for enlightenment, he stated.

In an address to a group of U.S. bishops making their 'ad limina' visits to the Vatican in 1988, Pope John Paul II called for a renewed zeal for Christian unity. "We are called to renew our zeal for the unity of all Christians as well as our openness to those who profess other religions and indeed to all people of good will," he said. His text appeared in Origins, vol. 18, pp. 315f.

are very close to that of the English Reformation ordinal. Also the commission might review the *whole* of the English ordinal through phases of development for a further testing of its intention to continue (as the Preface declares) 'the orders of ministers ... etc.'...

"When this new study which I am requesting is set in our present climate of theological dialogue, we believe that your commission would arrive at different conclusions. Our conviction in this matter is strengthened by the fact that in recent years new interpretations of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice have been proposed by distinguished scholars in the Roman Catholic Church (reference to Eugene Masure, Maurice de la Taille and Abbot Anscar Vonier). Since the heart of the argument in *Apostolicae Curae* turns on the understanding of eucharistic sacrifice by the English Reformers, these new interpretations of your theologians seem to call for a reconsideration of the earlier verdict of 70 years ago."

At the end of his letter, the bishop of Huron recalls that in their conversation Paul VI "noted that the intermingling of Anglican orders with theirs (those of the Old Catholics of Europe) is relevant to any modern review of Anglican orders." Further, the bishop remembers that "the possibility" of "the participation" of Roman Catholic bishops "as co-consecrators" in Anglican ordinations "came to your mind at the close of my November audience with you, and that you mentioned having heard it under discussion."[1]

3. Apostolicae Curae

Pope Leo's letter of 1896 is at the heart of this 1966 exchange because it laid out the doctrinal basis for the official Roman Catholic rejection of the validity of Anglican ordained ministry. The ultimate judgment of Pope Leo XIII is that Anglican orders are "absolutely null and utterly void." Leo XIII asserts that the Roman See has always treated Anglican orders as null and void whenever the question has arisen in practice and that this policy of non-recognition could be traced back without break to the period of the Marian restoration of the Roman Catholic Church in England, 1553-1558. *Apostolicae Curae* interprets the instructions sent by Popes Julius III and Paul IV to the Roman legate in England, Cardinal Pole, as stating explicitly that those ordained in the Church of England must be absolutely reordained to become Roman Catholic priests.[2]

Apostolicae Curae presents a theological defense of this tradition of Vatican rejection of the validity of Anglican orders. It is based on the argument that the Church of England ordinal was defective in "intention" and "form." By "defect of intention" Leo XIII meant that by the omissions of any reference to the eucharist as a sacrifice and to a sacrificing priesthood in the ordination ritual of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, the Church of England intended to introduce a radically new rite into England, one markedly different from those approved by the Roman Catholic Church. By "defect of form" Leo XIII meant that the words of the Anglican ordination prayer, "Receive the Holy Ghost," did not signify definitely the order of the Catholic priesthood with its power to consecrate and offer the body and blood of Christ in the eucharistic sacrifice.

This is the position of *Apostolicae Curae* in 1896: The exclusion of the concept of sacrifice from eucharistic worship in 1552 signified that the Church of England did not intend to ordain bishops and priests in the way that such ordinations had taken place before the Reformation in the Catholic Church in England. The exclusion of a sacrificing priesthood nullified any Anglican intention to do what the Catholic Church does at an ordination.

One key element in the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders today is that in 1978 the Vatican archives were opened through the year 1903. This has brought to light documents that show that the decisions of *Apostolicae Curae* were arrived at through a more complex process than we had previously imagined. The process, it must be admitted, is not so important as the conclusion. However, it is helpful to observe the process. The documents now available to scholars definitely confirm the existence of two distinct groups among the eight members of an apostolic commission appointed by Leo XIII in January 1896 to re-examine the validity of Anglican orders. Leo's commission was divided, and four members of the commission believed that a "historic continuity" with the medieval church in England could be traced in modern Anglicanism. In 1896 Vatican opinion on the invalidity of Anglican orders was not as solidly negative as we once imagined prior to 1978. It would not be to our purpose to comment on the opinions of the four members who were in favor of invalidity because these arguments found their way into *Apostolicae Curae*. Almost unknown today are the positions of the papal commissioners who concluded positively in favor of the orders.[3]

For example, one member of the papal commission, Louis Duchesne, believed that the practice of regarding Anglican orders as null and void did not derive from "an ecclesiastical sentence" given in full knowledge of all the facts in the case. For a second commission member, Pietro Gasparri, the material succession of Anglican orders was intact. A third member, Emilio de Augustinis, held that the ordination rite of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer safeguarded the substance of the sacrament of order and that the formula *"accipe Spiritum Sanctum,"* contained in the 1552 book, was a valid form of Catholic ordination. A fourth member, T.B. Scannell, believed approvingly that "true Roman caution" had prevented the papacy from making a definitive negative judgment on Anglican orders in the 16th century.[4]

Today we can study these conclusions for ourselves: 1) Rome in the 16th century did not state categorically and explicitly that all orders conferred with the Anglican ordinal of 1552 were

null and void; and Anglican orders were not consistently rejected by the Roman See during the Marian restoration in England of 1553 to 1558. 2) The vague nature of the instructions sent to Reginald Pole, the Roman Catholic legate in England during that period, suggests that reordination was not the only means of reconciliation of ministries in the 16th century. This conclusion is amplified by the fact that Pole himself was not a priest until March 1556. In any case, whatever conclusions one may reach today about the 16th century, we do have much more information about the background of the papal decision of 1896. This has made enough historical facts available to us to justify new investigation and appraisal.[5]

Why did Leo XIII reject the historical arguments of four members of his commission? The recently opened documents in the Vatican inform us that Pope Leo XIII apparently decided that the issue of reconciliation with the Church of England was not a matter of historical continuity alone. More important, to the pope validity was a matter of sacramentology and of ecclesiology. The new documents suggest this interpretation of *Apostolicae Curae:* Greater weight must be given to theological and institutional unity between Rome and Canterbury than to the proof of historical and sacramental continuity.

Leo XIII thus decided that historical proof of a continuation of sacramental validity within the Church of England was not the central question between Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism. History is not the question. Theology is the question. For there to be sacramental validity within the Church of England from the perspective of Rome, Anglicans and Roman Catholics must be in one institutional community of faith, which implies agreement about the theology of sacraments and ministry, and some Anglican recognition of the papacy.[6]

From this standpoint, Leo XIII was not saying no to Anglicanism. Today we can read letters in the Vatican archives in which Leo XIII and his secretary of state, Cardinal Rampolla, wished to encourage further contacts and discussion with Anglicans after the promulgation of *Apostolicae Curae*. They urge Anglicans and Roman Catholics to move toward unity in faith before the issue of sacramental validity is resolved. In the light of new historical documents, *Apostolicae Curae* did not end a process of dialogue. It began a process of dialogue. The Vatican response was theological, not political. It set out clear theological conditions for validity. Could this not imply that, given theological development, there could be some *future* discernment of substantial agreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on sacraments and ministry which could sustain a positive judgment of *future* ordinations in the mind of Rome?

This does not mean that we doubt the intention of Leo XIII in 1896 "to settle definitively the grave question about Anglican ordination," as he later wrote to the archbishop of Paris. But the documentation in the Vatican archives suggests that this decision on the precise technical point of Anglican orders was not meant to end contact between the two communions.

After 1896 Cardinal Rampolla supported informal visits, meetings, correspondence and prayer in order to "maintain good relations with the Anglicans" and to encourage Anglicans to continue to persevere in "positive sympathies toward the Roman church." In a similar manner, the chief Anglican protagonist of 1896, Lord Halifax, also believed that dialogue would continue. He wrote: "We have failed for the moment ... but God means to do the work himself.... The matter is as certain as it ever was."[7]

> "It is now not uncommon to think that the position of the problem of Anglican orders is no longer what it was under Pope Leo."

4. From Saepius Officio (1897) to the Anglican-Roman Catholic Preparatory Commission (1967)

The next stages of this process of dialogue were *Saepius Officio* and the Malines Conversations. Anglican prelates and the Vatican continued a private dialogue through correspondence, and then in March 1897 the archbishops of Canterbury and York replied to *Apostolicae Curae* in the encyclical letter *Saepius Officio*. The document derived considerable authority from the fact that it was addressed on behalf of the Anglican Communion to all the bishops of Christendom. Here the Anglican archbishops argued that the Anglican Church makes it clear that she intends to confer the office of priesthood instituted by Christ and all that it contains. Canterbury and York contended that the Church of England teaches the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice in terms at least as explicit as those of the canon of the Roman Mass: "Further we truly teach the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a 'nude commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross,' an opinion which seems to be attributed to us.... We think it sufficient in the liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy eucharist ... to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these." Finally, the archbishops pointed out that the words and acts required by the pope in 1896 are not found in the earliest Roman ordinals, so that if their omission renders an ordination invalid, the orders of the church of Rome are on no surer footing than those of the Church of England.

The archbishops were making two essential responses to the arguments of Rome: 1) "We plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross." 2) "The whole action ... we are accustomed to call the eucharistic sacrifice." Their summary of the Anglican understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice

Past texts in Origins on Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue include:
—October 1989 Common Declaration and Vespers Service Addresses of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie, vol. 19, pp. 316ff.
—1988 Exchange of Letters on Women's Ordination, by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie, vol. 19, pp. 63f.
—Observations and Commentary on ARCIC II's Agreed Statement "Salvation and the Church," by the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, vol. 18, pp. 429ff.
—Statement on the Ordination of Women as Anglican Bishops, by Archbishop J. Francis Stafford, vol. 18, pp. 247f.
—"Ecumenical Dialogue Today: An Overview," by Cardinal Johannes Willebrands, vol. 17, pp. 565ff, especially pp. 569-70.
—Agreed Statement on "Salvation and the Church," by ARCIC II, vol. 16, pp. 611ff.
—"Responding to ARCIC I's Final Report," by Bishop Michael Murphy, vol. 16, pp. 229 ff.
—1985-84 Exchange of Letters on Women's Ordination, by Pope John Paul II, Archbishop Robert Runcie and Cardinal Johannes Willebrands, vol. 16, pp. 154ff.
—Exchange of Letters Regarding a New Context for Discussing Anglican Orders, by Cardinal Johannes Willebrands, and the ARCIC II Co-Chairmen, vol. 15, pp. 662ff.
—Evaluation of ARCIC I Final Report, by the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, vol. 14, pp. 409ff.
—"Reflections on Christian Anthropology: A Context for Approaching Difficult Ecumenical Questions," by ARC, vol. 13, pp. 505ff.
—Joint Statement Announcing ARCIC II, by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Robert Runcie, vol. 12, pp. 49ff.
—Observations on the ARCIC I Final Report, by the Congregation for the

►

deserves to be quoted in some detail:

"The matter is indeed one full of mystery and fitted to draw onward the minds of men by strong feelings of love and piety to high and deep thoughts. But, inasmuch as it ought to be treated with the highest reverence and to be considered a bond of Christian charity rather than an occasion for subtle disputations, too precise definitions of the manner of the sacrifice of the eternal priest and the sacrifice of the church, which in some way certainly are one, ought in our opinion to be avoided rather than pressed into prominence."

The general tone of the letter is also important because it assumes that the bishops of the Anglican Communion are engaged in an ongoing debate with "our venerable brother," the pope. It was even understood that the outcome of this debate might be positive. The archbishops wrote: "God grant that, even from this controversy may grow fuller knowledge of the truth, greater patience and a broader desire for peace in the church of Christ." In the same hope of eventual resolution of these matters with Rome, the Lambeth Conference of 1908 proclaimed that there could be no fulfillment of the purpose of God in any scheme of reunion that "does not ultimately include the great Latin church of the West."[8] And the dialogue continued in this sense: The Vatican responded to *Saepius Officio*, restating its conclusions of the 1896 investigation in a French and Latin letter to the archbishops of Canterbury and York of June 1897 (letter No. 38245 in the Vatican archives), and inviting a continuing study of the doctrinal issues between the two churches.

The document *Saepius Officio* argued that there is a continuity of Anglican belief in the eucharistic sacrifice stretching from the 16th to the 19th century and, since *Saepius Officio* was formally endorsed by the Lambeth Conference in 1930, into the 20th century. At the 1930 Lambeth Conference a delegation of Orthodox bishops asked what Anglicanism teaches on the eucharistic sacrifice. The answer given by the Lambeth committee in charge quoted the passage from *Saepius Officio* mentioned here, and this passage was endorsed by the whole Lambeth Conference in its Resolution 33.

Further, the Malines Conversations, meetings of a group of Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians held in Belgium between 1921 and 1925 under the presidency of Cardinal D.J. Mercier, did stimulate movement for greater unity in sacramental theology and ecclesiology. It was informally agreed by Anglicans and Roman Catholics at Malines that the pope should be given a primacy of honor, that the body and blood of Christ are indeed taken in the eucharist, that the sacrifice of the eucharist is a true sacrifice, but after a mystical manner, and that episcopacy is by divine law.

The impression has been left that the Malines Conversations "ran into the sands and got nowhere"; and yet Pope Paul VI said in 1966 that these conversations were "epoch-making." Why was this so?

First, Malines may be seen as a new start continuing the debate that had begun at the time of *Apostolicae Curae*. Pius XI had no objection to what Cardinal Mercier was doing, and the pope was urged in this direction by his secretary of state, Cardinal Gasparri. This was the same Pietro Gasparri who had been one of the papal commissioners in 1896; his judgment had been that Anglican orders were at the least doubtfully valid.

Second, two key figures at Malines, Lord Halifax and Fernand Portal, had also been key figures in 1896. Malines built on the talks, discussions, lectures and private friendships that Halifax and Portal had kept alive for the 25 years since *Apostolicae Curae*. And there was a real advance from 1896: In 1896 Anglican orders had been considered by a commission that included only Roman Catholics. Malines was a mixed conference with theologians from both sides meeting on a basis of equality.

Finally, by 1925 the Anglican group at Malines expressed conclusions on the eucharistic sacrifice that moved a step closer to the position of Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae*. A memorial written on behalf of the Anglicans by Lord Halifax on May 21, 1925, defined the distinctive priesthood of the ordained ministry in such a way that there is a marked connection to the sacrificial character of the eucharist. The priest is defined as one who offers up the sacrifice of the cross by prayers and a commemorating rite. The faith of Halifax in the eventual triumph of reunion was so strong that even when the Malines conversations came to an end with the death of Cardinal Mercier, Halifax, then in his 90th year, was said to have uttered: "Now for a new departure."[9]

5. The Preparatory Commission for Dialogue Between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church (1967)

Despite the attempts at Malines and individual contacts between scholars and members of religious orders of the two churches, polarization is the word that best describes the debate on Anglican orders down to the 1960s.

Apostolicae Curae produced an enormous amount of literature, Roman Catholic authors generally explaining and defending the papal decision, Anglicans affirming the effective transmission of valid orders in England through the turmoils of the Reformation.[10]

A significant shift in this polarization took place in the context of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Preparatory Commission that was established by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey. At the first meeting of this commission (Gazzada, Italy, January 1967), the documentation from the bishop of Huron was made available to the members. At the second meeting (Huntercombe Manor, England, August-September 1967), the preparatory commission invited two of its members, Canons Findlow and Purdy, to "make a preliminary report on the question of the advisability and/or procedure to be followed in reconsideration of the problem of orders."

Doctrine of the Faith, vol. 18, pp. 429ff. —ARCIC I's Final Report: Preface, Introduction, Conclusion and Authority in the Church II, vol. 11, pp. 693ff. (The Final Report incorporated all the dialogue's agreed statements including three published earlier in Origins: The Eucharist, vol. 1, pp. 486ff; Ministry and Ordination, vol. 3, pp. 401ff; Authority in the Church I, vol. 6, pp. 501ff.)

Two speeches asking how visible unity can begin among divided churches appeared in Origins, vol. 7, no. 45. In one speech, Cardinal George Basil Hume of Westminster, England, asked whether full doctrinal unity on truths that are not fundamental, though not therefore less true, must precede visible unity. Hume's text appeared on pp. 709ff. The other speech, by Jesuit Father Herbert Ryan, examined the path to visible unity. It appeared on pp. 714ff. A note in the margin sections of pp. 714ff gave an overview of a 1970 address by Cardinal Johannes Willebrands — a text given before Origins existed — discussing the concept of a "typos" and of a plurality of "typoi" within the one church of Christ, a concept referred to in the text appearing on these pages.

The Findlow-Purdy report was presented at the last meeting (Mosta, Malta, December 1967-January 1968). It was based in part on a brief memorandum that Canon Findlow had prepared "with the archbishop of Canterbury's knowledge." The memorandum evoked the past (*Apostolicae Curae* and the bull of Paul IV, *Praeclara Carissimi*). It looked at the present (the contemporary approach to sacramentality, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People of 1920, the Church of England-Methodist Proposals). It discarded several suggestions: concentration on the Irish line of Anglican succession or on the work of Archbishop de Dominis, or increasing the Old Catholic participation in Anglican consecrations or making retrospective applications of the apostolic constitution of Pius XII on the matter and form of sacred orders (1948) "as a possible means of validating the invalid." It recognized that "the concept and understanding of the church has developed, as it must, and is developing still." Turning to the future, the memorandum noted that the time has "not quite yet" come for "a reopening of the old question of Anglican orders in the wider context of the whole church on earth, its faith, its ministry and its sacraments." It suggested that a special commission be given the task of outlining a *modus discutiendi* rather than *agendi*.

The Findlow-Purdy report also drew on considerations contained in two papers by Archbishop Henry McAdoo and Bishop Christopher Butler. These papers, however, treated the question of orders only incidentally. The report included a rather lengthy survey of recent literature: J.J. Hughes' books on *Apostolicae Curae*, articles by Daniel O'Hanlon and Franz Josef van Beeck in favor of some recognition of all Protestant ministries, other articles by Harry McSorley and Gregory Baum.

The report concluded by outlining two possible courses of action. First, there could be a joint inquiry by a pair of scholars into *Apostolicae Curae*; this could take account of various criticisms that have been made of the decision of Leo XIII and "consider what aspects of the problem were ignored." Second, another pair of scholars could investigate "the possibility of, and formulae for, a commission or recognition (Lambeth 1920)." In other words, it recommended that a search be initiated for an acceptable form of what is now called the reconciliation of ministries. "This," the report concluded, "is likely to produce quicker results."

As it examined the Findlow-Purdy report, the preparatory commission had in hand a mimeographed essay by a Dominican, Father J. Smith. This is essentially an examination of the then-recent volumes by Francis Clark (*Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, 1956) and J.J. Hughes (*Absolutely Null and Utterly Void*, 1969, and *Stewards of the Lord*, 1970). Smith's judgment is that J.J. Hughes has succeeded "in his main endeavor to bring forth solid arguments to show the validity of Anglican orders." Smith also provides a convenient summary of several suggestions made in modern Roman Catholic theology in favor of the recognition of Anglican orders.

There is "an approach in terms of matter, form and intention" that is inspired by *Apostolicae Curae* but reaches opposite conclusions. In addition, Smith mentions "an approach through the concept:

—"Of reception *in voto* (Kung).

—"Of extraordinary ministers (van Beeck).

—"Of a wider understanding of apostolic succession and an application of the principle of *ecclesia supplet* along the lines of the Orthodox 'economy' (Villain, Tavard)."

> "The recently opened documents in the Vatican inform us that Pope Leo XIII apparently decided that the issue of reconciliation with the Church of England was not a matter of historical continuity alone. More important, to the pope validity was a matter of sacramentology and of ecclesiology."

Toward the end of his essay, Smith explains these suggestions further, and he adds some others:

1. After making "a special study of the teaching of councils and popes about the legitimacy of ministers of the eucharist from Innocent III to Vatican I, McSorley believes that it is within the Roman Catholic Church's power of the keys to declare valid and legitimate ministries she has formerly called invalid or illegitimate."

2. "Kilian McDonnell ... favors an understanding of Reformation ministries as a set of charismatic ministries standing in a different way in the apostolic succession alongside episcopal orders, and believes that they should be acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Church on the principle of *ecclesia supplet* and the working of the 'economy'."

3. Father Coventry draws attention to two meanings of validity: recognition by the (Roman Catholic) Church, and "strength, authenticity, full value," and raises the question of the relationship between these two meanings; this leads him to the view that orders should be "recognized as orders insofar as a church is recognized as church, and not vice versa."

Father Smith's own conclusion is the following:

"It is evident how much the new argument, in all its versions, depends upon the renewal of theology taking place under the stimulus of Vatican II.... The coinherence of church and sacrament is no longer to be understood in a way that makes church character ("ecclesiality") and the sacraments a possession of the Roman Catholic Church that must be jealously guarded and kept to herself alone."

6. The Malta Report (1968)

The recommendation of the preparatory commission was embodied in the Malta Report. This report is the first document issued from an official commission of the two communions that illustrates the emergence of the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders by the Roman Catholic Church.

After examining the documents at its disposal, the preparatory commission included a specific recommendation. Although this Malta Report does not discuss the substance of the question, it notes that the contemporary desire for "intercommunion" points to the urgency of the matter. And it sets the question in the broad context of ecclesiology:

"19. We are agreed that among the conditions required for intercommunion are a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry. The latter presents a particular difficulty in regard to Anglican orders according to the traditional judgment of the Roman church. We believe that the present *growing together of our two communions* and the needs of the future require of us a very serious consideration of this question *in the light of modern theology*. The theology of the ministry forms *part of the theology of the church* and must be considered as such. It is only when sufficient agreement has been reached as to the *nature of the priesthood* and the *meaning attached in this context to the word "validity"* that we could proceed, working always jointly, to the application of this doctrine to the Anglican ministry of today. We would wish to *re-examine historical events* and past documents only to the extent that they can throw light upon the facts of the present situation"(emphasis added).

The points underlined contain the outline of an approach to the matter of Anglican orders. The question should be re-examined 1) in the light of modern theology, 2) and in the context of an ecclesiology of "communion"; 3) the process should include an agreement on the nature of the priesthood, 4) and on the meaning of sacramental validity; 5) but it need not return to the debates concerning the events of the

16th century except if and when this may be necessary to throw light on the modern situation. The contemporary question deals with the advisability of taking a step forward toward the reconciliation of the churches by recognizing Anglican orders today, whatever may have been the problems of the past.

7. The Work of ARCIC I (1970 to 1981): The Formulation of a "Substantial Agreement"

The recommendation of the Malta Report became part of the project of ARCIC I. How this first commission that had charge of the international dialogue between the two communions acted on the recommendation of the Malta Report further illustrates the growth of the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders.

> "In light of new historical documents, 'Apostolicae Curae' did not end a process of dialogue. It began a process of dialogue."

Not all the work proposed by the preparatory commission was attempted. ARCIC I arrived at what it identified as a "substantial agreement" on the sacrament of the eucharist (Windsor Statement, 1971, with the Elucidations of 1979), and on ministry and ordination (Canterbury Statement, 1973, with the Elucidations of 1979). It formulated the beginning of a substantial agreement on authority in the church (Venice Statement, 1976, with the Elucidations of 1981, and the second Windsor Statement, 1981).

The agreed statement on authority in the church included the principle of the primacy of the bishop of Rome in the college of bishops, but not all the range of authority that the Roman Catholic tradition has come to recognize in the primate. Four questions were left open in 1976:

1) The meaning and relevance of the Petrine texts of the New Testament.

2) The question of the divine right (*jus divinum*) that is attributed in the Roman Catholic Church to the Roman primacy and that is seen in the agreed statement as resulting from the divine providence by which God guides the church in its history.

3) The nature and extent of this primatial jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome.

4) The doctrine of papal infallibility as defined at Vatican I and as reformulated at Vatican II.

By 1981 and the publication of the Final Report, substantial agreement was reached on the first two points. Some progress was made on the last two. But the agreement registered was neither complete nor final.

Following the lead of the Malta Report, ARCIC-I did not delve into such historical questions as Cranmer's sacramental theology, the ordination of Matthew Parker as archbishop of Canterbury, the meaning of the bulls of Julius III and Paul IV. It did not investigate what is meant by the validity of sacraments and specifically of the sacrament of orders.

8. ARCIC I and the "Koinonia Ecclesiology"

ARCIC I went beyond what was explicitly foreseen by the preparatory commission regarding ecclesiology, although the Malta Report contained a hint of it. The introduction to the Final Report was itself discussed, composed and endorsed by ARCIC as an agreed statement. It drew attention to the ecclesiology that was at work in the documents of ARCIC and that underlay its claim of having arrived at substantial agreements in matters of doctrine. This ecclesiology was focused on "the concept of *koinonia* (communion)." This concept draws on the close relationship that exists between eucharistic communion and the church as the community that gathers for the eucharistic celebration. It identifies the church precisely as the eucharistic community. Or, in the formula that was used by Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Runcie, in their common declaration of Oct. 3, 1989, "the church is a sign and sacrament of the communion in Christ which God wills for the whole of creation."

ARCIC I saw the notion of communion as the key to the images of the church in the New Testament (No. 4). It embodies the principle of the believers' relationship to God and Christ in the Holy Spirit and to one another in Christ (No. 5). It is related to the eucharist, to ministerial *episcope* and to the primacy (No. 6), to the visibility of the church (No. 7), to the spiritual life of the community of Christians (No. 8) and to the unity that Christ wills for his church (No. 9). It is therefore in the light of its eucharistic doctrine and practice that the continuation of orders in the Anglican Communion is to be assessed. The insight of ARCIC I on the church as communion was in line with a previous study by (the future) Cardinal Jerome Hamer. It has been echoed in much recent writing.[12] In an address given at Great St. Mary's in Cambridge, on Jan. 18, 1970, Cardinal Jan Willebrands described the church of the future in which Anglicans and Roman Catholics will be reconciled. To do so, he drew on an essay in which Dom Emmanuel Lanne had shown that the universal church is not only a communion of communions, but a communion of diverse types of communions. In the universal communion, therefore, several *typoi* of the church must be at home:

"When there is a long coherent tradition, commanding men's love and loyalty, creating and sustaining a harmonious and organic whole of complementary elements, each of which supports and strengthens the others, you have the reality of a *typos*.

"Such complementary elements are many. A characteristic theological method and approach ... a spiritual and devotional tradition ... a characteristic canonical discipline, the fruit also of experience and psychology....

"Through the combination of all these, a *typos* can be specified."[13]

> "The contemporary question deals with the advisability of taking a step forward toward the reconciliation of the churches by recognizing Anglican orders today, whatever may have been the problems of the past."

This trend of thought leads evidently to the idea that contemporary Anglicanism, with its liturgies, its spirituality, its episcopal organization and its customary mode of authority, qualifies as an ecclesial *typos* which would have its proper place in the reconciled universal church. If a *typos* of the church is understood to be a eucharistic community standing in apostolic succession, teaching the Catholic faith and practicing its mode of worship and government within the oneness of the universal church, then the Anglican Communion throughout the world would be such a *typos*.

9. The Notion of "Sister Churches"

The question of the transmission of apostolic succession by way of episcopal ordination is not a matter of sacramental theology only. Since it is in the church that priests and bishops fulfill their tasks, the sacraments are to be seen on the background of ecclesiology. Precisely, Pope Paul VI raised the question of the ecclesial status of the Anglican Communion as he envisaged the future reconciliation of the Anglican and the Roman Catholic churches.

On Oct. 25, 1970, at the canonization of the 40 martyrs of England and Wales, victims of the Reformation, the pope included this passage in his homily:

"There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and the worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church when the Roman Catholic Church — this 'hum-

ble servant of the servants of God' — is able to embrace her ever beloved sister in the one authentic communion of the family of Christ, a communion of origin and of faith, a communion of priesthood and of rule, a communion of the saints in the freedom of love of the Spirit of Jesus. Perhaps we shall have to go on waiting and watching in prayer in order to deserve that blessed day. But already we are strengthened in this hope by the heavenly friendship of the 40 martyrs of England and Wales who are canonized today."[4]

Pope Paul did not call the Anglican Communion a "sister church." Yet by evoking a future embrace of it as the Roman Catholic Church's "ever beloved sister," he implicitly suggested that it has the making of a sister church. In this case, ecclesial sisterhood is virtual. It needs to be elicited and actualized. In other words, Pope Paul proposed a model for the work that should lead to a reconciliation of the two churches.

Precisely, the ecumenical climate is affected by images and symbols, no less than by clear formulations and attitudes. The warmth that is implied in the expressions used by Paul VI contributes to the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders.

10. Vatican II and the Sacramentality of the Episcopate

The new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders results in part from the orientation given by Vatican Council II to sacramental theology. In the Western Middle Ages the scholastic understanding of episcopal ordination differed widely from that which was suggested in the early patristic writings of St. Ignatius of Antioch. For the scholastics, episcopal ordination is simply the solemn granting of wider responsibility and authority to a person who has already received the fullness of the sacrament of orders in sacerdotal ordination. Episcopacy as such was not thought to be a sacrament: The sacrament was the priesthood. In the 16th century, however, the reform of the English ordinal was made on the principle that the ordination of a bishop is as sacramental as that of a priest. Accordingly, the sacramentality of the episcopate has been the common teaching of Anglican theologians.

There was an additional discrepancy in the 16th century between the Roman Catholic and the Anglican understanding of ordination. When Pope Paul IV denied the value of the ordination of Matthew Parker (Dec. 17, 1559), this was due to the fact that the Anglican ordinal included an explicit denial of papal authority. For the pope understood that episcopal ordination, while it does not give sacramental grace, signifies the grant of episcopal jurisdiction by the bishop of Rome.

On these two counts, Vatican II returned to the patristic tradition. In the first place, the constitution *Lumen Gentium* adopted a view of episcopacy that had been increasingly accepted among Catholic theologians, though it had not yet been endorsed magisterially: Being the highest form of the sacrament of orders, the episcopate is itself a sacrament. The conciliar text runs as follows:

"The holy synod teaches that the fullness of the sacrament of orders is conferred by episcopal consecration, that fullness, namely, which both in the liturgical tradition of the church and in the language of the fathers of the church is called the high priesthood, the acme of the sacred ministry.... In fact, from the tradition, which is expressed especially in the liturgical rites and customs of both the Eastern and the Western church, it is abundantly clear that by the imposition of hands and through the words of consecration, the grace of the Holy Spirit is given and a sacred character is imprinted" (No. 21).

> "One may ask if the prevailing mind of the Anglican Communion is still as contrary to the Roman Catholic understanding of eucharist, priesthood and ordination as Pope Leo XIII believed it was."

In the second place, Vatican II taught that the sacramental ordination of bishops introduces them into the episcopal college. From the perspective of Vatican II, hierarchical communion is also needed for incorporation into the episcopal college. The bishops' jurisdiction therefore pertains to them as "vicars and legates of Christ," not as "vicars of the Roman pontiffs" (*Lumen Gentium*, 27).

These reforms of the Catholic theology of the episcopate contributed to the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders. This is all the more striking as they were followed by a reform of the ritual of ordination.

11. The Reform of the Sacrament of Orders by Pius XII (1947) and Paul VI (1972)

Already Pope Pius XII, in the apostolic constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* (Nov. 30, 1947) explicitly excluded the "porrection" of instruments from the "matter" of ordination. In this ceremony of medieval origin the ordinand touches a chalice that is presented by the ordaining bishop. This gesture, the pope declared, was not required "by the will of our Lord Jesus Christ for the substance and validity of the sacrament." Furthermore, "if it was at one time made necessary to (the sacrament's) value by the church's will and statute, all know that the church can change and abrogate its statutes." The matter of the sacrament is simply the laying on of hands, that is of biblical origin. For the priesthood, it is "the first laying on of hands, that is done in silence"; for episcopacy, it is "the laying on of hands that is done by the consecrator." As to the form, it is in both cases contained in the "preface."

The logical consequence was drawn by Pope Paul VI. Through a series of *motu proprio* documents, Pope Paul reformed the sacrament of orders. In *Sacrum Diaconatus Ordinem* (June 18, 1968), he re-established the permanent diaconate. In *Pontificalis Romani Recognitio* (June 18, 1968), the Latin rite for the ordination of bishops came closer to the Oriental rite; in the ordination of priests he "brought closer unity to the rite," doing away with the porrection of instruments. For the three sacred orders, Pope Paul specified which "words of the consecratory prayer ... belong to the essential nature (of the sacrament), so that they are required for the validity of the action."[5] These are for the priesthood:

"Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, his famulis tuis presbyterii dignitatem; innova in visceribus eorum Spiritum sanctitatis: acceptum a te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineant, censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuent." (Almighty Father, grant to these servants of yours the dignity of the priesthood. Renew within them the Spirit of holiness. As co-workers with the order of bishops may they be faithful to the ministry that they received from you, Lord God, and be to others a model of right conduct.)

For the episcopate, the words are:

"Et nunc effunde super hunc electum eam virtutem, quae a te est, Spiritum principalem, quem dedisti dilecto Filio tuo Jesu Christo, quem ipse donavit sanctis apostolis, qui constituerunt ecclesiam per singula loca ut sanctuarium tuum, in gloriam et laudem indeficientem nominis tui." (So now pour out upon this chosen one that power which is from you, the governing Spirit whom you gave to your beloved Son Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by him to the holy apostles, who founded the church in every place to be your temple for the unceasing glory and praise of your name.)

In *Ministeria Quaedam* (Aug. 15, 1972), Paul VI abolished the minor orders of porter and exorcist and the subdiaconate (keeping the ministries of lector and acolyte). In *Ad Pascendum* (same date), he established norms for the permanent diaconate and for admission of candidates to the priesthood.

The chief thrust of this reform

was to simplify and clarify the ritual of ordination. Unlike the reform of the ordinal that was effected in the 16th century by Archbishop Cranmer, the reform of Paul VI was not tied to a shift in the theology of the church or of the sacraments. Paul VI himself formulated his principle: to keep close to the patristic rites and to those of the Oriental church. Yet by so doing, he also narrowed the gap between the Anglican ordinal and the pontifical. Thus the Roman reform of the ritual of ordination helped to shape the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders.

12. The Letter of Cardinal Willebrands on Apostolicae Curae (1985)

In the conclusion of the Canterbury Statement on ministry, ARCIC I recognized the emergence of a new context:

"17. We are fully aware of the issues raised by the judgment of the Roman Catholic Church on Anglican orders. The development of the thinking in our two communions regarding the nature of the church and of the ordained ministry as represented in our statement has, we consider, put these issues in a new context. Agreement on the nature of ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries. What we have to say represented the consensus of the commission on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence.... Nevertheless we consider that our consensus, on questions where agreement is indispensable for unity, offers a positive contribution to the reconciliation of our churches and of their ministries."

The nature of this new context was explored in a letter addressed by Cardinal Willebrands to the co-chairs of ARCIC II (July 13, 1985). The president of the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity recognized that a "new context" is now affecting the discussion of Anglican orders. He approved the principle that a study of the question "cannot be a purely historical one." The cardinal summed up *Apostolicae Curae:* Leo XIII's decision rested on the belief that the Anglican ordinal betrays a *nativa indoles ac spiritus*, a "natural character and spirit," that was judged unacceptable by the pope. This *nativa indoles* was found in "the deliberate omission of all references to some of the principal axes of Catholic teaching concerning the relationship of the eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ and to the consequence of this for an understanding of the nature of the Christian priesthood."

In the light of the liturgical renewal, the cardinal drew the conclusion that the doctrinal agreements of ARCIC I, once endorsed by the proper authorities of the Anglican Communion in a solemn "profession of faith," could remove what Leo XIII perceived as the Anglican *nativa indoles*. This in turn could "lead to a new evaluation of the sufficiency of these Anglican rites as far as concerns future ordinations." Such a study could prescind "at this stage from the question of the continuity in the apostolic succession of the ordaining bishop."[16]

Thus the new context that is now in the making may make it possible to reach a decision for the future without passing judgment on the past.

13. The Response of the Lambeth Conference (1988)

One of the conditions of Cardinal Willebrands has now been met by the Anglicans at the 1988 Lambeth Conference, which officially recognized the agreed statements of ARCIC on eucharistic doctrine, ministry and ordination, and their elucidations as "consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans." These statements can now be used pastorally and academically as examples of the doctrinal teaching of the Anglican Communion, and they point to a convergence in theology of ministry and eucharist which brings to an end the era of polarization.

Lambeth voted that such an agreement on eucharist and ministry offers a sufficient basis for taking "the next step forward" toward the reconciliation of ministries of the two churches grounded in this agreement in faith. The willingness expressed in Lambeth Resolution 7 to explore even more seriously with Roman Catholics "the concept of a universal primacy in conjunction with collegiality" is related to the need for a "personal focus" of unity and affection and the realization that such a universal primacy would symbolize and strengthen in new ways the fundamental unity of the human family.

In preparing for Lambeth 1988, the provinces of the Anglican Communion also gave a clear yes to Lambeth on both the statement on eucharistic doctrine and the statement on ministry of ARCIC I. No province rejected the statement in the Final Report that "the eucharist is a sacrifice in the sacramental sense," and many were extremely positive that the Final Report is "a helpful clarification" that "sufficiently expresses Anglican understanding." The provinces also reacted in a positive manner to this statement of the Final Report: "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." The provinces saw such a statement as giving help "to further the reconciliation of ministries and growth toward full communion."

In the light of the debate since *Apostolicae Curae*, the Lambeth Conference resolutions on ARCIC I assume historic proportions. And further, not only the Lambeth Conference, but now also 25 of the 27 provinces of the Anglican Communion have accepted the eucharistic doctrine and ministry sections of the Final Report. One may ask if the prevailing mind of the Anglican Communion is still as contrary to the Roman Catholic understanding of eucharist, priesthood and ordination as Pope Leo XIII believed it was.[17]

14. Significant Gestures

The relationships between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church are now evolving in a context that is marked not only by an ecumenical shift in doctrine and liturgy, but also by a growing number of ecumenical events that have allowed the archbishops of Canterbury and the bishops of Rome to know each other personally.

Archbishop Fisher was received by John XXIII on a private "visit of courtesy" on Dec. 2, 1960. Archbishop Ramsey paid an official visit to Paul VI in March 1966. On this occasion, the two bishops joined in leading a prayer service at St. Paul-Outside-the-Walls. Pope Paul called this "not yet a visit of perfect unity, but ... a visit of friendship placing us on the way to unity."[18] In an unusual symbolic gesture, he passed his own episcopal ring from his finger to that of the archbishop of Canterbury. Archbishop Coggan was received by Paul VI in April 1977, and they jointly presided at a liturgy of the word in the Sistine Chapel.

John Paul II paid an official visit to the cathedral of Canterbury, where he was received by Archbishop Runcie (May 1982). This visit was returned when Archbishop Runcie came to Rome in September-October 1989. On this occasion the two prelates worshiped together at the Church of St Gregory, from which Gregory the Great had sent Augustine to England to preach the Gospel to the Anglo-Saxons.

It is apparent that such symbolic gestures can be diversely assessed. By themselves, they do not imply that the difficulties faced by Leo XIII are no longer operative. Yet their cumulative effect reinforces the impression that relations between the two communions have entered a phase marked by serenity and cordiality. This is a feature of the new context for the evaluation of Anglican orders.

15. Conclusion

The purpose of the present survey has been to draw attention to the changing climate between the Anglican and the Roman Catholic communions since the condemnation of Anglican orders by Leo XIII. There has been a

growth in understanding and friendship between members of the two churches. Vatican Council II marked a point of no return. With the creation of the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity, the wish to substitute dialogue for polemic was given an institutional instrument. The movement of rapprochement has begun to bear fruit in the work of ARCIC I, ARCIC II, and a number of regional and national joint commissions.

A new context for the resolution of pending problems between the churches is thus in the making. This context is now posing new questions. Among them there is that of a possible re-evaluation of Anglican orders by the Roman Catholic magisterium. To what extent the new context allows for new approaches to the apostolic letter *Apostolicae Curae* and to its conclusion is a question that deserves discussion. To what extent this context has also been negatively affected by the ordination of women in the Anglican Communion is itself a point that should receive careful examination.

At the conclusion of the present report, ARC/USA invites theologians of their two churches to assess anew the past and present climate of their relationships as well as this report and to suggest possible ways forward to preserve and promote the ecumenical impact of Vatican II and of the recent dialogues, even in the face of whatever serious difficulties still exist.

ARC/USA trusts that its own efforts will contribute to the clarification of at least some of the issues involved in the assessment of the new context in which the churches now live.

Footnotes

[1] The bishop of Huron had his correspondence with Pope Paul printed and distributed widely: *A Local Item in the Roman Catholic-Anglican Dialogue ... 1965-1966*, 7 pages.

[2] The definitive Latin text of *Apostolicae Curae* is in Leonis XIII, *Acta*, Vol. XVI, Rome, 1897, pp. 258-275. In G. Rambaldi, "A proposito della Bolla *Apostolicae Curae* di Leone XIII," *Gregorianum* (61, 4, 1980), pp. 677-743, Rambaldi provides the entire text of the first scheme of an Italian draft by Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, the first Latin text and the final text. For an English edition see *Apostolicae Curae*, trans. by G.D. Smith (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1956) and *Anglican Orders* (English) (London: SPCK, 1957).

[3] The foundation of any new look at *Apostolicae Curae* has to be the new material now open to us in the Vatican archives. This consists primarily of four dossiers: 1. Segreteria di Stato, Anno 1901, Rubrica 66, Fasc. 1, 2, 3; 2. Epistola ad Principe, 142; 3. Lettere Latine, 1896; 4. Spoglia Rampolla, pacco 3.

These materials add new information to our understanding of the preparation and meaning of *Apostolicae Curae* in the following ways:

1. Here we find the previously unpublished positive *Vota* of Louis Duchesne and Emilio de Augustinis with negative hand-written comments in English, perhaps expressing the views of the negative papal commissioners. Spoglia Rampolla contains the manuscript of a positive evaluation by Baron Friedrich von Hugel, "Memoire, addresse par ordre a son Eminence la Cardinal Rampolla sur les Rapports entre les Catholiques Anglais et les Anglicans," dated December 1895.

2. Here we find the various drafts of *Apostolicae Curae* from the first scheme of a full Italian draft by Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, prefect of the Papal Palace, through the definitive Latin text. The various drafts contain changes and notations in Leo XIII's hand, so that we can see how the pope shaped the final versions of the document and came to his own conclusions on the issue of Anglican orders.

3. In addition, there are many letters of Cardinal Mariano Rampolla del Tindaro (1843-1913), the papal secretary of state, who maintained an extensive correspondence with the Anglican hierarchy and with Lord Halifax, the president of the English Church Union, W.E. Gladstone, the prime minister of Great Britain, Fernand Portal, the French priest who had worked closely with Lord Halifax, the scholars Louis Duchesne, Pietro Gasparri, Emilio de Augustinis, Friedrich von Hugel and Luigi Tosti, the abbot of Monte Cassino. Rampolla emerges as the Vatican figure who is the leading advocate of reconciliation with the Anglicans. There are also reports from the future Cardinal Raphael Merry del Val, an opponent of reconciliation with the Anglicans, building a case against the validity of the Anglican orders, as well as letters from the English, Irish and Scottish Roman Catholic hierarchy urging no recognition of validity.

[4] Recent publications in Italian and French make the positions of all the papal commissioners available to us today. 1) Louis Duchesne, of the Institute Catholique in Paris — G. Rambaldi, "La memoria di Mg. L. Duchesne sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane ed un suo esame critico contemporaneo," *Gregorianum* (62, 4, 1981), pp. 681-746. Here Rambaldi provides the entire French text of Duchesne's positive evaluation of Anglican orders, "Memoire sur les ordinations Anglicanes," with a historical introduction which shows how Duchesne was involved by Leo XIII and Cardinal Rampolla in the project. More on Duchesne's position is contained in G. Rambaldi, "Leone XIII e la memoria di L. Duchesne sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane," *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* (19, 1981), pp. 333-345. 2) Emilio de Augustinis, rector of the Gregorian University in Rome — G. Rambaldi, "Il Voto del Padre Emilio de Augustinis sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* (50, 1981), pp. 48-75. Here Rambaldi provides the entire Italian text of de Augustinis' positive evaluation of Anglican orders, "Sulla Validita delle Ordinazioni Anglicane," with a historical introduction. More on de Augustinis' position in relation to the constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of Pius XII and the 1985 letter of Cardinal Willebrands on *Apostolicae Curae* can be found in G. Rambaldi, "La Sostanza del Sacramento dell Ordine e la validita delle ordinazioni Anglicane secondo E. De Augustinis, S. J.," *Gregorianum* (70, 1, 1989), pp. 47-91. 3) Pietro Gasparri of the Institut Catholique in Paris — Pietro Gasparri, *De la valeur des Ordinations Anglicanes* (Paris, 1895). 4) T.B. Scannell, an English Roman Catholic parish priest from Kent. His position and that of his three colleagues are analyzed and contrasted with the negative opinion, in G. Rambaldi, "La bolla *Apostolicae Curae* di Leone XIII sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane — I," *Gregorianum* (64, 4, 1983), pp. 631-667, and "La bolla *Apostolicae Curae* di Leone XIII sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane — II," *Gregorianum* (66, 1, 1985), pp. 53-88. The substance of Scannell's position can be found in three letters to the Tablet: Aug. 24, 1895; Oct. 19, 1895; Nov. 9, 1895.

[5] For analysis in English of the new historical materials in the Vatican archives see three articles of R.W. Franklin, "The Historic Episcopate and the Roman Church: From Huntington's Quadrilateral to 1988," in *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, ed. by J. Robert Wright (London, Oxford and Cincinnati: Mowbray and Forward Movement, 1988), pp. 98-110; "*Apostolicae Curae* of 1896 Reconsidered: Cardinal Willebrands' Letter to ARCIC II," Ecumenical Trends (15, 5, 1986), pp. 80-82; "The Historical Foundations of *Apostolicae Curae*," Ecumenical Trends (16, 2, 1987), pp. 24-29. See George Tavard, *A Review of Anglican Orders: The Problem and the Solution* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press: Michael Glazier Books, forthcoming in 1990-1991).

[6] G. Rambaldi reconstructs the stages of the pope's thinking from the response to the positive commissioners through the various drafts and schema of *Apostolicae Curae* in two articles, "A proposito della Bolla *Apostolicae Curae* di Leone XIII," *Gregorianum* (61, 4, 1980), pp. 677-743; "Relazione e voto del Raffaele Pierotti, O.P., Maestro del S. Palazzo Apostolico sulle Ordinazioni Anglicane," *Archivum Historiae Pontificae* (20, 1982), pp. 337-388.

[7] The letter of Leo XIII to the archbishop is found in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* (29, 1896-1897), pp. 664. The importance of this sentence in any future evaluation of Anglican orders was underlined by James O'Connor in a paper on *Apostolicae Curae* presented to ARC/USA in July 1987. The larger context of the sentence is discussed by G. Rambaldi, "Una Lettera del Cardinale Richard sulla Fine della 'Revue Anglo-Romaine,'" *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* (18, 1980), pp. 403-410. The encouraging letters of Cardinal Rampolla quoted here are to Cardinal Domenico Ferrata, pro-nuncio in Paris, Sept. 24, 1896 (33180 in Vatican archives) and to Abbot Luigi Tosti of Monte Cassino, Oct. 9, 1896 (33468 in Vatican archives). Other letters encouraging dialogue and contact were sent by Cardinal Rampolla to Lord Halifax on March 15, 1897 (36409) and to Frederick Temple, archbishop of Canterbury on June 21, 1897 (38245). The Vatican initiative toward Anglicanism in the 1890s and the complex understanding of reconciliation within the Curia are discussed by G. Rambaldi in two articles, "Un Documento Inedito sull' Origine della Lettera di Leone XIII 'Ad Anglos,' *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* (24, 1986), pp. 405-414; "Verso l' Incontro tra Cattolici e Anglicani negli Anni 1894-1896, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* (25, 1987), pp. 365-410. The sentiments of Halifax are quoted in Roger Greenacre, *Lord Halifax* (London: Church Literature Association, 1983) p. 17. See also Regis Ladous: *L'Abbe Portal et la Campagne Anglo-Romaine, 1890-1912* (Lyon: Universite de Lyon, 1973).

[8] *Saepius Officio* (London: The Church Literature Association, 1977), pp. 13-16, 38-39. For a more complete analysis of *Saepius Officio* see E.R. Hardy, "Priesthood and Sacrifice in the English Church," The Holy Cross Magazine (July 1943), pp. 1-10. Other important Anglican letters to Rome after *Apostolicae Curae* encouraging dialogue and found in the Vatican archives are W.E. Gladstone to Abbot Luigi Tosti, Sept. 23, 1896 (33468), Lord Halifax to Cardinal Rampolla, March 5, 1897 (36409) and March 20, 1897 (36681), Frederick Temple, archbishop of Canterbury, to Leo XIII, April 4, 1897 (38245) and to Cardinal Rampolla April 1, 1897 (38245). *The Lambeth Conferences: 1867-1948* (London, 1948), p. 128.

[9] Leo XIII, in the French and Latin response to *Saepius Officio* (Letter 38245 in Vatican archives) argues that despite "the preservation of Catholic traditions in England ... the doctrine discussed in your brochure on ordination and on the priesthood as well as on the sacrifice of the Mass show that your doctrine is not that

of the Roman Catholic Church." For new documentation on Malines see John A. Dick, *The Malines Conversations Revisited* (Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1990). Paul VI is quoted by Owen Chadwick in the Tablet (Feb. 17, 1990), p. 216. Excerpts from the memorial of Halifax can be found in G.K.A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity: Second Series* (London, 1930), pp. 36-37. Halifax is quoted in Margot Mayne, "Catholic Reunion: The Noble Cause," Church Observer (Spring 1984), p. 14.

[10] The most complete bibliography through 1968 is given in John Jay Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void* (Washington and Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1968), pp. 309-342.

[11] Alan C. Clark and Colin Davey, *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue. The Work of the Preparatory Commission* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 112-113. This is reprinted in Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Final Report* (London: CTS/SPCK 1982), pp. 114-115.

[12] See Jerome Hamer, *The Church Is a Communion* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); Jean-Marie Tillard, *Eglise d'Eglises. L'ecclesiologie de communion* (Paris: Le Cerf, 1987).

[13] Secretariat for Christian Unity Information Bulletin (March 11, 1970), p. 14.

[14] Quoted in Robert Hale, *Canterbury and Rome. Sister Churches* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), p. 16.

[15] These texts are quoted from La Documentation Catholique (Paris, July 7, 1968, n. 1520, col. 1169), and the English translation is taken from *The Rites of the Catholic Church as Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI* vol. 2 (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1980), pp. 83 and 95.

[16] Origins (1987), pp. 662-663. The phrase *nativa ordinalis indoles ac spiritus* appears first in *Apostolicae Curae* on p. 270 (736-737). Not all recent letters from Rome on Anglican relations have had the positive tone of Cardinal Willlebrands'. An important critique of The Final Report has come from the prefect of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, "Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC," *Enchiridion Vaticanum*, vol. 8 (Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1984). For Cardinal Ratzinger, the Final Report "does not yet constitute a substantial and explicit agreement on some essential elements of Catholic faith." Similarly, the Committee on Doctrine of the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, in its "Evaluation of the ARCIC Final Report," Origins (14:25, 1984), pp. 409-413, found that "an unfinished agenda precludes our saying at present that this doctrinal agreement in faith includes all that is essential for full communion between the two churches." Some recent Roman Catholic publications have defended the conclusions of *Apostolicae Curae* on Anglican orders. See Christopher Monckton, *Anglican Orders: Null and Void?* (Canterbury: Family History Books, 1987); and Brian W. Harrison, "The Vatican and Anglican Orders," Homiletic and Pastoral Review (89:1, 1988), pp. 10-19.

[17] The full texts of the Lambeth resolutions may be found in the Ecumenical Bulletin (November-December 1988), pp. 19-21; the Final Report, pp. 20, 35; see also on these points Emmanuel Sullivan, "The 1988 Lambeth Conference and Ecumenism," Ecumenical Trends (17:10, 1988), pp. 145-148; and Thomas Ryan, "The 1988 Lambeth Conference," America (Sept. 24, 1988), pp. 162-164.

[18] La Documentation Catholique (April 17, 1966, n. 1469, col. 673, note 1). See also Edward Yarnold, *Anglican Orders — A Way Forward?* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1977).