

Catholic Church. National Conference of Catholic
Bishops

Documents on Anglican Roman...

III

~~AD 1979~~

FEB 13 1979

COLLEGE LIBRARY
BETHLEHEM UNIV

Ecumenical movement

**DOCUMENTS
ON
ANGLICAN
ROMAN CATHOLIC
RELATIONS**

**A
R
C
D
O
C
III**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

DOCUMENTS
ON
ANGLICAN ROMAN
CATHOLIC RELATIONS
III

Compiled by
BISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON
ECUMENICAL and INTERRELIGIOUS
AFFAIRS

in Cooperation with the
JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

1976
Publications Office
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC COMMISSION IN THE U.S.A. AGREED STATEMENT ON THE PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH	1
THE ECCLESIAL NATURE OF THE EUCHARIST, A report by the Join Study Group	12
COVENANTS, Covenant Relationship	36
JOINT PASTORAL LETTER, Bless These Beginnings	56
WHERE ANGLICANS AND ROMAN CATHOLICS AGREE, The Text of Bishop Clark's Address to the Anglican Synod on November 7, 1974	59
FIFTH MEETING OF THE ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC COMMISSION ON MARRIAGE	70
THE CANTERBURY STATEMENT	74
APPENDIX, ARC Response to ARCIC Canterbury Statement ..	82
ROMAN CATHOLIC—EPISCOPALIAN MARRIAGES	90

Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission In The U.S.A. Agreed Statement On The Purpose Of The Church

I. INTRODUCTION

1. As Roman Catholics and Episcopalians living in the United States today, we have been charged by our churches to explore the possibility that there is a fundamental unity between us on the deepest levels of Christian faith and life. Roman Catholics and Episcopalians believe that there is but one Church of Christ,¹ yet we find ourselves living in separate churches.

2. Those who went before us in the faith lived in one communion for many centuries. This fellowship was broken in the sixteenth century, yet our two churches continue to share "many elements of sanctification and truth" which "possess an inner dynamism toward Catholic unity."² We follow one Lord; we profess the ancient Creeds and confess one Baptism; we hear God's Word in the Scriptures; we revere the Fathers and the ancient Councils; we cherish similar structures of worship and episcopal succession. Thus, our estrangement of four centuries has been far from complete. In fact, recent authoritative statements and liturgical texts of both our churches which we have examined³ show a remarkable convergence in their answers to fundamental questions such as these:

Where does the Church come from and why does it exist?

Where is the Church going and what should it be doing here and now? In short, what is the *purpose* of the Church?

3. Since the prayer of the Church is the most intense expression of our faith in God and commitment to his purpose for the world, and since the Eucharist is seen in both our churches as bringing us into a new relationship of union with Christ and with one another in his sacramental Body and Blood,⁴ we have decided together to write our common belief about the Church's purpose or mission, in answer to the above questions, in a context inter-

woven with prayers from our contemporary Eucharistic liturgies. We invite the reader to reflect upon this relationship between prayer and belief in the statement that follows. In the parallel passages that we quote, liturgical texts used in the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Churches are placed, respectively, in the left and right hand columns.⁵

II. WHERE DOES THE CHURCH COME FROM AND WHY DOES IT EXIST?

4. Both our churches witness to the fact that the Church comes from God who sent Jesus Christ his Son in the power of the Spirit to accomplish the mystery of salvation and redemption. Christ announced the Kingdom and proclaimed the Good News. The Church is that community of persons called by the Holy Spirit to continue Christ's saving work of reconciliation.⁶ As Christ proclaimed the Kingdom, so the Church serves the Kingdom, so that "the entire world may become the people of God, the Body of the Lord, and the Temple of the Holy Spirit, that in, by, and through Christ there may be rendered to God the Creator and Father of the universe all honor and glory."⁷

God of all power, Ruler of the
Universe,
you are worthy of glory and praise.
Glory to you for ever and ever.

At your command all things came to
be,
the vast expanse of interstellar space,
galaxies, suns, the planets in their
courses,
and this fragile earth, our island
home:

By your will they were created and
have their being.

From the primal elements you have
brought forth the race of man,
and blessed us with memory, reason,
and skill;
you made us the rulers of creation.

Therefore, we praise you,
joining with the heavenly chorus,
with prophets, apostles, and martyrs,
and with men of every generation who
have looked to you in hope:
to proclaim with them your glory,
in their unending hymn:

Father in heaven, it is right that we
should give you thanks and glory:
you alone are God, living and true.
Through all eternity you live in
unapproachable light.
Source of life and goodness, you
have created all things, to fill your
creatures with every blessing
and lead all men to the joyful
vision of your light.

Countless hosts of angels stand before
you to do your will;
they look upon your splendor
and praise you night and day.
United with them, and in the name of
every creature under heaven,
we too praise your glory as we sing:

Holy, holy, holy Lord,
God of power and might.
Heaven and earth are full of your
glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name
of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

III. WHERE IS THE CHURCH GOING AND WHAT SHOULD IT BE DOING HERE AND NOW?

5. Many in our churches ask the questions, "Where is the Church going?" and "What should it be doing here and now?" Some feel the Church is engaged in a fruitless, self-serving enterprise which fails to come to grips with the challenges posed by the world today. Others ask in bewilderment whether the Church has abandoned its spiritual calling. We find this restlessness and bewilderment among clergy and laity in both our churches. On the one hand, this situation is partially rooted in the churches' awareness of "the cry of those who suffer violence and are oppressed by unjust systems and structures (in a world whose) perversity contradicts the plan of its Creator."⁸ On the other hand, it is partially produced by movements of renewal and new responses to the Spirit within our churches, such as the charismatic movement, the liturgical movement, new forms of piety, and developments in biblical study and catechesis.

6. In the midst of the long history of human selfishness and sin, we hear the story of God's redeeming action for us and all mankind calling us to re-examine our faithfulness to our mission.

Holy and gracious Father,
in your infinite love you made us for
yourself;
and when we fell into sin
and became subject to evil and death,
you, in your mercy, sent Jesus Christ,
your only and eternal Son,
to share our human nature,
to live and die as one of us
to reconcile us to you,
the God and Father of all.

Father, we acknowledge your
greatness:
all your actions show your wisdom
and love.
You formed man in your own likeness
and set him over the whole world
to serve you, his creator,
and to rule over all creatures.
Even when he disobeyed you and
lost your friendship
you did not abandon him to the
power of death,
but helped all men to seek and find
you.
Again and again you offered a
covenant to man,
and through the prophets taught him
to hope for salvation.

7. In our re-examination, we need to be constantly reminded that "the Church is not a man-made society of like-minded people who are trying to live Christian lives and to exert some kind of Christian influence upon the world."⁹ Rather, it is a community created and called by God. Its task is evangelization and salvation: to be an instrument of God's work in the world focused in the saving and liberating mission of Jesus Christ. It must, therefore, look to him for the example and style of its mission and to the Holy Spirit for the power to accomplish it.¹⁰

8. Our churches have understood that this mission of witness to Jesus Christ is to be carried out by the proclamation of the Good News, the praise of God's Name, and service to all people. This mission is carried out in the context of the fellowship of believers, and it is the responsibility of all—not just some—of the Church's members.¹¹ The corporate character of this witness springs from the nature of the Church as the Body of Christ.

9. The witness which the Church is called upon to give must first find expression in the lives of its individual members and in the Church's regulation of its own structures and agencies. Only then can it become a light to the world¹² and find expression in the structures of society.

Almighty and everliving God, you
have fed us with the spiritual food
of the most precious Body and
Blood of your Son, our Saviour
Jesus Christ;

You have assured us, in these Holy
Mysteries, that we are living
members of the Body of your Son,
and heirs of your eternal kingdom.

And now, Father, send us out to do
the work you have given us to do,
to love and serve you as faithful
witnesses of Christ our Lord.

To him, to you, and to the Holy Spirit,
be honor and glory now and for
ever. Amen.

Lord Jesus Christ,
we worship you living among us in
the sacrament of your Body and
Blood.

May we offer to our Father in heaven a
solemn pledge of undivided love.

May we offer to our brothers and
sisters a life poured out in loving
service of that kingdom
where you live with the Father and
the Holy Spirit,
one God for ever and ever.

A. Proclamation of the Gospel

10. The first thing the Church should be doing here and now is proclaiming the Gospel. The original Gospel was not only a message preached but also a life lived, and for this reason our

proclamation today must involve not only preaching in words but also witness in deeds.¹³ The Church proclaims Jesus as Lord and Savior, both in its preaching and in its witness, and the response it asks is a following in both word and deed. The task of proclamation and likewise the necessity of response, moreover, are an obligation not only for individuals but also for the Church as a whole.

Therefore, O Lord and Holy Father,
we your people
celebrate here before your Divine
Majesty,
with these holy Gifts which we offer
to you,
the memorial of the blessed Passion
and precious Death of your dear Son,
his mighty Resurrection and glorious
Ascension,
looking for his Coming again in
power and great glory.
And with these Gifts, O Lord, we
offer to you ourselves,
for this is our duty and service.
And we pray you, in your goodness
and mercy, to accept,
through the eternal mediation of our
Savior Jesus Christ, this our sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving.
Gracious Father, in your almighty
power,
bless and sanctify us and these holy
Mysteries
with your Life-giving Word and Holy
Spirit;
fill with your grace all who partake
of the Body and Blood of our Lord
Jesus Christ;
make us one Body that he may dwell
in us and we in him.
And grant that with boldness
we may confess your Name in
constancy of faith,
and at the last Day enter with all your
Saints
into the joy of your eternal kingdom.

Father, calling to mind the death your
Son endured for our Salvation, his
glorious resurrection and ascension
into heaven, and ready to greet
him when he comes again,
we offer you in thanksgiving this holy
and living sacrifice.

Look with favor on your Church's
offering, and see the Victim whose
death has reconciled us to yourself.
Grant that we, who are nourished by
his body and blood, may be filled
with his Holy Spirit, and become
one body,
one spirit in Christ.

May he make us an everlasting gift to
you and enable us to share in the
inheritance of your saints,
with Mary, the virgin mother of God;
with the apostles, the martyrs, and
all your saints, on whose constant
intercession we rely for help.

Lord, may this sacrifice, which has
made our peace with you, advance
the peace and salvation of all the
world.

11. Both in proclaiming the Gospel and in responding to it, the Church remembers with its Lord the words of the prophet as recorded in the Good News according to St. Luke (4:18-19): "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to

set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." These words of Scripture, we believe, as well as the words of our Eucharistic liturgies, lead us to affirm that "action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world" are fully a "constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel."¹⁴ This is to say, the Gospel as a word of reconciliation must be embodied in efforts to bring about social justice,¹⁵ and in particular the Church must address itself to the questions posed by technological change. Such change, which is inevitable in the modern world, adds urgency and brings new opportunities for Christian mission. To the negative effects of technology, the Church must proclaim a word of challenge and even, at times, confrontation, whereas the positive effects of technology should receive the Church's active promotion; in both cases, however, the Church must seek to evaluate these effects and then make its voice heard. The imperative of evangelism, therefore, has many dimensions.¹⁶

B. Worship

12. The Church which proclaims God's Word expresses its own life most fully when it gathers as a community for worship, especially the celebration of the Eucharist, which is the summit and source of its mission.¹⁷ Worship, indeed, is part of the mission of the Church, for it testifies to the dependence of all people upon God and it affirms God's action for humanity in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the promise of the gift of the Spirit, and in our ultimate destiny of union with the Father.

He stretched out his arms upon the
Cross,
and offered himself, in obedience to
your will,
a perfect sacrifice for all mankind.

On the night he was handed over to
suffering and death,
our Lord Jesus Christ took bread;
and when he had given thanks to you,
he broke it, and gave it to his
disciples,
and said, "Take this and eat it:
This is my Body, which is given for
you.
Do this for the remembrance of me."

After supper he took the cup of wine;
and when he had given thanks, he

Father, you are holy indeed,
and all creation rightly gives you
praise.
All life, all holiness comes from you
through your Son, Jesus Christ our
Lord,
by the working of the Holy Spirit.
From age to age you gather a people
to yourself,
so that from east to west
a perfect offering may be made
to the glory of your name.

And so, Father, we bring you these
gifts.
We ask you to make them holy by
the power of your Spirit,
that they may become the body and
blood

gave it to them,
and said, "Drink this, all of you:
This is my Blood of the new Covenant,
which is shed for you and for many
for the forgiveness of sins.

Whenever you drink it, do this for the
remembrance of me."

Therefore, Father, we recall the
mystery of faith:

of your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ,
at whose command we celebrate this
eucharist.

On the night he was betrayed,
he took bread and gave you thanks
and praise.

He broke the bread, gave it to his
disciples, and said:

Take this, all of you, and eat it;
This is my body which will be given
up for you.

When supper was ended, he took the
cup.

Again he gave you thanks and praise,
gave the cup to his disciples, and said:
Take this, all of you, and drink from it;
This is the cup of my blood,
The blood of the new and everlasting
covenant.

It will be shed for you and for all men
So that sins may be forgiven.

Do this in memory of me.
Let us proclaim the mystery of faith:

Christ has died,
Christ is risen,
Christ will come again.

13. To many contemporary Christians; moreover, the witness of worship is only fully complete when it results in a commitment to service.

C. Service

14. The imperative of viewing the Church's purpose in the context of "Service" (*diakonia*) has deep roots both in Holy Scripture and in the documents of our respective traditions.¹⁸ While this call to serve others and to place our resources at the service of others is recognized and widely discussed in each of our churches, we must confess that it does not appear that either of us has yet found the means to carry out this aspect of mission as successfully as we might. This presents a particular problem as well as a special opportunity to those Church members who find themselves among the affluent, for they possess, under God, particular means whereby the Church may become more fully a servant people, a sign of hope on mankind's way.¹⁹ One of the major challenges facing our churches is the cultivation of an awareness of "unjust systems and structures" that oppress human freedom, maintain situations of gross inequality, and facilitate

individual selfishness.²⁰ Forms of Christian service which do not take these structures into account are not adequate for the complexities of our day.

Lord God of our Fathers,
God of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob,
God and Father of our Lord Jesus
Christ:
open our eyes to see your hand at
work in the world about us.
Deliver us from the presumption of
coming to this Table
for solace only, and not for strength;
for pardon only, and not for renewal.
Let the grace of this Holy Communion
make us one body, one spirit in Christ,
that we may worthily serve the world
in his name.
Risen Lord, be known to us in the
breaking of the Bread.

Father, you so loved the world
that in the fullness of time you sent
your only Son to be our Savior.
He was conceived through the power
of the Holy Spirit, and born of the
Virgin Mary,
a man like us in all things but sin.
To the poor he proclaimed the good
news of salvation,
to prisoners, freedom,
and to those in sorrow, joy.
In fulfillment of your will
he gave himself up to death;
but by rising from the dead,
he destroyed death and restored life.

15. Our contemporary re-examination of mission has emphasized the call of the Church to serve as an agent and forerunner, in this world, of God's Kingdom of justice and peace. "Mindful of the Lord's saying, 'By this will all men know you are my disciples, if you have love for one another' (John 13:35) Christians cannot yearn for anything more ardently than to serve the men of the modern world ever more generously and effectively. Therefore, holding faithfully to the Gospel and benefitting from its resources, and united with every man who loves and practices justice, Christians have shouldered a gigantic task demanding fulfillment in this world. Concerning this task they must give a reckoning to Him who will judge every man on the last day. Not everyone who cries, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter into the kingdom of heaven, but those who do the Father's will and take a strong grip on the work at hand. Now, the Father wills that in all men we recognize Christ our brother and love Him effectively in word and in deed."²¹

16. Human liberation, we agree, is that aspect of the Church's mission of service which is most challenging for our time. We agree, also, with the context in which Pope Paul VI has recently placed it: [Human liberation] "forms part of that love which Christians owe to their brethren. But the totality of salvation is not to be confused with one or other aspect of liberation, and the Good News must preserve all of its own originality: that of a God who saves us from sin and death and brings us to divine life."²²

IV. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH?

Conclusion

17. The Church, the Body of Christ in the world, is led by the Spirit into all nations to fulfill the purpose of the Father. Insofar as it faithfully preaches the Gospel of salvation, celebrates the sacraments, and manifests the love of God in service, the Church becomes more perfectly one with the risen Christ. Impelled by its Lord, it strives to carry out the mission it has received from him: to prepare already the structures of the Kingdom, to share with all persons the hope for union with God.

18. In humility and repentance, the Church shares the guilt of mankind in its disunity. Presenting men and women with hope in the fulfillment of their destiny beyond this life, it also assumes, under the cross of its Lord, the burdens and the struggles of the oppressed, the poor, and the suffering. Striving for justice and peace, the Church seeks to better the conditions of this world. To the divided, it offers oneness; to the oppressed, liberation; to the sick, healing; to the dying, life; to all persons, eternal salvation.

But chiefly are we bound to praise you for the glorious Resurrection of your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, for he is the Paschal Lamb who by his death has overcome death, and by his rising to life again has opened to us the way of everlasting life.

Accept these prayers and praises, Father, through Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, to whom with you and the Holy Spirit, your Church gives honor, glory, and worship, from generation to generation.
Amen.

Father, in your mercy grant to us, your children,
to enter into our heavenly inheritance in the company of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God,
and your apostles and saints.

Then, in your kingdom, freed from the corruption of sin and death, we shall sing your glory with every creature through Christ our Lord, through whom you give us everything that is good.

Through him,
with him,
in him,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all glory and honor is yours,
almighty Father,
for ever and ever.
Amen.

19. We, as Roman Catholics and Episcopalians charged by our churches to explore the possibility that there is a fundamental unity between us, find that we are in substantial agreement about the purpose or mission of the Church as we have set it forth above. We have uncovered no essential points on which we differ. And we know, also, that insofar as the Church appears

visibly divided, its purpose is obscured, its mission impeded, and its witness weakened. We yearn, therefore, for a restoration of the unity that will serve our common purpose.²³ Listening to the signs of the times, we seek guidance from the Spirit, so that through our common witness all may acknowledge that Jesus is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father, and that, in this faith, all may have life and have it abundantly. We conclude with a prayer common to both our traditions:²⁴

O God of unchangeable power and eternal light: Look favorably on your whole Church, that wonderful and sacred mystery. By the tranquil operation of your providence, carry out the work of man's salvation. Let the whole world see and know that things which were cast down are being raised up, and things which had grown old are being made new, and that all things are being renewed to the perfection of him through whom all things were made, your Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with you, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever. Amen.

NOTES

¹ Constitution of the Episcopal Church, preamble; Vatican Council II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, 5 and 8, ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J., pp. 17-18, 22-23.

² Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 8; Decree on Ecumenism: *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 3 and 13; ed. Abbott, pp. 23, 345-46, 356.

³ At these meetings: ARC XIII, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 19-22, 1973; ARC XIV, Vicksburg, Miss., January 6-10, 1974; and ARC XV, Cincinnati, November 10-13, 1974. The following papers, among others, were considered: Charles H. Helmsing, "Some Reflections on the Mission of the Church"; George H. Tavad, "The Church as Eucharistic Communion"; and J. Robert Wright, "The Purpose or Mission of the Church as seen by the Episcopal Church." The documentation for this present statement has been largely drawn from these papers, which were themselves documented from authoritative statements and liturgical texts of both our churches.

⁴ Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission, Windsor Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, paras. 2-4.

⁵ Episcopal texts are taken from *Services for Trial Use* (1971) and *Authorized Services* (1973). Roman Catholic texts are taken from *The Roman Missal: The Sacramentary* (Liturgical Press 1974). The aim of ARC in this statement has been to describe the Church's purpose or mission as it is seen in the present faith of our two churches, and in our selection of texts we have not intended to urge the superiority of any one particular form of liturgical expression over another. It is acknowledged that liturgical revision is still in process in both our churches.

⁶ ARCIC, Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination, paras. 3-5, 12, 17.

⁷ Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 17; cf. Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests: *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, 1; ed. Abbott, pp. 36-37, 532-33.

⁸ Roman Catholic Church, Second General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops, *Justice in the World* (1971), introduction; cf. Lambeth Conference 1948, pp. 26-28.

⁹ Lambeth Conference 1948, p. 26.

¹⁰ Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: *Gaudium et Spes*, 3 and 21; ed. Abbott, pp. 201, 219. *The Book of Common*

Prayer (Episcopal Church), p. 38 (Prayer for Missions). Cf. General Convention of the Episcopal Church, 1973, definition of evangelism: "The presentation of Jesus Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit, in such ways that persons may be led to believe in him as Savior and follow him as Lord, within the fellowship of his Church."

¹¹ Episcopal Church, canon I.3, article 1: membership of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society comprises "all persons who are members of the Church." Cf. Vatican II, Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity: *Ad gentes*, 1, 11, 15, 20, 21, 35, ed. Abbott, pp. 585, 597, 602, 609-11, 623.

¹² Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 1; ed. Abbott, pp. 14-15.

¹³ *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 83; Lambeth Conference 1968, p. 24; Anglican Congress 1954, p. 199; Episcopal Church, House of Bishops, Pastoral Letters, November 12, 1953, and November 12-17, 1960; cf. Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 25; ed. Abbott, p. 47.

¹⁴ *Justice in the World*, introduction; cf. Episcopal Church, Position Statement of the Executive Council on Empowerment, February 22, 1972.

¹⁵ Cf. *Justice in the World*, part III.

¹⁶ *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 47-48 (Bidding Prayer), 74-75 (Prayer for Whole State); Lambeth Conference 1968, p. 77; Anglican Congress 1954, p. 44. Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 8; ed. Abbott, pp. 22-24.

¹⁷ Vatican II, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2 and 10; ed. Abbott, pp. 137, 142; Anglican Congress 1954, pp. 197-98. Cf. *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 291 (Second Office of Instruction, Bounden Duty).

¹⁸ *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962), vol. 3, pp. 386 ff. ("Ministry," *diakonia*, by M. H. Shepherd, Jr.); Robert C. Dentan, *The Holy Scriptures* ("The Church's Teaching Series," Protestant Episcopal Church, 1949), pp. 167-69; Augustin Cardinal Bea, *We Who Serve* (1969), esp. pp. 171-184; Lambeth Conference 1968, p. 24; Anglican Congress 1963, p. 264; Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 18; *Gaudium et Spes*, 3 and 45; ed. Abbott, pp. 37, 201, 247.

¹⁹ Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 8, 9, and 10; ed. Abbott, pp. 205-9; Lambeth Conference 1968, p. 74. *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 18, 32 (Prayer for All Conditions), p. 44 (Prayer for Social Justice).

²⁰ Cf. *Justice in the World*, introduction; *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 298-9, 579-80 (Duty Towards Neighbor).

²¹ Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 93; ed. Abbott, p. 307; cf. Episcopal Church, Actions of General Convention 1967, pp. 303-7; Summary of General Convention Actions 1970, pp. 3-6; Position Statement of the Executive Council on Empowerment, February 22, 1972.

²² *L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition, November 7, 1974, p. 9.

²³ Cf. John 17.

²⁴ In the Episcopal Church: *Services for Trial Use*, in Eucharistic Intercessions form VI, and in the Solemn Collects for Good Friday. In the Roman Catholic Church: prayer following Reading VII in the Easter Vigil.

The Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist

A REPORT BY THE JOINT STUDY GROUP

The present Report was examined by the National Ecumenical Commission for Scotland of the Roman Catholic Church at its meeting in Glasgow on September 22nd, 1973. The Report was approved in the following terms:

"The National Ecumenical Commission receive with pleasure the Report on the Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist. They wish to thank the Joint Study Group for their excellent work, and warmly commend the Report as a most useful basis for study. The National Ecumenical Commission are particularly pleased to note the clear expression in the Report of so much agreement between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland on fundamental present-day belief about the Eucharist. The National Ecumenical Commission, while satisfied with the Report as a whole, would not wish to be committed however, to any particular historical judgment on Reformation doctrine on the Eucharist."

Subsequently, the Report was discussed at a meeting of the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference of Scotland and it was accepted in the same terms as by the National Ecumenical Commission.

The Report was likewise presented to the Provincial Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church at its meeting on October 9th-10th, 1973. The Synod expressed appreciation of the Report and suggested its widespread study.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE JOINT STUDY GROUP

Roman Catholic Church:

Western Group: Rev. Desmond Strain (Convener)
 Mr. James Breen
 *Rev. Henry Docherty
 Rev. John H. Fitzsimmons
 Mr. Frank G. MacMillan

Eastern Group: Rev. James Quinn, S.J. (Convener)
 *Rev. Charles Barclay
 *Rev. Brian Cavanagh, O.F.M.
 Rev. Matthew J. Donoghue

Rev. Robert Hendrie
Professor P. G. Walsh
Rev. Hugh G. White

Scottish Episcopal Church:

Western Group: Rev. Hugh McIntosh (Convener)

*Mr. Walter H. A. Abbott

Rev. A. Oswald Barkway

Dr. Robert A. Shanks

Rev. Samuel S. Singer

Rev. John A. Trimble

Eastern Group: Rev. Donald A. Guthrie (Convener)

Rev. Alexander S. Black

*Miss Gillian M. Carver

Rev. W. B. Currie

*Rev. E. J. C. Davis

*Mr. Thomas Glen

Dr. Robert Gould

*Principal Alistair I. M. Haggart

Consultant-Observer:

Rev. Richard F. Baxter (Scottish Churches' House)

* Later Resigned

FOREWORD

The Joint Study Group of representatives of the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland and the Scottish Episcopal Church was formed in 1968. The details of its formation and composition are given in the Foreword to its common statement on "The Nature of Baptism and its Place in the Life of the Church," which was published in 1969 with the authority of the Scottish Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Provincial Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The procedure whereby groups of Roman Catholics and Scottish Episcopalians, both clerical and lay, met in Edinburgh and Glasgow for detailed and frank discussions, and then met in plenary session to draw together the results of their deliberations, seemed a happy and fruitful arrangement. The immediately sponsoring bodies of the Joint Study Group are the National Ecumenical Commission of the Roman Catholic Church and the Inter-

Church Relations Committee of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and in presenting their common statement in 1969, the members of the Joint Study Group asked these authorities to continue their remit, suggesting as the next subject for discussion "The Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist." This was agreed, and the present report represents the extent to which the Joint Study Group has been able to pursue its chosen but difficult goal.

The composition of the Group has understandably not remained unchanged, and several members for one reason or another were unable to continue. More grievous was the departure of the Chairman, Provost Haggart, whose appointment as Principal of the Scottish Episcopal Theological College in Edinburgh compelled him to relinquish a position he had filled admirably. On the credit side, we were glad to welcome newcomers to our Group, and in particular to welcome an observer from the Scottish Churches' Council at plenary sessions.

Necessary changes notwithstanding, the bond of friendship and understanding which was so notable a feature of our discussions on Baptism, grew in warmth and openness: it is true to say that we have not been able fully to complete our remit by including consideration of "The Ministry" or "Intercommunion," but none of us now has the same fear of grasping the nettle of our historic divisions on these two subjects as we should have felt had we not learnt to know each other so well.

Both Chairman and Secretary are only too conscious of the debt of gratitude they owe to several members for many a long stint at home preparing documents for discussion. We must also thank our colleagues for a forbearance in discussion without which our tasks would not have been possible.

Above all, we have been humbly aware that in spite of the limitations and imperfections of our report, our prayers for the guidance of the Holy Spirit were not entirely unanswered.

Robert A. Shanks
(Chairman)

James Quinn, S.J.
(Secretary)

INTRODUCTION

On first acquaintance, "The Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist" as a topic for ecumenical discussion has a recondite air far from the problems of individual Christians who are disturbed by their

divisions and yet unmoved by the spectacle of theologians at play. This report will try to make plain that the unique inter-relationship between Eucharist and Church is as *central* to our common faith as it is to our divisions. From earliest times, the Eucharist has been held to be the supreme gift of God, and has been celebrated in obedience to the express command of Our Lord. While there have been historical differences both within and between our two communions, the *centrality* of the Eucharist has never been in question. Not the least of our difficulties has been that of nomenclature, and we have chosen the term "Eucharist" in preference to "The Mass," "The Lord's Supper," or "Holy Communion" for reasons of euphony, brevity, and neutrality.

The heart of our problem could not be reached without some preliminary discussions: some subjects might seem peripheral, but had to be dealt with to clear the way for unambiguous consideration of our views on the Eucharist and the Church. From time to time, ecumenical groups have been accused of agreement by ambiguity—a polite glossing over differences of interpretation of phrase or concept. "For all colours will agree in the dark," wrote Francis Bacon in his essay, "Of Unity in Religion," and it was precisely in order to avoid this error that the Joint Study Group decided to spend some time on antecedent considerations, such as differing eucharistic practices, and the theology of Presence and Sacrifice, before going on to consider the nature of the Eucharist and the light it throws on the nature of the Church.

The plan of this report was to begin with Eucharistic Practice and Eucharistic Theology, and to follow this with the main section on the Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist. We had intended to complete the report with two final sections on the Ministry and Intercommunion, in that order.

We have not departed from this plan, although it soon became clear that we should not be able to complete it in time for our first report—itself delayed beyond our expectations. To those who are familiar with the difficulties of such discussions this will come as no surprise. It is worth stressing that some of the delays occasioned by protracted discussions were because of an unexpected measure of agreement between us, allowing a deeper exploration of our beliefs.

A discussion of the nature of the Eucharist inevitably involves consideration of what is meant by "The Real Presence": for many

Protestants there is difficulty over the meaning of the word "sacrifice" as applied to the Eucharist; and there is the ever-present difficulty of the nature of the act of Communion and the basis for the authority of the presiding minister of the Eucharist. It is a tribute to the individual members of the Joint Study Group that our often protracted discussions seldom ranged beyond the use of words and always returned to the Narrative of Institution—the words of Our Lord himself—as the centre of our eucharistic theology.

Preliminaries were clearly needed for a meaningful consideration of our remit, and it should be emphasized that the work involved was considerable. Individual pairs from both groups produced papers on items for discussion, only to find them torn to pieces in argument, and so requiring that another draft be prepared and offered for similar treatment. It is our earnest hope that the mutual respect and understanding that we reached in our deliberations will be reflected in this report.

The succeeding chapters are largely self-explanatory, and it remains perhaps to explain the *title* of our report. It might be thought that to explain the choice of the word "ecclesial" as a title for a report over which so much time and consideration has been spent would be only too easy. In one sense, it may be so: "ecclesial" is an obsolete form of the current adjective "ecclesiastical," according to the Shorter Oxford Dictionary (although the New Chambers Dictionary allows "ecclesial" as the adjective from "ecclesia"). The word "ecclesiastical," however, has more overtones than are desirable if it is to be used to imply the essential nature of the Church; but in distinguishing between these two words and using "ecclesial" to refer to the essential nature of the Church while reserving "ecclesiastical" to include aspects of Church organisation, we are in danger of implying a dichotomy that is not intended. The matter is dealt with in some detail in Chapter III.

Two sections of this report remain to be studied, namely "The Ministry" and "Intercommunion." These are subjects that we have not yet been able to discuss in depth, yet we are in no way reluctant to do so. We know very well that the nearer we move to the practical implications of our agreement on the centrality of our faith, the closer we come to the problems of entrenched positions and attitudes of mind rooted in history rather than reason. Yet we remain convinced that this report, which

indicates how little of truly *ecclesial* importance separates the Scottish Episcopalian from the Roman Catholic in the three aspects of eucharistic theology so far considered, can only lead us to hope for a similar agreement on the other two, and so lead us nearer to that unity which is Our Lord's will for his Church.

I. EUCHARISTIC PRACTICE

The basic fact to emerge from our discussions was the *centrality* of the Eucharist in the worship of both Churches.

In Roman Catholic practice, this is reflected in the tradition of daily celebration, while the Scottish Episcopal Church has a tradition of celebrating "frequently, but always on a Sunday and on the greater festivals." The Eucharist takes the same essential form in both Churches: there is the same two-fold pattern of "Liturgy of the Word" and "Liturgy of the Eucharist," the latter being expressed by means of a four-fold action—Offering, Consecration, Breaking of the Bread, and Communion.

In the Scottish Episcopal Church, Communion is received "under both kinds," while the Roman Catholic practice is for it to be received by the laity under one kind only, although the practice of receiving under both kinds is gradually being renewed. In both Churches, Communion is usually received kneeling; but whereas Episcopalians receive the consecrated Bread in their hands, Roman Catholics normally receive it in the mouth.

In all Roman Catholic churches and many Episcopalian ones, the Blessed Sacrament is reserved: in both traditions, where the consecrated elements remaining after Communion are not to be reserved, they are reverently consumed by the ministers. With regard to ceremonial, the use of lights (candles), vestments, and genuflections is "universal" in the Roman Catholic Church, and "widespread" among Episcopalians.

In the matter of admission to the Eucharist, the present discipline of the two Churches differs, in that the Scottish Episcopal Church recognises wider areas of admission for "Christians duly baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity and qualified to receive Holy Communion in their own Churches," who "may be welcomed at the Lord's Table in the Anglican Communion" in order to meet "a special pastoral need," and in certain authorised ecumenical situations.¹ The Roman Catholic Church does not admit to Communion anyone except those in full communion

with Rome, though there are some exceptions to this with regard to Eastern Christians and other Christians in special circumstances.²

There are thus many liturgical elements held in common by our two Churches, and in many respects our practice is identical. Since a common "Lex Orandi" would be a factor making for a common "Lex Credendi," we feel it is important to recognise how much is already done in similar ways, as well as to press forward wherever possible with the development of other common elements. Although it is clearly necessary for each tradition to develop in harmony with its own past and heritage, nevertheless agreement to use a common Lectionary and to observe a revised Christian Year, together with the incorporation of internationally agreed texts for the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and other elements of the Liturgy, and the creation of a common store of hymns and church music—all of these are factors which would promote further unity between our two Churches.

II. ASPECTS OF EUCHARISTIC FAITH

Sacrifice

Down the centuries both our traditions have developed a theology about the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist; and in both cases the roots of this theology are to be found in the biblical tradition of the Old and New Testaments, together with the interpretation of its data embodied in the traditional teaching of the Church.

On examining together the New Testament narratives of the institution of the Eucharist, we have seen how the evangelists have taken over the themes and motifs of the Old Testament's own theology of sacrifice.¹ Their central idea is that of the Eucharist as the "Christian Passover": just as the Passover of Israel is anticipated and signified in the meal shared in Egypt (cf. Ex. 12, 1-36), so the Passover of Christ and Christians is anticipated and signified in the Last Supper. The context of the narratives of institution (at least in the tradition of the Synoptic Gospels) is the Passover meal shared by Jesus and his followers. While the image of Christ as the Paschal Lamb is none too clear, the words of the institution interpret his death as an atonement sacrifice—his Body and Blood are "for many" and "for you."

The sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is further heightened

by its definition as the sealing of the New Covenant between God and man.² Here again the immediate reference is to the covenant sacrifices of the Old Testament. As in the Old Testament sacrifices the ritual words and actions interpret the offering of the victim, so the words and actions of Jesus in the Upper Room interpret his offering of himself on the Cross as the Victim reconciling God and man.

The Last Supper provides us with a key to the understanding of Calvary, and the Last Supper and Calvary together provide us with a key to the understanding of the Eucharist. The author of the Letter to the Hebrews takes up these ideas and expresses them succinctly: the sacrifice of Christ was offered "once and for all", and this offering of Christ achieves perfect forgiveness for all men; through the sacrifice of Christ, the Christian can approach God with faith and hope that he is delivered from sin (cf. *Heb.* 9-10).³

In the light of this interpretation offered by the New Testament writers, the Eucharist was early understood in terms of **Christ's offering of himself as a sacrifice for the reconciliation of God and man.** As the perfect sacrificial offering, he fulfills in himself the aspirations and intentions of the Old Testament in its worship. There are, however, other aspects of the New Testament understanding of the Eucharist which are significant for us, in that they have been integrated into the theology of both our traditions.

The words of institution contain the injunction to celebrate the Eucharist as a "memorial" of Christ, and to this St. Paul adds the further notion of the Eucharist as a "proclamation" of the death of Jesus (*I Cor.* 11, 26), so allowing the Church to see in the Eucharist the source and fullest expression of its mission.

If the idea of communion with God through the offering of sacrifice is essential to the Old Testament theology of sacrifice, it is also an essential aspect of the New Testament theology of the Eucharist. The eucharistic sharing of the Body and Blood of Christ makes all Christians one—the many are one body, for they all partake of the one bread (*I Cor.* 10, 17). Further, the Eucharist is celebrated until the Lord "comes" (*I Cor.* 11, 26), and so stands as a sign and guarantee of the final fulfilment of the salvation in which the Christian is already caught up through his sharing in the Lord's Body and Blood. Thus what God's people of the Old

Testament hoped for and looked forward to in the celebration of the Passover meal, the Church now possesses in the celebration of the Eucharist. The Messianic Banquet, which expresses the full and final union of all men with God and with one another, is already anticipated in the eucharistic meal.⁴

Inspired by this interpretation of the Eucharist offered by the New Testament writers, both Churches have understood the Eucharist as **the presence here and now in the Christian community of Christ's once-and-for-all offering of himself as a sacrifice for the reconciliation of God and man.** The communion with God in a sacred meal or banquet which belongs to the New Testament appreciation of the Eucharist has been the source and context of our understanding of the real presence of Christ. Our idea of the Church as the "Body of Christ" is derived from the

New Testament idea of the Eucharist as the sharing of one bread which makes us who are many, all one with God and with one another. Our hope and our expectation for the future are nourished by the Eucharist, which **points to the fulfilment of our salvation.** The eucharistic sacrifice indeed has been understood by both Churches as a pattern for the life of the Christian community: "Be imitators of God, as beloved children. And walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God" (*Eph. 5, 1-2*).

In examining the interpretation of biblical data embodied in the traditional teaching of both our Churches, we have seen how the Eucharist has been understood as a "re-presentation" of the one sacrifice of Christ, through the re-enactment of the words and actions of the Upper Room, which make the reconciling work of Christ **present and effective for us,** and through us for all men. Through the eucharistic mystery celebrated by the Church in the Spirit, the sacrifice of the Cross, achieved "once and for all," is brought to mind in the "memorial" of Christ, and thus made sacramentally present, so that its saving power may be communicated to us.⁵

From the very beginning, the Church has gathered to celebrate the Paschal Mystery of Christ's death and resurrection, reading all that the Scriptures have to say about the "things referring to himself" (*Lk. 24, 27*) and celebrating the Eucharist in which "the victory and triumph of his death are again made present."⁶ **It is clear that there can only be one sacrifice: the**

eucharistic sacrifice is the same sacrifice as that of Christ on the Cross, and this one sacrifice is now offered by the ascended and glorified Lord in his Church. The Eucharist is the celebration not only of the death, but also of the resurrection and ascension of Christ: it is the sacrament of the whole Paschal Mystery. The Eucharist is not simply the commemoration of Calvary as of a past event, nor is it simply an offering of praise and thanksgiving for Calvary and its reconciling and atoning effects. On the contrary, the Eucharist is the continuing presence in our time and situation of Christ's sacrifice. This presence, which signifies and brings about the reconciliation of men with God and with one another, is his gift to those who, through the Spirit, are incorporated with him in his Body the Church. It is this identification of the faithful in the Spirit with the risen humanity of Jesus Christ that guards the "once and for all"-ness of Christ's sacrifice and yet makes that sacrifice the sacrifice of the Church itself.

In this connexion we have looked at the Anglican Articles, especially Art. XXXI. What is repudiated in this Article is something that never had been part of the authentic teaching of the Roman Church. The "sacrifices of Masses" referred to there is part of a conception which would understand the eucharistic sacrifice as *adding* something to the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary. This idea is rightly denied and the traditional faith of the Church remains what it always has been: there is but one sacrifice, the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary of which the Eucharist is the "memorial" or "re-presentation."⁷

The Real Presence

In speaking of the eucharistic sacrifice, we have referred to the idea of the sacred banquet, that communion with God which we share in the Eucharist, as the source and context for our understanding of the real presence of Christ. From St. Paul onwards, the Church has always maintained that a *change* takes place in the eucharistic elements after the consecration.⁸

After the consecration, the Bread of the Eucharist is a different kind of bread: the bread of human life has been changed into the Bread of everlasting life. This change, though it does not affect the physical or chemical properties of bread, is nevertheless a real change—not one imposed by our purpose, minds, or faith. It is more than a change in the use to which we put bread; it is more than a change in its meaning for us. It is a change by which the bread of human life has become the Bread of everlasting life, has become the

“Body of the Lord” (1 Cor. 11, 29).

We do not think of the eucharistic sacrifice and the real presence as separate, nor do we believe that they should be thought of in this way. Christ is present, i.e., the change takes place in order that we may offer him and his oblation on behalf of ourselves and the world, and receiving the full benefits of his death and resurrection in his gift of Holy Communion may be reintegrated in him so as to participate more effectively in his mission and service to the world.

It is important also to recall that Christ is the Giver as well as the gift bestowed, and that he is present and active in more than one way in the Eucharist—in his People gathered together, in the minister who presides, in his Word read and proclaimed, in the world’s needs brought forward in the Intercessions (Mt. 25, 40).⁹

The priesthood which is exercised in the eucharistic offering is the priesthood of Christ himself. He is at once Priest and Victim. In the Church’s offering of his sacrifice, the officiating priest and the whole community share in his Priesthood. Hence, those who say that the ministry of an episcopally ordained priest is necessary for the eucharistic offering do not deny that the whole People of God offers the sacrifice together.¹⁰ The presence of Christ’s sacrifice in the eucharistic offering is the work of the Holy Spirit acting in the community, as the liturgical traditions of both our Churches constantly attest. In the Christian community’s exercise of his priesthood, which it shares, the Eucharist is offered by Christ in and through the Church.

III. THE ECCLESIAL NATURE OF THE EUCHARIST

Introduction

The understanding of the Eucharist expressed in Chapter II calls our attention once more to a fundamental but somewhat neglected feature of our common eucharistic heritage: viz. *the unique relationship of mutual dependence between the Eucharist and the Church*. It is not without significance that from the earliest times, as acknowledged in the New Testament and faithfully maintained in both traditions, the Eucharist has been cherished as the supreme gift of God to his Church and that the celebration of the Eucharist has always held a place of pre-eminence in the growing life and work of the Church. For it is in the celebration of the Eucharist that the faithful experience and

express most fully that unity which must always be the first characteristic of the Church of Christ. The eucharistic sacrifice "is the fount and apex of the whole Christian life . . . Strengthened anew at the Holy Table of the Body of Christ, (the faithful) manifest in a practical way that unity of God's people which is suitably signified and wondrously brought about by this most awesome sacrament."¹

The Eucharist—Sacrament of the Church: A Biblical Approach

It was his appreciation of this intimate connection between the Eucharist and the Church which allowed Paul to speak of both the Eucharist (*I Cor.* 10, 16) and the Church (*Ephes.* 1, 23) as the "Body" of Christ, meaning by body "person."

"Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body for we all partake of the one bread" (*I Cor.* 10, 17).

". . . and he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all" (*Ephesians* 1, 22).

Already, Paul finds in the celebration of the Eucharist the sign and source not only of the union of the faithful with Christ, but of their unity with one another—"a single body." As such, Paul prompts us to an understanding of the Church as *first and foremost a Eucharistic Community*—what is achieved by and witnessed to in the fellowship of the Eucharist is the normative guide for the Church. The Eucharist reveals the nature of the Church, and in each celebration of particular communities the Church continues to discover afresh the dynamic source of its own membership, growth and renewal, the origin of its structure and the ultimate meaning and purpose of all its activity. Without the Church there can be no Eucharist, but without the Eucharist there would be no Church—each stands as a sign and source of the other.

When the New Testament authors came to set down in writing the tradition of the words and deeds of Jesus, they were acutely aware that they were not handling facts of the past which belonged exclusively to the past. It is for this reason that we can see an underlying conviction in all that they wrote: the conviction that the Jesus of whom they write is still alive, exalted at the right hand of the Father, and present and active in his Church. This explains why Luke refers to the details of the Gospel

story as events which "have been accomplished" and which have been fulfilled "among us," thereby identifying himself and his readers with the witness of the past (*Lk.* 1, 1). In the same way, John speaks of the Word's becoming flesh and dwelling "among us," in such a way that "we have beheld his glory" (*Jn.* 1, 14). The same conviction animated Matthew when he wrote of the birth of Jesus as the coming of Emmanuel, "which means God with us" (*Mt.* 1, 23), and when he concluded his version of the Gospel with the promise of Jesus: "I am with you always to the close of the age" (*Mt.* 28, 20).

When we use the language of contemporary theology and speak of Jesus Christ as "the sacrament of the Father," we are simply expressing something that responds to the New Testament portrayal of the person and mission of Jesus. (Here it is enough to remark that "sacrament" is taken in its most general sense—an effective sign: a sign, first of all, which can be seen and understood as such, and one which actually effects what it signifies, makes it real and present.) In this case, what is meant, therefore, is that in Christ the Father is present and active. The Gospel picture of the ministry (and more specifically of the miracles) of Jesus underlines this active presence of the Father in him. They all involve an encounter between men and Jesus: this encounter is effective, for the "blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the good news preached to them" (*Mt.* 11, 5). The Gospels, then, show us how the presence of Christ is the presence of the redeeming love of God in the midst of men (cf. *Mt.*'s quotation of *Hos.* 6, 6 in 9, 13), in such a way that they can see it and respond to it. The whole technique of the handing on of the tradition which we find in the New Testament is based on the conviction that **what Jesus once did, he does still**. This is the heart of sacramental theology, and it is the key concept with regard to the existence and nature of the Church. Just as the leper, the blind, and the lame receive a fuller life through their encounter with Jesus, so the Christian shares a new kind of life through his encounter in faith with the Risen Christ. Christ is "the sacrament of the encounter with God,"² the infinite love of God coming into contact with men in a tangible and personal form. "In Christ God . . . was reconciling the world to himself . . . and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation" (*II Cor.* 5, 19). Here, we begin to touch upon the very essence of the Church—

it is to be the meeting between Christ and men through the ages.

So, when we use the language of contemporary theology and say that "the Church is the sacrament of Christ,"³ we are simply expressing the basic New Testament vision of the Church and its function. What Christ has done, that is the Church's task—"He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me" (*Mt.* 10, 40). It is the abiding presence of Christ himself which enables the Church to carry out its mission—"where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (*Mt.* 18, 20). The community of those who have gathered in his name is to be the bridge between Christ and the world in all places and in all times. Just as Christ, raised on the Cross, draws all men to himself (*Jn.* 12, 32), the Church must be an ensign for the nations (*Is.* 11, 12), carrying out and continuing the mission which Christ himself was sent to fulfill. It was Christ himself who commissioned the Church to go "and make disciples of all nations" (*Mt.* 28, 19); the witness of the Church to the abiding presence of Christ is the work of the Holy Spirit—"the Spirit of your Father speaking through you" (*Mt.* 10, 20). It is for the Holy Spirit to lead the Church to a deeper awareness of itself and its mission, to lead it "into all the truth" (*Jn.* 16, 13).

Against this background, it is easier to see how the New Testament writers regarded the Church as being most fully itself, as expressing most completely the abiding and active presence of Christ, when it came to the celebration of the Eucharist. In the Synoptic tradition, there is the highly symbolic presentation of the miracle of the feeding of the multitude (cf. *Mk.* 6, 32-44, par. *Mt.* 14, 13-21; *Lk.* 9, 11-17), where the disciples are involved in the miracle in such a way that they become partners of Jesus in feeding the people; further, the narratives of the institution of the Eucharist itself (cf. *Mk.* 14, 22-25, par. *Mt.* 26, 26-29; *Lk.* 22, 17-20), are short and to the point because they simply make explicit something which lies at the heart of the whole Gospel tradition—the abiding presence of Christ. There is a logic which imposes itself here: if Christ is the sacrament of the Father, and if the Church is the sacrament of Christ, then the sharing of the eucharistic meal is the sacrament of the Church. The formula with the wine is all the more significant: "This is my blood of the covenant" (*Mt.* 26, 28); the covenant between God and man is what brings the people of God into existence, and it is the cove-

nant in the blood of Christ which brings the Church into existence. **In the sharing of the Eucharist is the full affirmation of the Church's identity.** But not only is it an affirmation of identity, it is also an affirmation of what the Church *does*—to unite men to Christ and to unite them with one another: that is the mission of the Church. That is why the Fourth Gospel speaks of the Eucharist in terms of the giving of eternal life: "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him" (*Jn.* 6, 56). It also explains why the Fourth Gospel interprets the Last Supper in terms of a parting gift and instruction to the Church—"by this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (*Jn.* 13, 35). It is for this reason that St. Paul was able to move from the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist to the identification of the Church itself as "the Body of Christ." It is for this reason also that he sees in the Eucharist the remembrance of the death of the Lord and in the partaking of the Eucharist, the proclamation to the world of the Lord's death (cf. *I Cor.* 11, 23-26).

Just as John concentrates on the relationship between Christ and the individual Christian in his eucharistic doctrine, so the other New Testament writers emphasise this aspect, each in his own way. The identity between Christ and the Christian is basic to the meaning of Matthew's Mission Discourse (cf. *Mt.* 9, 35—11, 1). The mission of the Christian, however, which makes of him a "sacrament" of Christ, is consequent upon the call he has received to follow Christ. Men are "called" in the Gospels, and they are "baptised" in the letters of Saint Paul. It is those who have been "called"/"baptised" who are sent to preach under the guidance of the Spirit; so the New Testament perspective helps us to see the integral elements of Christian Initiation. The culmination of this initiation into Christ comes with the sharing in the Eucharist. It is Christ himself who called men to witness to his death and resurrection, to preach his Gospel, to forgive sins, to suffer with him, to share his authority, to be his companions, i.e., to live their lives in his company through to an eternal destiny. This is the ultimate sense of the Eucharist in the Church: it is the continuation (or "re-presentation") of the self-giving of Christ, and the guarantee of his lasting presence in the community of those who bear his name. The man who has been initiated into Christ becomes part of his work and his life becomes fused with the life and action of Christ. This is the new covenant between God and man, and it is sealed in the Eucharist.

The Eucharist—Model of the Church

In the Eucharist, the Church is always aware that here is the continuing action of God himself, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, by whose life the Church lives. The Church sees itself in the Eucharist as the mystery of the Trinity, revealed and actualised in our world and our history with the purposes of bringing all men into personal communion with the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. Incorporated into Christ so as to form his living Body, the faithful live in the fellowship of the Spirit as true sons of the Father.

Hence in the Eucharist the Church is built up by the Spirit into the fullness of Christ, and, through the saving work of Christ there made present, has access to the Father. *The Church knows itself as the object of the Father's loving initiative, mediated by the Son, in the power of the Spirit.*

In the Eucharist the presence of Christ is known through the signs of his self-giving love: his broken Body and outpoured Blood are shown forth in the consecrated elements. *The Church knows itself to be, like Christ, the suffering and redeeming Servant of God and of all men.*

In the Eucharist the Church is caught up into God's heavenly glory, and receives the promise and foretaste of the life of the age to come. *The Church knows itself to be a pilgrim people, travelling in hope towards that goal of which it already has the foretaste.*

In the Eucharist the Church blesses God for all creation by offering that creation to its Lord under the symbols of bread and wine, and the Church is herself nourished with the life of God through these same symbols, now made Christ's Body and Blood. *The Church knows itself to stand as the priestly people within creation and through the whole universe of matter God works out his purposes of love.*

In the Eucharist the Church is summoned to a sacred meal, which is a foretaste of the perfect fellowship with God which is to come. The Church knows itself to be a fellowship of men and women, having a vocation to build itself up as the universal family of mankind and thus committed to overcoming everything that breaks or hinders the fellowship of men with each other and with God.

Since the Church is the sign of Christ's saving action in the world and the means of that saving action, it lives at two levels. Its inner life and its structure are revealed in the Eucharist. It is here that we can see the need for holding two aspects of the Church in a dynamic tension. The Church is the visible society founded on the apostles, and at the same time the mystery of salvation always present. The Church is at once the community of the redeemed and the redeeming community. Acts 2, 42, holds the balance—"These remained faithful to the teaching of the apostles, to the brotherhood, to the breaking of bread and to the prayers." In the community gathered together to celebrate the Eucharist we see a visible society; this gathered community not only recalls and ratifies again the new covenant between God and man, but is also here and now caught up in the very acts of Christ by which it is gathered together and established as the People of God. *The Eucharist is the mystery of salvation constituting the Church in its inmost being—the People of God gathered together in the unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.*

Wherever and whenever the tension between these two aspects of the reality of the Church is not maintained, the nature of the Church as a visible society is distorted and the presence of the saving activity of God in the Church is obscured. In other words, there is a constant danger that the "ecclesial" aspect of the Church can be taken for the "ecclesiastical" and vice versa. In distinguishing these two aspects, we are provided with a means of describing the mystery of the Church in its fullness. For, in the actual life of the Church, there is an unchanging element, a "givenness," forever to be found where the People of God are gathered together in the new and eternal covenant sealed with the Blood of Christ: **this is its "ecclesial" nature, willed by God and given by Christ.** It is God's will that men will be made holy and saved, "not merely as individuals without any mutual bonds, but by (his) making them into a single people, a people which acknowledges him in truth and serves him in holiness . . . Established by Christ as a fellowship of life, charity and truth, it is also used by him as an instrument for the redemption of all."² Side by side with this, however, it must be recognised that the Church exists in history and subject to the changes, the stresses and the strains of history, in the same way that the men and women who make up the People of God are subject to them.

Because of this, in the course of history, the Church takes on many different shapes, many different structures. **This is what is meant by its "ecclesiastical" nature:** it is the product of the guidance of the Holy Spirit coupled with the goodwill and activity of the members of the Church in any historical situation to make the Church a clearer expression of what God wills that it should be in every age, to make it a more effective "instrument for the redemption of all." The ecclesiastical may be Spirit-inspired for times and circumstances or it may be consequent on human genius or frailty, and it is in this area that the Church is "semper reformanda." Consequently, there is always a priority of the "ecclesial" over the "ecclesiastical": the shape and structure of the Church must be judged by its effectiveness in allowing the Church to be as fully as possible "the Sacrament of Christ," his visible embodiment in the power of the Spirit.

However, since the Eucharist is "the sacrament of the Church" and "the model of the Church," it likewise has implications for an estimate of the *structure* of the Church. The "ecclesial" shape of the Church is proclaimed in the Eucharist: at the Eucharist, the Church is most fully itself, and it is there that the characteristic roles and attitudes of the People of God find expression. The witness of the Church to the saving event of God in Christ cannot be separated from its unity in faith, hope and love. "I in them and you in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me" (Jn. 17, 23). The unity of the Church in the Body and Blood of Christ is both source and sign of its unity in faith, hope and love. When we pose the question of what is essential for the Eucharist, then we become conscious of what we are really asking—the question of what is essential for the Church itself. It is the Eucharist which lays bare the "ecclesial" nature of the Church, and helps us to distinguish it from the Church's "ecclesiastical" aspect. As ever, the Last Supper serves as guide and paradigm: The People of God are all equally served by Christ and called to serve one another: "If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet" (Jn. 13, 14). The "example" of Christ is a rule for his Church, and since "a servant is not greater than his master, nor he who is sent greater than he who sent him" (Jn. 13, 16), it follows that those who have authority in the Church are called to serve the community in the spirit of Christ.

It is in the light of these considerations that we can consider the existence and exercise of authority in the Church, the nature and function of the ministry in the Church. There we can discover the same kind of distinction between what is "ecclesial" and what is "ecclesiastical"; in making this vital distinction and in drawing out its implications, the Eucharist will be our guide because it enables us to see clearly what the structure of the Church is.

The Eucharist and Membership of the Church

All that is implied by Baptism and Confirmation is fulfilled in the Eucharist. There the Christian expresses the fullness of responsible membership of the Church. There he brings to completion what his Baptism and Confirmation looked forward to, rejoices in Christ's risen life within his Church on earth, and is drawn into his reconciling work in the world. Through his incorporation into Christ's Paschal Mystery, made present in the Eucharist, the Christian shares in the divine life (*Romans 6, 3-11*).

Often, the New Testament places the close relationship between Christ, the Christian, and the Church in a eucharistic context. With the words, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you can have no life in you," St. John draws out the eucharistic implications of the community of faith (*John 6, 52-58*).

Later, in the great discourses of Our Lord at the Last Supper with his disciples, we find this relationship described as so intimate that it is like a vine and its branches (*John 15, 1-7*).

St. Paul goes even further, illustrating membership of the Church in terms of being so closely one with Christ that we may think of the Church as his Body. Once again the relationship is seen as expressing itself in the Eucharist. The cup of blessing which we bless, the bread which we break—these are a sharing in the Body of Christ (*1 Cor. 10, 16-17*). By the action of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, our union with Christ is continually deepened and our fellowship with one another is strengthened.

But it is perhaps in the First Letter of St. Peter that we have the clearest picture of the eucharistic community in action—a priestly people called by God to holiness, a New Israel set for a light in the world (*1 Peter 2, 4-10*). **The Christian goes out from the Eucharist to serve the world, able to share in this work**

through the power and grace of Christ's Paschal victory, which was first mediated to him in Baptism and is ever renewed for him in the Eucharist.

The Eucharist and Mission

The New Israel has been a missionary body from the first: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations," was the command of Christ (*Matthew 28, 19*). The primary and chief agent of mission is the Father himself, who loves the world so much that he sent the Son. The Church's calling is to continue the mission of Christ in the power of his Spirit (*John 20, 21-23*), and this is symbolised by the fact that the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost gives to the disciples the courage and capacity to spread the Gospel (cf. *Acts 2*).

God's Mission—the Father's sending of the Son to redeem the world—is focused, actualised and celebrated above all in the Eucharist. There the Church is called together, reintegrated in Christ, and sent out in his Spirit to share in his mission and service to the world. It is a world made new in Christ, and in which he comes to meet us in many forms. But the Lord who meets, beckons, challenges and judges us variously through his world, meets us by appointment, so to speak, and most plainly in the Eucharist. Christians recognise Christ's saving presence not only in the Eucharist but in the world, and are therefore committed to co-operate with him and to help others to realise his saving presence for themselves.

The relationship in Christ with God, with other Christians and with the world, which is explicit in the Eucharist, must increasingly be lived out in daily life. At the Eucharist we stand before the Father as those who have received forgiveness; we must then go out and forgive others. Because we are united with one another as well as with Christ, we must go out and draw men together. Because we have been loved, we must go out and love. Thus the world should see in the living community of the Church its own true face, and the possibility of bringing to birth its own potentialities in the power of Christ.

A great aspiration of present-day Christians is "One Church renewed for mission." This phrase emphasises our conviction, based upon the words of Jesus in *John 17, 21*, that the Eucharist is the sign and source of unity, and that unity at the Eucharist is

part of the gospel of reconciliation, to be preached to the whole world.

FINAL STATEMENT

Having come to the end of our study of the topic proposed to us, namely, "The Ecclesial Nature of the Eucharist," we can take great encouragement from the fact that our discussions have led to extensive and thorough agreement on the doctrine of our respective traditions with regard to the Eucharist, sacrament and sacrifice. The preliminary discussion of the eucharistic practice of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church helped us to find a common ground, in that both traditions agree on the continuing application of the principle: "Lex orandi, lex credendi." Our study of two essential aspects of eucharistic faith—the eucharistic sacrifice and the real presence—have brought us to an agreement which is not only "substantial," but which can fairly be described as "complete." This is already something for us to rejoice over; further, it is a sign of hope for future discussions.

It is, however, in our conversations centring on the relationship between the Eucharist and the Church that we have felt ourselves breaking new ground and moving closer to the heart of all ecumenical endeavour. Not only have we been able to reach a similar degree of agreement in this context, but we have been able to see as a result the way in which our future discussions must go: the way is clear for us to open up the topic of the Ministry, and ultimately of Intercommunion.

We have felt it necessary to pause at this stage, so that we can estimate the gains we have made, and so that we can clarify as far as possible the precise questions which now face us. The fact that we have concurred in relating the Eucharist to the Church, and in this way clarifying our understanding of the Church itself, means that we have to go further in this direction; the recognition of elements which are "ecclesial" as distinct from "ecclesiastical" is crucial for our estimate of the Church and for our understanding of the ministry within the Church. It will be remembered that our study of the Eucharist in relation to the Church has meant that we had to discuss the Church's inner nature, its structure and its mission, as well as the connexion between the Eucharist and membership of the Church. From the fact that we recognise the connexion between the Eucharist and

membership of the Church, it follows that we must consider this connexion in relation to the vexed question of intercommunion. What we have done, we believe, is to clear the ground for such further discussions. In the experience of the representatives of both communions, there has been a great deal of clarification of thought gained through our study to date, as well as a mutual growth in awareness and appreciation of the theological and liturgical traditions of both communions. Throughout our work we have been activated by a desire to hasten the time when "all Christians will be gathered, in a common celebration of the Eucharist, into that unity of the one and only Church which Christ bestowed on his Church from the beginning."¹

We have gained encouragement from the "Windsor Statement"² of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, and we would hope that what we have agreed together serves to clarify some of the questions alluded to in that document, and indeed carry the discussion further.

It is our conviction that what we have studied together is of supreme importance to the life of the Church of Christ; it is our earnest hope that what we have concluded will serve as a step on the way to the restoration of unity between our two communions. With this in mind, we submit our work to the authorities of our respective Churches.

NOTES

I. EUCHARISTIC PRACTICE

1 Cf. "Intercommunion. A Scottish Episcopalian Approach," being a Report of the Commission on Intercommunion to the Provincial Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, together with a Postscript recording the decisions of the Provincial Synod at its meeting in Perth on 4th-5th November, 1969, published for the Provincial Synod by the Representative Church Council, 13 Drumsheugh Gardens, Edinburgh, nos. 21-22, pp. 9-10.

2 Cf. "Guidelines for Ecumenical Activity," issued by the National Ecumenical Commission for Scotland of the Roman Catholic Church, Glasgow, 1970, nos. 16-18, pp. 13-15; the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church on this point has been further elaborated by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in its Instruction on June 1st, 1972, and the interpretative "Note" issued on October 17th, 1973.

II. ASPECTS OF EUCHARISTIC FAITH

1 Above all else, the Old Testament's theology of sacrifice is concerned with a personal response of man to a God who is personal: Jahweh, the Lord, is Master, Creator, the Transcendent, but above all he is a person. Sacrifice is

the external expression of an internal attitude of service and dedication. The different kinds of sacrifice which we find in the religion of the Old Testament each emphasize various aspects of the total reality—the highest expression of man's self-giving to God, and an act of communion between God and man.

2 Cf. "My blood of the covenant" in Mt. 26, 28, and Mk. 14, 24, and "The new covenant in my blood" in Lk. 22, 20, and I Cor. 11, 25. We have understood this idea against the background of Ex. 24, 8.

3 It is significant that exegetical opinion recognises in these chapters the "central section" and "essential message" of the entire Letter. The author institutes a comparison between the Old Covenant and its religious expressions and the unique, effective, and definitive sacrifice of Christ which brings the New Covenant into being; the priesthood of Christ replaces the former priesthood, and so "we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus" (10, 19) and can "draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith" (10, 22).

4 Each of these notions has an important bearing on the total New Testament picture of the Eucharist, and consequently on the traditional theology of both Churches: the biblical idea of "memorial," the Pauline idea of "proclamation," the Eucharist as "effective" sign of unity, and the Eucharist as a share in the eschatological future.

5 Cf. Council of Trent: "Doctrina de Sanctissimo Missae Sacrificio," esp. ch. 1. Vatican II has expressed the same idea concisely and in the form of a synthesis: "At the Last Supper, on the night when he was betrayed, our Saviour instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the cross throughout the centuries until he should come again, and so to entrust to his beloved Spouse, the Church, a memorial of his death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is consumed, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us" (Const. on the Sacred Liturgy, ch. 2, no. 47.)

Cf. also Lambeth Conference Report, 1958, p. 2. 84; and Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), Agreed Statement on the Eucharist, para. 3.

6 Cf. Council of Trent, "Decretum de Sanctissima Eucharistia," ch. 5. Cf. also Encyclical Letter, "Mysterium Fidei," no. 34, and ARCIC Agreed Statement, para. 5.

7 Article XXXI states that "the sacrifices of Masses," not the sacrifice of the Mass, were "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." It asserts that "the Offering of Christ once made is the perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction," which again is not in question today. It is the idea that the Mass adds something to Calvary that is rightly denied, and the notion that the more Masses are offered, the greater is the redemption. The writings of Elizabethan and later Anglican divines to the effect that in the Eucharist the one sacrifice of Christ is offered to the Father make clear that the notion of "re-presentation" here stated is not contrary to the teaching contained in this article. Indeed Ridley, at his trial, referred to the Eucharist as an "unbloody sacrifice." Thus the agreement in this statement is not a contravention of Anglican faith.

8 The doctrine of eucharistic change in contemporary Roman Catholic theology is not tied to any particular philosophy. "The word 'transubstantiation' is commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the Eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements.

The term should be seen as affirming the fact of Christ's presence, and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place." (ARCIC Agreed Statement, footnote to para. 6.)

The Thirty-Nine Articles appear to deny transubstantiation as a doctrine. A letter from the author of the article in question, no. XXVIII, insists that it did not exclude the presence of Christ's Body from the sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof. He goes on: "Though he took Christ's Body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially, and carnally as the doctors do write, yet he did not for all that see it, smell it, nor taste it." What Bishop Guest, the writer, appears to be denying is the belief that gave rise to the legend of bleeding hosts and blood-stained corporals. It is clear that what is here controverted is an idea that no one would assert today. He affirms a presence that is not in a "corporal, carnal, or natural manner." He quotes Bishop Jewel, who claimed that the presence is "invisible, unspeakably, supernaturally, divinely, and by way to him only known." Thus no denial of what is currently held by Roman Catholics is contained here; indeed, it is asserted.

It is also relevant to note that the so-called Black Rubric added at the last moment to the Communion service of the 1552 English Prayer Book, and rewritten in modified form in the 1662 Prayer Book, has never appeared in any Scottish Prayer Book. In its 1552 form the Rubric stated that kneeling to receive communion did not imply "any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." In the 1662 Book this was changed to "any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

The Scottish Prayer Book of 1929 includes the following among its rubrics for Holy Communion: "According to long-existing custom in the Scottish Church, the Presbyter may reserve so much of the consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church."

9 Cf. ARCIC Agreed Statement, para. 7.

10 Cf. Vatican II: Const. on the Church, ch. 2, no. 10. Cf. also Lambeth Conference Report, 1968, "Renewal in Ministry," pp. 93 ff.

III. THE ECCLESIAL NATURE OF THE EUCHARIST

1 Cf. Vatican II: Const. on the Church, ch. 2, no. 11.

2 Cf. Schillebeeckx, E.: "Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God," London and Melbourne, 1963.

3 Cf. *Ibid.*, ch. 2: "The Church, Sacrament of the Risen Christ." Cf. also Vatican II: "By her relationship with Christ, the Church is a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God and of the unity of all mankind." (Const. on the Church, ch. 1, no. 1.)

FINAL STATEMENT

1 Cf. Vatican II: Decree on Ecumenism, ch. 1, no. 4.

Covenants

COVENANT RELATIONSHIP

What is it?

A "Covenant Relationship" is an agreement between two communities—e.g., a Roman Catholic parish and a parish or congregation of a non-Roman Catholic church—in which the members of these communities commit themselves to pray for each other, and together; to cooperate in whatever ways they determine are mutually desirable; and to come to know and support one another in the LORD.

Why?

Concern for Christian Unity has been a growing awareness in the lives of Christians and their churches during this century. For Roman Catholics, this awareness was confirmed in official Church policy at the Second Vatican Council, where Catholics—"faithful and clergy alike"—were charged with the responsibility of being concerned for restoring unity. The Council called for closer cooperation among all Christians.

Yet ecumenism—or, working for Christian Unity—has often remained on a theoretical, upper-echelon level. Its practical meaning is not clear to the people in the pew, nor often to their parish clergy, either.

Practical steps at the parish level are needed if we are to become aware of our call as a people to work for that unity for which Christ prayed. To enter a "Covenant Relationship" is one such practical step to build understanding and trust, cooperation and support, on the firm foundation of prayer and faith in Christ.

What does a "Covenant" contain?

The Covenant is primarily a willingness on the part of members of both parishes to enter into a relationship of prayer, cooperation and mutual support in Christ. Unless this attitude is firmly rooted in the hearts of people, a document will be meaningless.

The Covenant must also be reflected in the activities and programs of each parish, in their internal concerns and priorities.

If it is a simple "good idea" which everyone approves but no one acts upon, the "Covenant" will be empty.

Finally, the Covenant should be written up in such a manner as to express the attitude and commitment of the people and parishes, and as a reminder for self-evaluation to determine periodically what the relationship truly means. Such a written document should contain at least the names of the parishes involved, the purposes for the Covenant, how they have mutually agreed to express this relationship in various programs or activities, and any other special provisions the two parishes may agree upon.

How is it developed?

The following is suggested approach for Roman Catholics:

1. The parish staff should consider the idea carefully. Once they fully understand it, they should determine whether they would be willing to carry through on such a relationship.

2. The Parish Council should consider the idea in the light of the Church's official position on Christian Unity. The question is whether this is an effective step to be taken locally to build greater understanding and love. If it is not, then alternatives to the "Covenant Relationship" should be decided upon: not to act for Christian Unity may be a betrayal of our Catholic convictions.

3. If the parish staff and Parish Council are agreed that a Covenant Relationship is desirable, conversations should be initiated by the parish staff with a parish or congregation with which the Catholic parish already enjoys a certain level of understanding and mutual cooperation. At least, this would appear the most effective first choice.

4. The staff and appropriate agencies of the other parish or congregation should be encouraged to consider the proposal as thoroughly as the Catholic parish has just done.

5. If there is agreement that the idea is worth pursuing, joint study committees drawn from both communities should be established to investigate the various possibilities for what the Covenant Relationship might entail.

6. The parish staffs and councils of the two communities should eventually determine the extent of the Covenant Rela-

tionship, approve the statement of it, and prepare the people of their respective communities for this relationship.

7. For Roman Catholic parishes, approval of the Covenant by the Bishop is required before it may be signed by the local parish. Approval by the proper authorities of the other Church is encouraged.

A suggested time-table

Careful preparation is needed to achieve a genuine Covenant Relationship.

Before June 30—steps 1 through 4

Before November 30—step 5 should be completed

Before December 30—steps 6 and 7

During the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity (January 18-25), formal signing of the Covenant document and initiation of the relationship.

—The Ecumenical Commission of The Roman Catholic Diocese of Helena.

TOWARD A THEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF CLUSTERS

The term "cluster" occurs in ordinary language when, e.g., we say, "That cluster of birches makes a brilliant scene," or, as a model in physics, such as a "cluster of molecules." Clusters of churches normally refers to two or more neighboring churches who associate in any way. The phenomenon of clustering reflects the local, regional, or grass roots turn in contemporary ecumenism.

We should more appropriately speak of "covenants," not clusters. In fact, covenant is the term used in Wales where churches have been involved in this process since 1964. It has a firm basis in Scripture and Tradition in the concept of the People of God as a covenantal community. While clusters implies pragmatic cooperation based upon geographical proximity, covenant means conscious intention to bring about a new relationship of community based upon a recognition of the faith which we share.

This means that the covenant is primarily a relationship. It is neither sacramental nor voluntary association. It is a relationship created by the love of God and sustained by the faith of its con-

stituents. It is intentional, conscious, freely made, involves a community of persons, and carries specific responsibilities. The churches who comprise the covenant each recognize that the present state of affairs is not the final one. Purification and renewal are constantly needed. Death for an exclusive identity and resurrection to a more inclusive identity can then occur.

A covenant of churches may take a variety of shapes depending on the makeup of its constituents and their current state of development. They may be denominational—Orthodox, Protestant, Catholic or ecumenical.

Theologically speaking, any covenant model must include four basic features. Each one is indispensable and all four are equally important and must be held in balance: spiritual, intellectual, moral, and organizational. Indeed, it is the purpose of a covenant of churches to assure that all four dimensions of our ecumenical and religious life flourish together.

A covenant of churches is a worshipping community. In the process of mutually recognized and shared worship, it begins to create new ecumenical liturgies based on its own experience together.

A covenant of churches is a thinking community. It takes seriously the need to supply vision and to be informed as Christians and as people of the 20th Century. Accordingly, it provides occasions to engage in dialogue, reflection, and action with any person.

A covenant of churches is an acting community. It understands the basic meaning of the word "ecumenism" as "the inhabited world" and so acts courageously as an agent of reconciliation, change, and transformation among persons and institutions (including its own) in the world.

A covenant of churches is a conciliar community. That is, how it reaches decisions and organizes its life is as important as what it does. Honesty, openness, humility, fairness, e.g., equal male-female representation and toleration characterize its total organizational life.

A covenant of churches will grow to the degree that it allows all four dimensions to develop fully and in balance. It can help ecumenism move beyond the stalemate between the diplomatic ecumenism of polite conversation on the one hand and the utilitarian ecumenism of mere community service on the other.

The impetus for a covenant of churches should spring from our faith. It may arise though from the sudden realization that the existence of five or ten separate, unrelated, or competing churches in a community each with its own budgets, programs, staff, buildings, etc., raise serious moral not to say economic questions today. Instead of all the wasted energy and ineffective (shall we say faithless?) witness which that scene increasingly represents, think of what it might mean to begin seriously building a covenant of churches, a community of Christians worshipping, thinking, acting and planning together.

If we thoughtfully recognize the faith which we as churches share, then it will be our intention to really build covenants of churches. In the process, the twin luxuries of denominationalism and ecumenism as we now know them will vanish. Think of what that might mean in our neighborhoods, towns, and region!

Prepared by:

Rev. Daniel L. Anderson

SOUTHBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, COVENANT

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Christ,

Notre Dame and Holy Trinity will be part of a pilot program in Anglican/Roman Catholic relations. Together with other pairs of churches in the diocese of Worcester, we will undertake a covenant of mutual concern. As an expression of this covenant, each parish at its principal Sunday service, will offer public prayers, for the clergy and people of the sister parish and for the re-union of the Anglican and Roman Catholic communions. What will happen as a result of these prayers remains for the Lord of the Church and His people to decide, although, if the future is like the past, we may expect gratifying—even surprising—progress.

After four centuries of estrangement, the Anglican Church (of which the Episcopal Church is the American branch) and the Roman Catholic Church have been blessed with a spirit of warm reconciliation within the past decades but especially within the past five years. In 1966 the Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, and Pope Paul VI met and instituted an Anglican/Roman Catholic ("ARC") Joint Preparatory Commission.

The ARC meetings in America have revealed that the two

churches hold surprisingly identical positions, particularly in regard to the Eucharist and the historic, ordained ministry. Indeed the members of ARC resolved:

We see the goal as to realize full communion of the Roman Catholic Church with the Episcopal Church and the other Churches of the Anglican Communion. For the past four and one-half years we have given our energies to the task of this consultation. Nothing in the course of this serious enterprise has emerged which would cause us to think for a moment that this goal, given the guidance and support of the Spirit of Christ, is unattainable.

In order to let this relationship develop at the grass roots, the ecumenical commissions of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Worcester and the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts called a meeting last June to discuss the possibility of yoking local Roman Catholic and Episcopal parishes together in a formally declared covenant. The Ecumenical officers of Holy Trinity and Notre Dame attended this meeting and heartily endorsed the idea.

As your pastors we desire that you will join in praying and working for reconciliation between our churches so that we will soon have intercommunion. We ask you to attend the service in which we make our covenant with each other. The service will be held at 7:30 Wednesday evening, December 1, 1971 in Holy Trinity Church.

Faithfully in the service of Christ,

Rev. Raymond J. Page

Rev. Edward A. M. Cobden, Jr.

SERMON PREACHED BY REV. EDWARD A. M. COBDEN, JR.
AT HOLY TRINITY CHURCH, SOUTHBRIDGE, ON
NOVEMBER 21, 1971.

"A Special Covenant"

This morning Fr. Page and I are interpreting to our congregations the Covenant we wrote to you about earlier this week. The letter explained that parishioners of Notre Dame and Holy Trinity will meet here at 7:30 Wednesday evening, Dec. 1, to pledge to each other that we will offer ourselves as instruments of unity and that the first step we will take is to pray for each other and the reunion of our communions at the principle services of our churches.

In commenting on this Covenant the overall note which I would like to strike is one of profound joy.

After more than 400 years of isolation and alienation our two communions are declaring our friendship for each other. When you look down the road and see what this step we are about to take signifies, who can fail to be exhilarated by the warmth of the reconciliation we now have? It is such a happy feeling you can feel sympathetic to the married couples who like to quarrel because it is so nice when they make up. Let's hope, of course, that we no longer have to quarrel to feel the joy of the reconciliation we now have.

The joy we have can be compared to that which we have when the cure to a dread disease has been discovered. Our division has been very much like a disease which has sapped the strength of Christ's church. Now happily a cure has been found.

What makes it even more exciting is that the cure has been tested in the laboratories by the theologians and bishops and they have given it their approval. Now it can be used. It is interesting to note that it will be used first in our two dioceses, and it just so happens, it will be used first in our two parishes. In the whole western hemisphere and perhaps in all the world, the concrete step of reconciliation will happen first here with us.

That it should happen with us first is no accident. Our dioceses have long been working toward this moment. Years ago you may remember we had the Living Room dialogues. Our bishops have been eager for this, and none have been closer than Bishop Stewart and Bishop Flanigan. In addition Fr. Page and I are dedicated body and soul to the reconciliation between our two churches. I know you share with us the joy and thrill over the historically significant step we will be making on December 1.

Now while the overarching mood is one of extreme jubilation and thanksgiving, certain cautions must be noted. We wish to neither mislead nor overstate the meaning of what we are doing.

First of all, this Covenant relationship between our two communions and parishes is *not to be interpreted as a merger*. It has nothing to do with merging buildings, budgets, or people. It will not mean we will become Roman Catholics or the people of Notre Dame Episcopalians.

What we are aiming at is intercommunion. This means that

we would recognize the validity of what each church believed and was doing in order that we could embrace each other as brothers and co-workers for Christ. The specific issues involved are the doctrines of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and the validity of Anglican orders in the mind of the Roman Catholic Church.

Theological consensus on the Eucharist has been reached. When this consensus is approved by the teaching authorities of both churches, then the doctrine of ministry will follow quite easily. A few weeks ago Archbishop Ramsey did approve the consensus on the Eucharist and approval by Pope Paul is anticipated shortly.

When this theological understanding is reached, we can share our ministry for Christ in a teamlike fashion. We can have communion together. We can teach and preach together since we are like-minded on essential matters. That is what is meant by intercommunion.

Intercommunion does not mean one church will absorb the other or that we will both be absorbed in a bigger church. We are not aiming at a new political structure with a new constitution. Each communion—Anglican and Roman—will retain its own identity, character, ethos, and distinctive qualities. To use colloquial idioms, we will continue doing our own thing, dancing in our own style, but dancing as partners to the same tune.

The joint commission on Anglican-Roman Catholic relations hopes their work will lead to "the restoration of full communion and organic unity." It makes clear that "full communion must not be interpreted as an agreement to disagree while sharing in the eucharistic gifts, nor may organic unity be understood as juridical concept implying a particular form of church government. Such a unity is hard to visualize, but would mean a sufficient compatibility of policy to make possible a united mission to the human family. Whatever structural forms emerge, it is hoped that cultural and liturgical *variety* will remain so that the values of both the Roman and Anglican ethos will survive and develop."

The kind of relationship we are talking about might be put like this. Two families have announced that after 400 years the feud is over. They are going to be friends because happily they are able to see eye to eye about basic issues. These families are talking about having dinner in each other's homes to celebrate

their friendship. They are talking about working together as a team in the community. But these families recognize that they still have their own family responsibilities. They are not planning to move into each other's houses.

I can speak of the remaining cautionary notes more briefly.

The second is this: Having a close bi-lateral relationship between two churches—Roman and Anglican—does not in any way preclude or hinder other bi-lateral relationships.

I am concerned that people will say now that Holy Trinity is friends with Notre Dame or now that the Episcopal Church is moving forward with the Roman Catholic Church, that means that they are moving away from the Orthodox or Protestant Churches. This may be a normal reaction but it is incorrect. It is like the little girl who says that Susie doesn't like her anymore because Susie is playing with Mary. As we mature we find we can have several friends simultaneously.

We need to see this reconciliation as taking place in the context of a total movement of unity. I picture it by using the image of a wheel with spokes. The spokes are the denominations, and the wheel is the church as a whole. The Anglican and Roman Catholic spokes are close to each other. We have a lot in common by nature, and so we find it less difficult to get together. But all the other spokes—the other churches—are holding the wheel together. And when the wheel is *doing its job and moving*, you don't think about the various spokes—it's even hard to distinguish them—you think of the wheel as a whole.

So we will continue to be friends with members of all the other churches. Indeed we feel that when two churches can achieve a close relationship, it is a good sign for all the other churches. If A is close to B and A is also close to C, this can only help to draw B and C closer together.

Third: The progress which has been made can only be continued with the support of the people. A great amount of careful preparation has gone into the stage where we are now. But if the *Archie Bunker* in each of us, if our ghetto-mindedness and ethnic blindness prevents us from seeing the will of Christ in our reconciliation, then further progress will be hindered. If you want the church to have peace with itself and effectiveness in its mission, then I ask you to give your enthusiastic support to this movement toward reconciliation.

The kind of support I mean is to have a positive attitude. What we need is a willingness to interpret what we are doing with love to those who have sociological hang-ups and who may very well be sour and suspicious about this new relationship.

Right now we are not looking for support in promoting a lot of joint projects. In our press conference, reporters wanted to know what we were going to do besides praying for each other. The answer is that for the moment this is all we plan. After 400 years of animosity, we want to live for a while with the good news that we are friends. Let's give this good news a little while to register in our minds and hearts.

The fourth caution I would make is that this Covenant we will have is only a step toward our goal. Even intercommunion is not the final step. Our goal is the renewal of the whole church. We would have the church become what Christ meant it to be: the light of the world showing forth a recreated humanity, living at peace with each other because we live in obedience to the Lord.

So we can only rest for a moment as we celebrate the historic step we take on December 1. But we cannot stop there as wonderful as it is that we have made good friends in Christ. Rather we must link arms with our new friends as we move forward together in a life-long mission.

These then are the cautions:

- 1) We seek intercommunion and not merger
- 2) Our friendship with Notre Dame does not preclude friendship with any other church
- 3) We can proceed only with the support of the people
- 4) This reconciliation is not an end in itself but only a step toward the goal of renewal for the church as a whole.

Having made these precautions, we can feel a deep sense of step toward the goal of renewal for the church as a whole.

TO THE GLORY OF GOD
A SERVICE OF COVENANT

Notre Dame Parish (Roman Catholic) and
Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, Southbridge, Mass.
December 1, 1971, 7:30 P.M.

Hymn: "We Gather Together" Episcopal Hymnal 315

A Prayer of Purity:

Almighty God, to you all hearts are open, all desires known, and from you no secrets are hid: Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of your Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love you, and worthily magnify your holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

A Penitential Rite:

Leader: My brothers and sisters, that we might more worthily pursue greater unity with each other, let us pause for a moment in silence, to recall our sinfulness and our constant need for God's forgiveness. (Brief period of silence).

Leader: That we may be forgiven controversies marked by irony, suspicion, pride, and intolerance. Lord have mercy.

People: Lord, have mercy.

Leader: That we may be forgiven all acts of violence and injustice toward our separated brothers, toward those in our own communions. Christ have mercy.

People: Christ, have mercy.

Leader: That we may be forgiven the complacency and apathy which tolerates indefinitely the scandal of disunion which delays and diminishes the fulfillment of Christ's will for His church. Lord have mercy.

People: Lord, have mercy.

Leader: May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life.

People: Amen.

Gloria in Excelsis: (All will now say together).

Glory to God in the highest, and peace to his people on earth. Lord God, heavenly King, almighty God and Father, we worship you, we give you thanks, we praise you for your glory. Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father, Lord God, Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world; have mercy on us; you are seated at the right hand of the Father; receive our prayer. For you alone are the Holy One, you alone are the Lord, you alone are the Most High, Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

Minister: The Lord be with you.

People: And also with you.

Minister: Let us pray.

A Prayer For The Unity Of The Church:

Almighty Father, whose blessed Son before his passion prayed for his disciples that they might be one, even as you and he are one; Grant that, bound together in love and obedience to you, your Church may be united in one body by the one Spirit; that the world may believe in him whom you have sent, your Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, now and ever. Amen.

Old Testament (all sit)

Isaiah 35

Silence

Epistle

Ephesians 4:1-6

Gospel

(all stand)

John 17:15-23

After the announcement of the Gospel
the people respond:

“Glory to you, Lord Jesus Christ.”

After the Gospel the people respond:

“Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ.”

Hymn: “O Come, O Come, Emmanuel” Episcopal Hymnal 2

Greetings

The Rev. Edward A. M. Cobden, Jr.

Homily

The Rev. Raymond J. Page

The Creed:

We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, one in Being with the Father. Through him all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven: by power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man.

For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate: he suffered, died, and was buried. On the third day he rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures: he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father. With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets.

We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

Anthem:
(all stand).

Minister: Let us make our covenant with each other in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

People: Amen.

All: Father, we acknowledge your Son's desire for unity in His Church. With the assistance of your Spirit we, therefore, pledge to you and each other that we will offer ourselves as instruments of unity. As our first act we

promise to pray for each other and the reunion of our two communions. Renew your Church, Lord, beginning with us. Amen.

The Exchange of Peace: The Peace of the Lord be with you.

Response: And also with you.

Minister: Let us pray with confidence to the Father in the words our Saviour gave us.

People: Our Father in heaven, holy be your Name, your kingdom come, your will be done, on earth as in heaven. Give us today our daily bread. Forgive us our sins as we forgive those who sin against us. Do not bring us to the test but deliver us from evil. For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours now and for ever. Amen.

A Thanksgiving

Minister: Let us give thanks to God our Father for all his gifts to us. For our very lives and all the wonder of your creation.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For your constant care for us.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For the way you rescued us from Sin and death by your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For the outpouring of your Holy Spirit especially in your Church by which you keep us whole and well unto eternal life.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For our baptism by which we share the most profound unity in Christ.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For the Eucharist in which we are nourished by the very life of our resurrected Lord Jesus.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For the ordained ministers of the Church: deacons, priests, and bishops as they offer the Word and Sacraments to God's people.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: For your leading us to this joyful step toward reunion and renewal.

People: We thank you, Lord.

Minister: Let us go forth into the world in peace, rejoicing in the power of the Spirit.

People: Thanks be to God.

Hymn: "The Church's One Foundation"

Episcopal Hymnal 396

STATEMENT OF INTENT (MONTANA)

Jesus Christ prayed that his followers would be one.

Recognizing that the division among Christians is counter to the Will of Christ, Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury and Pope Paul VI of Rome issued a common declaration on March 24, 1966. They pledged "to inaugurate between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion a serious dialogue which, founded on the gospels and on the ancient common traditions, may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed."

At the national and international levels, this dialogue has been pursued with gratifying results.

Attempting to respond faithfully to the Will of Christ, and pursuant to the call of the leaders of our respective Churches, we the Bishops of the Episcopal Diocese of Montana, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Great Falls, and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Helena, now issue the following Statement of Intent:

1. We will pursue a serious dialogue between our various Dioceses in the spirit of the national and international Dialogues, in an effort to approach that unity in truth for which Christ prayed.

2. We encourage the parishes of our respective traditions to enter into covenant relationships one with another

to build through a spirit of prayer, study and social life together, a mutual understanding which can form the basis for the practical discovery of that unity for which Christ prayed.

3. We express the hope that our common experience will enable each of us to engage in further dialogues with Christians of other traditions and Churches, as we strive to overcome those barriers to unity which still scandalously divide Christians today.

Great Falls, Montana

April 2, 1974

Bishop of the
Diocese of Montana
Signed: Jackson E. Gilliam

Bishop of the
Diocese of Great Falls
Signed: Eldon B. Schuster

Bishop of the
Diocese of Helena
Signed: Raymond G. Hunthausen

A JOINT DECLARATION (MONTANA)

In an effort to respond to the call of Christ for unity among His followers, the Episcopal Diocese of Montana and the Roman Catholic Dioceses of Great Falls and Helena have entered into official dialogues.

We have held a joint workshop to study the results of the Anglican—Roman Catholic Dialogues held nationally and internationally at the call of Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury and Pope Paul VI of Rome. With the aid of competent experts, clergy and lay persons from our dioceses have studied the Windsor Statement on the Eucharist and the Canterbury Statement on Ministry and Ordination.

After prayerful study and reflection, we find these Agreed Statements to express substantially the faith we each profess. We call, therefore, for their official ratification by our respective Churches.

We ask this official recognition in order to promote better understanding between our Churches. We ask also that within our Churches, such recognition may provide official reassurance that the substance of our faith is accurately expressed in these documents.

We commit ourselves as individuals and as local Churches to strive to live this richer understanding in truth of the faith we profess.

Signed at Bozeman, Montana, this 27th day of June, 1974.

The above Joint Declaration was approved in substance by participants at the Workshop on June 27, reviewed and revised by the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue group for Montana, and signed by the Bishops concerned.

Bishop of the
Diocese of Montana
Signed: Jackson E. Gilliam

Bishop of the
Diocese of Great Falls
Signed: Eldon B. Schuster

Bishop of the
Diocese of Helena
Signed: Raymond G. Hunthausen

KANSAS CITY COVENANT

In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Whereas, it is the Will of Jesus Christ "that they all may be one"; and

Whereas, the highest leadership of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches have expressed a desire for reunion of these Christian and Sister Churches; and

Whereas, the theologians of these Churches are meeting to solve the theological problems involved in reunion; and

Whereas, the Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of West Missouri and the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph have expressed a desire that the parishes in their Diocese prepare themselves for this reunion; and

Whereas, the peoples of Grace and Holy Trinity Cathedral and the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, both in the City of Kansas City and the State of Missouri, are conscious of the Will of Jesus Christ and the desire of their respective Churches for reunion;

Now,

Therefore, we solemnly and reverently enter into this Covenant and hereby pledge:

1. To support each in preserving the traditions of the other—Roman Catholic or Anglican as the case may be—according to the mandate of the Gospel.
2. To strive for the removal of any existing obstacle to reunion.
3. To place no impediment in the way of reunion.
4. To include in our liturgies a petition to God for the reunion of these Churches.
5. To include in our liturgies a prayer for each other.
6. To share as far as is feasible our facilities.
7. To make available each to the other programs sponsored by our congregations.
8. To have designated representatives attend Mass or a service of the other once each month.
9. To work together for social justice and the common good.
10. To sponsor joint social events.
11. To continue covenanting meetings on a regular basis for prayer, study and the furtherance of inter-involvement.

We dedicate ourselves to these objectives and ask the blessing of Almighty God on this Covenant that we may be faithful to it to His Honor and Glory.

In Witness Whereof, we have hereunto set our hands this Pentecost, the second day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-four.

GREEN BAY COVENANT

We, the Bishops of the Episcopal Diocese of Fond du Lac and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Green Bay, met recently to discuss ways to augment the findings of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission for Unity. As you undoubtedly are aware, there has already been much progress toward this end between our two Communion in this area.

For example, there has been a history of warm, personal friendship between priests of our dioceses for many years; there has been a sharing of church facilities; there have been joint catechetical ventures between some of our parishes and other gestures of fraternal and pastoral sharing.

Deserving of special note is the recent Windsor Statement of the International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission concerning our substantial agreement on the Eucharist. Inasmuch as the Holy Eucharist lies at the very heart of the life of both our Communion, this remarkable breakthrough in common understanding and faith deserves our attention, serious study and prayerful hope for its full realization.

Already toward this end there are noteworthy beginnings: In the Dioceses of Worcester, Massachusetts, and Western Massachusetts "Covenant Relationships" have been established for some two years. This has involved prayer for one another publicly in the liturgy, a serious getting to know one another among both the clergy and the laity, and a mutual concern for the sick and shut-ins, the youth and many others in need. Even closer to home may we point out that the same sort of Covenant relationships have been initiated between the Cathedrals of Milwaukee and some twenty other of our parishes . . .

We request the prayers of you, our brothers in Christ, that the Holy Spirit guide us in this humble beginning toward oneness in Christ.

GEORGIA/SAVANNAH COVENANT

In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit:

The Lord Jesus Christ prayed that we His followers be one, as He and His Father are one. The present divisions that exist among Christians clearly are not what He wills for us. On 24 March 1966

the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a common declaration in which they pledged "to inaugurate between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion a serious dialogue which . . . may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed."

At the national and international levels this dialogue already has been pursued with most encouraging results. Moved now by the Holy Spirit, we, the bishops of the Episcopal Diocese of Georgia and the Roman Catholic Diocese of Savannah, issue the following statement of intent:

1. We will promote serious dialogue between our two dioceses in the spirit of the national and international dialogues between our Churches.

2. We encourage all our congregations to enter into covenant relationships with one another. Although we recognize that inter-communion has not yet been achieved by our Churches, we strongly recommend common prayer together, study together, (especially of the Canterbury and Windsor Agreed Statements) and social witness together.

3. We will inaugurate a Prayer Cycle for the congregations of our two dioceses so that each day we can pray for one another in an ordered way.

May the Lord grant us to grow in love for Him and for one another. Amen.

Joint Pastoral Letter

Trinity Church, Copley Square, Boston, June 6, 1975

BLESS THESE BEGINNINGS

Dearly beloved Brothers and Sisters in Christ:

Our first words must be of thanks that we can address together some of the points on which our two Christian communions have spoken separately for four and one half centuries. We attribute this possibility to the Holy Spirit working in our day to bring together that which is broken and to reunite those whom the events of history have made separate.

It is, of course, our task to reaffirm the constant Christian concern with those who suffer from want or deprivation of whatever sort. It is our hope that more and more we may find ways to make explicit before our people and our neighbors the ecumenical axiom—never do separately what can be done together.

There is need for the world to see this common witness as there is need for us to manifest it. A humanism which is not rooted in the notion of the divine is most apt to be rootless and impermanent, and subject to the ever-changing social pressures of the times.

It is precisely because we emphasize the transcendence of God over human affairs that we can give to man and his problems that dignity which would otherwise be open to question. We can project for our fellow men the highest and holiest of accomplishments, regardless of present obstacles, because our belief in God's presence in human affairs, and our allegiance to His holy will are firm.

This is true of our war on racism, poverty, exploitation and ignorance. We recognize what great contribution has been made in this respect by those who do not share our faith in God, but we believe that it is such a faith alone which will guarantee the steadfast continuance of a holy battle for human justice in the face of every adversity.

Our two communions have much to share in what has gone before. Together we are blessed and refreshed by innumerable

common memories and understandings. Together we celebrate the accomplishments of those giants of the Christian faith, Columba, Hilda, Patrick and Augustine of Canterbury. We recall that for centuries this same Canterbury, like Jerusalem, Rome, and Compostello, was a great shrine of pilgrimage and prayer.

Despite the historical division and continuing separation, we share much of a community of piety and worship rooted in the inspired Word of God and a common tradition of spirituality.

This past is prelude to the present in which we attempt to discern the working of the Spirit in our midst. Our common desire for increasing unity between our two communions is surely a sign of the Spirit. We rejoice that through three significant movements: Biblical studies, the liturgical renewal, and ecumenism, we are further encouraged and prompted to create, with God's grace, this future of growing unity.

As we project for the future, it is important that we do not lose our past and we commend that past to the study of our two communions. That past has had its problems and difficulties and yet it is that past that makes it possible for us today to address this joint letter to our peoples.

What can be more profitable in the future than for our people to study together—as we have these past two days—the ways whereby God has guided us over the years of our common and separate histories until the present with its hope of a bright new future?

We know sadly how much remains to be accomplished to bring about the unity of the world despite the marvels of modern communication. We know how suspicion and hatred linger long after their apparent root causes are removed.

But we do know that a great first task in which we must work and pray is the reunion of all those who profess the Christian name and believe the Christian gospel. We recognize that the Episcopal and the Roman Catholic Churches have so many links that they can approach each other with the confidence of a common background.

In John 17 our Lord prayed again and again that all who profess His name should be one, "that they may be one even as we are one—that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even

as thou hast loved me." This is our Divine impulse, God's ecumenical imperative. This is the innate thrust of the church visible: to be one. How can we speak to the world of God's reconciling love unless we manifest our love for one another? How can we be ambassadors of Christ, the ministers of reconciliation if we do not express our unity in Christ, our community rather than our divisions? Visibly, institutionally we are divided, yet we firmly believe that there is but "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all."

The Good News must be shared! It cannot be contained nor placed under a bushel. It is good news for the whole world. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

Hence we who have met to discern the signs of existing unity and to seek ways of future greater unity among us, do so in all humility, trusting that we are but instruments of the Providence which wills that we may all be one. Our common task may be regional and apparently small but in the sum of all that must be accomplished for God and His Christ, it is irreplaceable.

May God bless these beginnings.

Devotedly yours in Our Lord,

John M. Burgess
Bishop of Massachusetts

Humberto Cardinal Medeiros
Archbishop of Boston

Where Anglicans and Roman Catholics Agree

The Text of Bishop Clark's Address to the
Anglican Synod on November 7, 1974

PART I

I would like to begin these reflections with almost a platitude—that no one ever speaks in a void—though I hasten to add that it is farthest from my thoughts to describe the General Synod as a void! What I wish to emphasise from the outset of what is for me a very privileged occasion, is that the opportunity to speak to you regarding the work of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission is particularly valuable in the light of the extensive interest the two Agreements (on the Eucharist and on the Ministry) have aroused throughout the Church. One finds enormous encouragement in the recent welcome given to them by the two Convocations of York and Canterbury. My contention is, quite simply, that the work of the Commission, particularly as a result of its specific methodology, has changed the face of ecumenical dialogue. In fact, I believe that the whole span of ecumenical activity, which is now contributing towards the growth in Christian unity, has drawn breath and life from the achievements of ARCIC.

But if one always speaks out of the present moment and to the present moment, it is right to specify in general terms the contemporary context which has made these agreements possible. First and foremost I would emphasise the ecumenical movement itself. This has thrown into reverse the tragic drift to greater and greater division and to the hopelessness of unyielding polarisation and mutual distrust. This must not be seen as a great human achievement—though great and good men have done much to enable all of us to accept the grace which is being offered—it is a pure gift of God in the Holy Spirit. Why else should those who confess one Lord and one Saviour be converted, within so short a time, to the massive undertaking of seeking a unity that, though never entirely lost, had become submerged in controversy and polemic? The movement of return is under way, a return not to the past but, paradoxically, to a future which Christ, the Lord of the Church, to whom all things are subject, is leading all of us, and

which we will disregard to our peril. We cannot ascertain the details of the shape and form of the Church of the future but we are not ignorant of its basic constituents which exist by the express will of Christ. For this Church will be always, at any time in history, the continuing identifiable community of believers, joined by adherence to one apostolic faith, sharing the same sacraments and the same organic life based on the gifts of the Spirit. In whatever way it is incarnated in the passing society of a particular age, it is in visible continuity with its past.

This perhaps is the key to an understanding of how the International Commission made its first stumbling steps to the fashioning of a method whereby, without disregarding the history of our divisions, we could positively profess an unimagined unity of faith in those very areas where reconciliation had appeared for too long to be impossible, namely in the doctrine of the Eucharist, of the Ordained Ministry and of the authority given by Christ to the Church to order all things according to his will. We spoke to each other, not out of our catechisms, but out of our experienced faith, a faith formed by the communities to which we belong. What do you and I believe to be the Eucharist which the Church celebrates in memory of its Lord? What is the Church doing when she gathers the faithful round the altar in this celebration? What is the office and function which is embodied in the ordained ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon? By what authority do we say this is the meaning of the Gospel we are commissioned to preach, and by what criterion do we give absolute value to those doctrines which we consider of the essence of our faith?

These are the questions which set in motion the interchange of ideas which were to be the stuff out of which our agreements were made. We avoided taking up again, in the same terms, the mechanics of the Reformation debate—not because we underrated the strength of that long, long controversy which, after all, is still with us, but because nothing suggested we would do better than our forebears. Instead, we began by asking what we, as representatives of our respective Churches, believed here and now to be Gospel truth. We began by speaking to each other in our own language, of course, but seeking to understand what each was saying—not just the words but the doctrinal positions which these words signalled. Our dialogue was—and remains—an encounter of persons, persons in love with the same Lord and en-

joying the love of the same Lord. This means that we did not seek to convince each other of the rightness of our own interpretations but rather, by reflecting *together* on the sources of the faith we professed, to reach a consensus of faith. It was as though I, as a Roman Catholic, said: this is my faith, to which my Anglican brother replied: it is also mine. Only within this climate of the Spirit is it possible to disentangle the reasons why Christians should adopt with such determination particular positions that conflict, rather than unity, becomes inevitable. As Pope John pointed out some ten years ago, speaking out of his generous vision of the redeemed community of our Lord and Saviour, all dialogue begins with a conversion of heart and mind.

Nevertheless, we regarded, and continue to regard, the formulation of our belief as of overriding importance. The faith we profess is a faith to be preached and proclaimed. It needs words to articulate it. Yet it is precisely in the arena of human words and argument that the faith can so easily be distorted. Particular words or expressions become signs of denominational identity, at times even shibboleths. The truth that even within the unity of one faith there can be different expressions of the same faith is not an abstract principle of semantics but the dynamic fact which admits the legitimacy of a certain pluralism even at the level of faith. This cannot mean that every expression of faith is admissible. There are limits to orthodoxy. But it is evident that much of our doctrinal division requires our close attention in order to be sure that the divisions result from differing belief rather than from differing theology. We must be able to distinguish what are accretions to our faith, accretions which should be seen for what they are—therefore expendable if need be!

I hope, by now, I have described enough of the spirit and dynamic forces which the work of the commission released, in order that you may grasp with sympathy not only what we have been endeavouring to do over the last five years but what you, I hope, will be ready to do in your own areas of responsibility. Perhaps this is the moment when it would be right to indicate in more detail the structure of the two agreements, the impetus of their argument and so underline the stringency of their conclusions. I then propose to offer you, in simplicity and with the assurance of your charity, some reflections on the present position and practical consequences of the commission's work.

The first Agreed Statement was achieved at Windsor in Sep-

tember 1971 at the Third Meeting of the International Commission. It ended (see N.12) with the assertion that substantial agreement had been reached on the doctrine of the Eucharist. The full implications of such an agreement have yet to be registered but in simple terms the commission was rejecting the assumption that Anglicans and Roman Catholics professed substantially different doctrine in the central mystery of the Christian faith. In the mind of the "Men of Windsor," it was time to bring to an end the polemic of the Reformation in this area. Nevertheless, though this was not immediately apparent, we were very conscious that we had produced a new kind of credal document—a fact which explains much of the confused reaction that ensued on its publication.

If I may be permitted to quote myself from another context:

"Agreed Statements are a kind of ecclesiastical document. They are not agreed by the highest authorities, nor by the Church at large, but by a commission officially sponsored by these authorities. They are formulated in a language acceptable to all members of the commission but not wholly familiar to those more accustomed to the style and vocabulary of their Church's "official" declarations of Faith. They seek to provide a deeper examination of the issues that have historically divided our Churches and to provide a wider context in which such problems may eventually be resolved.

"They are the first word of doctrinal reconciliation, not the last. They cannot be adequately evaluated in isolation but only as part of an overall programme. Their purpose is to promote the convergence of the Churches by establishing unity of faith . . .

"We are in process of reconciliation precisely because, on the fundamental issues of *eucharist*, *ministry* and *authority*, we are steadily achieving a common understanding. The reconciliation of our Churches and their ministries is the goal of our endeavour." (*Commentary on Ministry and Ordination*: p. 3).

But in the face of the bitter polemic of the past regarding the Eucharist, how was this possible? I have already outlined the general methodology of the commission, and it will, I think, be helpful to put into sharper focus the lines of our argument which imposed our conclusion.

The Agreed Statement expresses:

(a) the overall relation of the Eucharist to the Redemption (see N.5);

(b) the correlation of the eucharist action—a liturgical celebration—with the historical event of the death and resurrection of Christ—expressed through the analogy of memorial or *anamnesis* (see *ibid*);

(c) the meaning of “sacrifice” when applied to this liturgical, sacramental action. The meaning to be attached to the mystery of Christ acting in the Church as its Head and Priest. This action is so *new* (for it belongs to the New Dispensation) that older concepts must be very carefully employed if we are to avoid distortion and the unnecessary accusations and counter-accusations that such distortion produces;

(d) the transformation of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ (the mystery of the Real Presence) in order that, in sacrament but reality, these may be eaten and drunk for the growth in eternal life of his Body which is the Church—with the crucial qualification that, though the primary purpose of his presence in sacrament is for Holy Communion, and demands faith in the communicant in order that this encounter may be fruitful, the coming-to-be of this presence is not dependent on that personal faith:

(e) finally—but central—the total mystery is to be attributed to the word of the Holy Spirit.

In a true sense our approach was strictly matter-of-fact. We looked at what the Church is doing when she celebrates this mystery, and then endeavoured to discern what central beliefs control this response to the Lord’s command. “Do this in Memory of me.” In this long and searching examination of our apostolic faith, we identified two *pivotal* truths within the diversity of one truth.

This point is of considerable importance. The Christian faith is one but also multiple. Because it exceeds the power of the human mind to comprehend, it must need to be expressed as a complex of mysteries. But even within each single mystery there is complexity—a hierarchy of truths. One truth will find its authenticity as dependent on a deeper and more central truth. There is, as one of our brilliant French theologians in the com-

mission perceptively analysed, an axis in eucharistic faith round which the total mystery revolves. This axis—this pivotal faith—we identified as, first, the sacramental relation of the Church's celebration to the unique sacrificial event of Christ's death and resurrection, and secondly, the mysterious action of the Holy Spirit whereby bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ. From these two pivotal doctrines, all else derives. This is not to deny that the derivative doctrines are themselves within the area of faith. For example, the permanence of Christ's presence in the eucharistic elements is not directly confronted by the document, even though we are convinced that we have established principles whereby this area of non-agreement (not disagreement) may be explored in the fullness of time. Hence our agreement we styled as substantial, not full, suggesting, nevertheless, that, in the light of the above analysis of pivotal faith, our agreement in eucharistic faith is such that "it will no longer constitute an obstacle to the unity we seek" (N.12).

It is very open to my fellow commissioners to question the emphasis of my presentation. This is not only legitimate, it is inevitable. For the depth of a mystery we contemplate together ensures that our own limited theological perspectives will be exposed to view. True union, paradoxically, diversifies, particularly since no *theological* formulation can ever exhaust the content of faith. Hence there can be—there is—a plurality of expression of faith *in the fundamental unity of this same faith*. Rather than get involved in the morass of the argument regarding the limits of comprehensiveness, I would prefer to quote the sober words of Newman: "The deliberate judgment in which the whole Church at length rests and acquiesces, is an infallible prescription and a final sentence against such portions of it as protest and secede" (from the *Apologia*).

I would like to think that all here will find in the Agreed Statement the makings of "a deliberate judgment of the whole Church" on its eucharistic faith.

PART II

The second agreement of the Commission on *Ministry and Ordination* dated at Canterbury 5 September 1973, was, somewhat strangely, more easy to achieve, not because the issue was not divisive, but because, once again, we held fast to our brief that *factual* implications of agreement in doctrine were firmly

outside it. It is the Church as a whole which must decide on the factual implications of our, this time, full consensus.

Time does not permit me to describe in detail the massive development in the theology of ministry within the Roman Catholic Church over the last decade, signalled, even as in eucharistic theology, by a considerable number of official documents. This development is paralleled, as I see it, in the mainstream of Anglican thought during the same period. Because of this it was not too difficult for the commission to find its feet reasonably early in its inquiry.

Because both Churches require apostolicity as a constitutive feature of all ministry and specifically of the ordained ministry, acknowledging together the full emergence of the threefold pattern of ministry at the end of the 2nd century—acknowledging this historical development as according to the will of Christ—it was possible to begin in an area of outstanding agreement. Neither of us can avoid the problem of the statement, to assert that the normative *principles* of the ministry are contained in the apostolic preaching and have a firm scriptural basis.

Where do we begin? With Christ, the High Priest, the Minister of the Father. The Church, which is the Body, shares, by its common priesthood, in the priesthood of its Head and is summoned by him into all ministry. The backcloth of any discussion of the *ordained* ministry is thereby firmly unrolled. The whole Church is in priesthood, the whole Church is in ministry.

The first question to arise, therefore, is to establish the specific role of the ordained minister. The answer is simple: to enable the whole Church to exercise its priesthood of praise, in holiness of life, and the ministry of service of the Gospel. The specific character of the ordained ministry lies in its function of enablement, though it would be to falsify the richness of the gift to reduce it to merely sociological terms. Its historical development illustrates the assertion of the Agreed Statement that the over-arching concept of *episcopate* or “oversight” binds together the three main features of this ministry. For the ordained minister—and we speak chiefly of the bishop without contradicting our affirmation that the threefold pattern of ministry should be seen as one ministry historically diversified—is in the Church in order to coordinate its Spirit and to discern or evaluate the objectives the Church as a whole chooses to make its own. In this way, the

ordained minister acts as an effective sign of Christ's ministry as Lord of the Church and of the world. At first sight apparently enclosed within the Church, this ministry makes no sense except as an instrument of the Church's mission as the sign of salvation to the world of history and experience.

Many may be recalling the tons of paper expended over the appropriateness of the term "priesthood" as applied to the ordained ministry. The commission is at pains to establish that the unique priesthood of Christ, reflected in the common priesthood of the Church, has a particular relationship to the work of the ordained minister—in fact, a "sacramental relationship" (see N.13) vividly realised in his presidency of the Eucharist. The position of some Reformers that the ordained minister is such exclusively by deputation and assignment of the Christian community is rejected, and his particular charism, in virtue of which he labours in the Church is firmly placed in a specific gift of the Spirit.

The further question arises: what makes a man an ordained minister, be he bishop, presbyter or deacon? Vocation, by Christ, in and through the Church. What sign or sacramental action gives official embodiment to this vocation? Ordination—never repeated—into the apostolic succession.

It would be inhuman to ask you to avoid the question: does the Agreed Statement assert that both Churches are in the apostolic succession, thereby reversing the Roman Catholic judgment of *Apostolicae Curae*? But I must ask you to be content with the sober words of our conclusion: "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." This reconciliation we believe to be possible but only when other issues, such as authority and specific questions raised by the notions of infallibility and primacy, have been satisfactorily resolved—for they do admit of resolution if God gives us the courage and the intelligence of the Spirit. For the moment we should direct our attention to the apparently novel—to the western Christian—approach enshrined in the meaning we attach in the document to the Apostolic Succession.

The Church of God—if one may use this expression without prejudice—is no abstract unity: it is a complex amalgam of communities in varying degrees of communion one with the other.

We are committed, ecumenically, to the pursuit of one communion organically united in legitimate diversity. This organic unity is achieved by the insertion of every Christian Church into the communion of all the Churches in the apostolic tradition. At ordination the bishops of neighbouring churches attest by their action that the new bishop, and the church over which he now is called to exercise oversight, lives within the apostolic faith and the bishop's ministry is in historical continuity with the original apostolic ministry (see N.16).

It will, I think, be clear that the Statement has ventured to relate the functions of the ordained minister one to the other in such a way that he is no longer seen as primarily a liturgical or cultic figure. Though he possesses, in virtue of his office, a traditional liturgical role, the office entails a wider field of responsibility. As an ordained minister of the Gospel, his prime task is to preach and proclaim that Gospel from within the Christian community whose mission it is to bring every human activity under the lordship of Christ. This work is first and foremost the work of the Spirit of God working in and through the community, but, by Christ's ordinance, it is coordinated, promoted and discerned by the Church's ordained ministers. Once this is firmly established it becomes crystal clear that his sacramental role is firmly embedded in his responsibility for oversight. For the Christian community is built up into the Body of Christ by the celebration of the Eucharist over which he is called to preside.

This is in a true sense a work of humble service, but it is a service first and foremost of Christ who has chosen those who exercise it, and none other may do so. Clearly the question of the nature of this authority is overwhelmingly important if we, in the commission, are to fulfill our goal of consensus in faith. The logic of our dialogue demands the resolution of our differences and disagreements in this difficult area, but we would be poor servants of our Churches if we balked the task we are already in fact pursuing. (The commission has begun this work and will be meeting again at St. Stephen's, Oxford, next year.)

I have said that our goal is consensus in faith. This is the immediate purpose. But there is a deeper and profounder content to what we are doing. For what will emerge at the end of the day, if we respond to the grace of God, is a picture, however, imperfectly drawn, of what we profess to be the Church of Christ. This is the fundamental consensus we are seeking. If we have

done our work well, then all of us, wherever we are, will have to face the charge: why then do we remain divided?

As a very personal coda to the introduction to the work of the commission and to the Agreed Statements it has produced, I ask the liberty to make some tentative statements about where we now stand and how we should proceed.

I am, of course, overjoyed at the terms of the proposed resolution which will be put, at the proper time, to the assembly. Agreements reached at commission level, however official the commission, will have no value unless they are accepted by the Church at large. But by the nature of the case mere intellectual acceptance of our consensus has a way of being of little avail. No real commitment is involved, no real movement of persons towards one another need take place. It is only when our communities accept that the faith portrayed in our consensus documents is indeed *their* faith that something dramatic has occurred. This can happen only if our communities—using perhaps the Statements as guide-lines—go through themselves exactly the same process as the members of the commission. My own experience of hawking these documents up and down the land convinces me not only that we are all still victims of our past—which is inevitable—but that it requires great faith and courage to accept the need to confront our habitual faith and to disentangle its constituent parts with a view to their re-ordering in deeper truth. As the great *Constitution on Divine Revelation* of the second Vatican Council puts it: “There is a growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed down . . . As the centuries succeed one another the Church constantly moves towards the fullness of divine truth, until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her.” (*Dei Verbum*: para 8).

In the concrete ecumenical situation, however, we suffer a nagging temptation to rush to *institutionalise* the degree of agreement we have undoubtedly reached. This is by no means to be rejected. The problem arises when, without care, we urge—to take one example—a degree of sacramental sharing which is not supported by this degree of agreement. It is one thing to ask for greater eucharistic hospitality: it is another to request general intercommunion. A Roman Catholic cannot accept the latter request because he finds therein a basic ambiguity, which does not primarily arise from questions of validity but from the meaning of the Eucharist as a sacrament of faith. In receiving our holy

communion we attest not only our belief in the presence, in sacrament, of the Body and Blood of the Risen Lord but also in the unity of the Church. If that unity is not yet given, then we are better servants if we accept the pain of our division. This approach, one knows is unacceptable to many and the deep charity that inspires their longing to share the one bread and the one cup is something one understands. Perhaps it is best to say, at this particular moment, that our way to unity is not only a great grace but that it is also the way of the Cross. Dr. Philip Potter, in his address to the Synod of Bishops in Rome last month, was not afraid to involve this reality of Christian life. This is the authentic path of Christian reconciliation.

Fifth Meeting of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission on Marriage

Dublin, April 1-5, 1974

The fifth meeting of the Anglican/RC commission on the Theology of Marriage and on Mixed Marriages took place at the Church of Ireland Divinity Hostel, Dublin, April 1-5, 1974.

Bishop Hallock (formerly of Milwaukee) and Archbishop Dean (formerly of Cariboo) having both retired and resigned from the commission, their places were taken by Dr. Lincoln Mason Knox and Fr. Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F. The Bishop of Menevia was unfortunately prevented by illness from attending, but the commission had the services of Chancellor Garth Moore and Fr. Brien O'Higgins as ad hoc consultants.

Discussion centred mainly on three topics:

1. the ecclesiological positions underlying the disciplines of the two communions concerning the upbringing of the children of mixed marriages;
2. the pastoral disciplines of the two communions concerning defective marital situations, and their conceptions of the character and relationship of natural and sacramental marriage;
3. the answers received to an international questionnaire addressed during the preceding year to most provinces of both communions about current marriage discipline and thinking.

The next meeting of the commission is to be arranged for June 23-27, 1975. It will issue a final report. The two members charged to produce a first draft for this have already done so, and this draft will be circulated for consideration by the members of the commission in good time for the final meeting.

Discussion centered mainly on three topics:

Meeting of Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC)

Grottaferrata, August 27-September 5, 1974

The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission met from August 27th to September 5th at Centro Mariapoli near Grottaferrata, Italy, to begin their discussion of the question of authority in the Church. This was the third of the three major subjects of dialogue outlined in the Malta Report, the Joint Preparatory Commission (1968), and agreed in a letter of the late Cardinal Bea to Archbishop Ramsey under the title "the nature of Authority in the Church and its concrete form in the teaching authority, Petrine primacy, etc." It had already been the subject of a paper produced at the Commission's meeting at Venice in 1970 and subsequently printed, in which some general principles were accompanied by an attempt to set side by side a Roman Catholic and an Anglican view of authority within the Church seen as community.

A large number of papers were either directly commissioned or adopted for use during the preceding year, and the Commission had reason to be grateful to the authors of those studies, which provided an exceptionally broad basis from which to begin joint reflection.

On the general nature of authority in the Church and on the purposes which it should serve, the Commission became more clearly aware of possible lines of convergence which had already been glimpsed at Venice. While historic differences about authority in the concrete persist and there was no attempt to obscure or minimise them, the meeting ended with reason to hope that we might, on the basis of the work already done and on that of some precise studies to be commissioned shortly, carry our process of convergence into this field also with the prospect of reaching agreement in faith.

The Commission was honoured and grateful to be received in audience by Pope Paul VI at Castelgandolfo and to hear from him words of hope and encouragement. We wish also to record our deep appreciation of the devoted care by which the members of the Focolare Movement made our stay at Mariapoli so

agreeable. The Commission will meet to continue its work at Oxford in a year's time.

TEXT OF THE ALLOCUTION OF THE HOLY FATHER

Welcoming you here today, we recognize at once that for most of you it is not the first time you have visited Rome and the Holy See in a fraternal spirit and in a fraternal relationship. Many of you made your contribution of service to the Second Vatican Council, in one case as a Council Father and member of its theological commission, in other cases either as our periti or as observers on behalf of the Anglican Communion. In this way you already cemented friendships, and sowed seeds of better understanding—seeds which have taken root and flourished.

We recall too that some of you accompanied our beloved brother in Christ, Michael Ramsey, on his historic visit to this See, more than eight years ago. The memory of that visit has remained green with us, and has been many times refreshed by letters of greeting, full of his characteristic spirit of Christian love and wisdom.

It was from that meeting of nineteen hundred and sixty-six that the resolve came to embark on that "serious dialogue" which continues to bring you together, and which has already brought from you the most generous efforts, the most untiring labour.

The Fathers of the Second Vatican Council saw and expressed in the Decree on Ecumenism the "special place" occupied by the Anglican Communion in relation to the Catholic tradition. The dedication and the depth manifested in your work during these recent years testify to and strengthen that special relationship. This is so not only because of your own industry and achievements, but also because of the collaboration you have been able to enlist in many parts of the world, showing how widespread is the impulse towards that reconciliation in Christ which strives to perfect the unity which He wills.

You interrupt a difficult phase of your work to come to visit us. At such a moment there is no need for us to remind you of the obstacles that remain to be overcome. Let us rather dwell on hope and encouragement. What you seek to do is God's work—an indispensable aspect in our time of the ministry of Christ, which is a ministry of reconciliation. As you do so our thoughts, our gratitude, our fervent prayers are with you. We pray that

you will have the spirit of knowledge and of prophecy, and the faith that moves mountains, but remembering Saint Paul's scale of values, we pray above all that you will have love, which 'bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things' and leads us from partial knowledge to full understanding (cf. *1 Cor. 13, 7*).

The Canterbury Statement

PREFACE

At Windsor, in 1971, the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission was able to achieve an agreed statement on eucharistic doctrine. In accordance with the program adopted at Venice in 1970, we have now, at our meeting in Canterbury in 1973, turned our attention to the doctrine of ministry, specifically to our understanding of the ordained ministry and its place in the life of the church. The present document is the result of the work of this officially appointed commission and is offered to our authorities for their consideration. At this stage it remains an agreed statement of the commission and no more.

We acknowledge with gratitude our debt to the many studies and discussions which have treated the same material. While respecting the different forms that ministry has taken in other traditions, we hope that the clarification of our understanding expressed in the statement will be of service to them also.

We have submitted the statement, therefore, to our authorities and, with their authorization, we publish it as a document of the commission with a view to its discussion. Even though there may be differences of emphasis within our two traditions, yet we believe that in what we have said here both Anglican and Roman Catholic will recognize their own faith.

H. R. McAdoo, Bishop of Ossory

Alan C. Clark, Bishop of Elmham
Co-Chairmen

Introduction

1. Our intention has been to seek a deeper understanding of ministry which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the traditions of our common inheritance, and to express in this document the consensus we have reached.¹ This statement is not designed to be an exhaustive treatment of ministry. It seeks to express our basic agreement in the doctrinal areas that have been the source of controversy between us, in the wider context of our common convictions about the ministry.
2. Within the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Com-

munion there exists a diversity of forms of ministerial service. Of more specific ways of service, while some are undertaken without particular initiative from official authority, others may receive a mandate from ecclesiastical authorities. The ordained ministry can only be rightly understood within this broader context of various ministries, all of which are the work of one and the same Spirit.

Ministry in the Life of the Church

3. The life and self-offering of Christ perfectly express what it is to serve God and man. All Christian ministry, whose purpose is always to build up the community (*koinonia*), flows and takes its shape from this source and model. The communion of men with God (and with each other) requires their reconciliation. This reconciliation, accomplished by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is being realized in the life of the church through the response of faith. While the church is still in process of sanctification, its mission is nevertheless to be the instrument by which this reconciliation in Christ is proclaimed, his love manifested, and the means of salvation offered to men.

4. In the early church the apostles exercised a ministry which remains of fundamental significance for the church of all ages. It is difficult to deduce, from the New Testament use of "apostle" for the Twelve, Paul, and others, a precise portrait of an apostle, but two primary features of the original apostolate are clearly discernible: a special relationship with the historical Christ, and a commission from him to the church and the world (Matt. 28.19; Mark 3.14). All Christian apostolate originates in the sending of the Son by the Father. The church is apostolic not only because its faith and life must reflect the witness to Jesus Christ given in the early church by the apostles, but also because it is charged to continue in the apostles' commission to communicate to the world what it has received. Within the whole history of mankind the church is to be the community of reconciliation.

5. All ministries are used by the Holy Spirit for the building up of the church to be this reconciling community for the glory of God and the salvation of men (Eph. 4. 11-13). Within the New Testament ministerial actions are varied and functions not precisely defined. Explicit emphasis is given to the proclamation of the Word and the preservation of apostolic doctrine, the care of the flock, and the example of Christian living. At least by the

time of the pastoral epistles and 1 Peter, some ministerial functions are discernible in a more exact form. The evidence suggests that with the growth of the church the importance of certain functions led to their being located in specific officers of the community. Since the church is built up by the Holy Spirit primarily but not exclusively through these ministerial functions, some form of recognition and authorization is already required in the New Testament period for those who exercise them in the name of Christ. Here we can see elements which will remain at the heart of what today we call ordination.

6. The New Testament shows that ministerial office played an essential part in the life of the church in the first century, and we believe that the provision of a ministry of this kind is part of God's design for his people. Normative principles governing the purpose and function of the ministry are already present in the New Testament documents (e.g., Mark 10.43-5; Acts 20.28; 1 Tim. 4.12-16; 1 Pet. 5.1-4). The early churches may well have had considerable diversity in the structure of pastoral ministry, though it is clear that some churches were headed by ministers who were called *episcopoi* and *presbyteroi*. While the first missionary churches were not a loose aggregation of autonomous communities, we have no evidence that "bishops" and "presbyters" were appointed everywhere in the primitive period. The terms "bishop" and "presbyter" could be applied to the same man or to men with identical or very similar functions. Just as the formation of the canon of the New Testament was a process incomplete until the second half of the second century, so also the full emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon required a longer period than the apostolic age. Thereafter this threefold structure became universal in the church.

The Ordained Ministry

7. The Christian community exists to give glory to God through the fulfillment of the Father's purpose. All Christians are called to serve this purpose by their life of prayer and surrender to divine grace, and by their careful attention to the needs of all human beings. They should witness to God's compassion for all mankind and his concern for justice in the affairs of men. They should offer themselves to God in praise and worship, and devote their energies to bringing men into the fellowship of Christ's

people, and so under his rule of love. The goal of the ordained ministry is to serve this priesthood of all the faithful. Like any human community the church requires a focus of leadership and unity, which the Holy Spirit provides in the ordained ministry. This ministry assumes various patterns to meet the varying needs of those whom the church is seeking to serve, and it is the role of the minister to coordinate the activities of the church's fellowship and to promote what is necessary and useful for the church's life and mission. He is to discern what is of the Spirit in the diversity of the church's life and promote its unity.

8. In the New Testament a variety of images is used to describe the functions of this minister. He is servant, both of Christ and of the church. As herald and ambassador he is an authoritative representative of Christ and proclaims his message of reconciliation. As teacher he explains and applies the Word of God to the community. As shepherd he exercises pastoral care and guides the flock. He is a steward who may only provide for the household of God what belongs to Christ. He is to be an example both in holiness and in compassion.

9. An essential element in the ordained ministry is its responsibility for "oversight" (*episcopate*). This responsibility involves fidelity to the apostolic faith, its embodiment in the life of the church today, and its transmission to the church of tomorrow. Presbyters are joined with the bishop in his oversight of the church and in the ministry of the word and the sacraments; they are given authority to preside at the eucharist and to pronounce absolution. Deacons, although not so empowered, are associated with bishops and presbyters in the ministry of word and sacrament, and assist in oversight.

10. Since the ordained ministers are ministers of the gospel, every facet of their oversight is linked with the Word of God. In the original mission and witness recorded in Holy Scripture lies the source and ground of their preaching and authority. By the preaching of the word they seek to bring those who are not Christians into the fellowship of Christ. The Christian message needs also to be unfolded to the faithful, in order to deepen their knowledge of God and their response of grateful faith. But a true faith calls for beliefs that are correct and lives that endorse the gospel. So the ministers have to guide the community and to advise individuals with regard to the implications of commitment to Christ. Because God's concern is not only for the welfare

of the church but also for the whole of creation, they must also lead their communities in the service of humanity. Church and people have continually to be brought under the guidance of the apostolic faith. In all these ways a ministerial vocation implies a responsibility for the word of God supported by constant prayer (cf. Acts 6.4).

11. The part of the ministers in the celebration of the sacraments is one with their responsibility for ministry of the word. In both word and sacrament Christians meet the living Word of God. The responsibility of the ministers in the Christian community involves them in being not only the persons who normally administer baptism, but also those who admit converts to the communion of the faithful and restore those who have fallen away. Authority to pronounce God's forgiveness of sin, given to bishops and presbyters at their ordination, is exercised by them to bring Christians to a closer communion with God and with their fellow men through Christ and to assure them of God's continuing love and mercy.

12. To proclaim reconciliation in Christ and to manifest his reconciling love belong to the continuing mission of the church. The central act of worship, the eucharist, is the memorial of that reconciling action in Christ, who through his minister presides at its mission. Hence it is right that he who has oversight in the church and is the focus of its unity should preside at the celebration of the eucharist. Evidence as early as Ignatius shows that at least in some churches, the man exercising this oversight presided at the eucharist and no other could do so without his consent (*Letter to the Smyrnaeans*, 8.1).

13. The priestly sacrifice of Jesus was unique, as is also his continuing high priesthood. Despite the fact that in the New Testament ministers are never called "priests" (*hiereis*),² Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in these ministers and used priestly terms in describing them. 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. So our two traditions commonly use priestly terms in speaking about the ordained ministry. Such language does not imply any negation of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ by any addition or repetition. There is in the

eucharist a memorial (*anamnesis*),³ of the totality of God's reconciliation and nourishes the church's life for the fulfillment of the Lord's Supper and gives himself sacramentally.

So it is because the eucharist is central in the church's life that the essential nature of the Christian ministry, however this may be expressed, is most clearly seen in its celebration; for, in the eucharist, thanksgiving is offered to God, the gospel of salvation is proclaimed in word and sacrament, and the community is knit together as one body in Christ. Christian ministers are members of this redeemed community. Not only do they share through baptism in the priesthood of the people of God, but they are—particularly in presiding at the eucharist—representative of the whole church in the fulfillment of its priestly vocation of self-offering to God as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12.1). Nevertheless their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit. It exists to help the church to be "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, to declare the wonderful deeds of him who called (them) out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2.9, RSV).

Vocation and Ordination

14. Ordination denotes entry into this apostolic and God-giving ministry, which serves and signifies the unity of the local churches in themselves and with one another. Every individual act of ordination is therefore an expression of the continuing apostolicity and catholicity of the whole church. Just as the original apostles did not choose themselves but were chosen and commissioned by Jesus, so those who are ordained are called by Christ in the church and through the church. Not only is their vocation from Christ but their qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit: "our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3.5—6, RSV). This is expressed in ordination, when the bishop prays God to grant the gift of the Holy Spirit and lays hands on the candidate as the outward sign of the gifts bestowed. Because ministry is in and for the community and because ordination is an act in which the whole church of God is involved, this prayer and laying on of hands takes place within the context of the eucharist.

15. In this sacramental act,⁴ the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers, with the promise of divine grace for their work and for their sanctification; the ministry of Christ is presented to them as a model for their own; and the Spirit seals those whom he has chosen and consecrated. Just as Christ has united the church inseparably with himself, and as God calls all the faithful to lifelong discipleship, so the gifts and calling of God to the ministers are irrevocable. For this reason, ordination is unrepeatable in both our churches.

16. Both presbyters and deacons are ordained by the bishop. In the ordination of a presbyter the presbyters present join the bishop in the laying on of hands, thus signifying the shared nature of the commission entrusted to them. In the ordination of a new bishop, other bishops lay hands on him, as they request the gift of the Spirit for his ministry and receive him into their ministerial fellowship. Because they are entrusted with the oversight of other churches, this participation in his ordination signifies that this new bishop and his church are within the communion of churches. Moreover, because they are representative of their churches in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles and are members of the episcopal college, their participation also ensures the historical continuity of this church with the apostolic church and of its bishop with the original apostolic ministry. The communion of the churches in mission, faith, and holiness, through time and space, is thus symbolized and maintained in the bishop. Here are comprised the essential features of what is meant in our two traditions by ordination in the apostolic succession.

Conclusion

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 represents the consensus of the commission on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence. It will be clear that we have not yet broached the wide-ranging problems of authority which may arise in any discussion of

ministry, nor the question of primacy. We are aware that present understanding of such matters remains an obstacle to the reconciliation of our churches in the one communion we desire, and the commission is now turning to the examination of the issues involved. 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.

NOTES

¹ Cf. *An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, para. 1, which similarly speaks of a consensus reached with regard to the Eucharist.

² In the English language the word "priest" is used to translate two distinct Greek words, *hiereus* which belongs to the cultic order and *presbyteros* which designates an elder in the community.

³ Cf. *An Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine*, para. 5.

⁴ Anglican use of the word "sacrament" with reference to ordination is limited by the distinction drawn in the Thirty-nine Articles (Article 25) between the two "sacraments of the Gospel" and the "five commonly called sacraments." Article 25 does not deny these latter the name "sacrament," but differentiates between them and the "two sacraments ordained by Christ" described in the Catechism as "necessary to salvation" for all men.

Appendix

ARC RESPONSE TO ARCIC CANTERBURY STATEMENT

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation in the U.S.A. at its fourteenth meeting, January 6-10, 1974, in Vicksburg, Mississippi, has read carefully and discussed extensively the "Canterbury Statement" on Ministry and Ordination released by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission on December 13, 1973. We wish to express our enthusiastic reception of this Statement. We are unanimous in our substantial agreement with it. We are convinced that in this Statement we see our own faith and the faith of our respective churches, and we find no major points of disagreement with it.

Since the Commission has published the statement "so that it may be discussed by other theologians" and has called for "observations and criticism made in a constructive and fraternal spirit" and has promised to "give responsible attention to every serious comment which is likely to help in improving or completing the result so far achieved," we now proceed to record our observations and criticisms, which, we emphasize, are minor.

1. *Ministry in the Life of the Church*

In paragraph one, we see that different published editions of the document have different editorial styles regarding capitalization of the word "ministry" as well as some other words, and we note that members of the International Commission who are members of our Consultation assure us that these differences are accidental and that no theological distinction is intended between "Ministry" and "ministry." Nevertheless, since this distinction is employed in some other significant ecumenical statements, such as those of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue in the U.S.A., we call this to the Commission's attention.

2. *The Ordained Ministry*

In the section entitled "The Ordained Ministry" (paragraphs 7-13), there is one sentence with which we are in substantial agreement but which we feel needs further clarification. It is the next to the last sentence in paragraph 13: "their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs

to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit." Here we understand the "common Christian priesthood" to mean *hierateuma* of Exodus 19 which is fulfilled and completed in Christ, to which all Christians are born by their baptism, and the phrase "another realm of the gifts of the Spirit" to be applied specifically to the ordained ministry. However, in our discussion of this sentence, we see a generic relationship among the various special ministries, both ordained and unordained (such as those enumerated in I Corinthians 12:4-11 and Ephesians 4:11-13), which exist within the common Christian priesthood and serve to build it up. A clarification such as this would, we believe, help to remove a vagueness which many of us thought the sentence contained.

Our Consultation would have preferred at this point to read some more adequate expression of the vital relationship that does exist between the ordained ministry and the common Christian priesthood of all the faithful.

In further discussion over the meaning of this sentence, one Anglican member welcomed its description of the ordained ministry in preference to the statement of Vatican Council II that the ordained priesthood differs from that of the laity "in essence and not only in degree" (*Lumen gentium* #10), whereas another Anglican member explicitly preferred the Council's own terminology.

3. *Vocation and Ordination*

In the section entitled "Vocation and Ordination," we found ambiguities in the second and last sentences of paragraph 16. The phrase in the second sentence, "signifying the shared nature of the commission entrusted to them" could, we believe, more clearly affirm that the commission the presbyters share is not co-extensive with the commission of the bishop.

Our difficulty with the final sentence of this paragraph was our inability, at first reading, to locate the "essential features" of apostolic succession which the sentence describes simply as "here." This location, we are assured by members of the International Commission, is to be found in the totality of paragraphs 14-16, and not just in paragraph 16 or even in its latter portion. We believe that this might have been more clearly indicated in the document.

4. *Conclusion*

In the final paragraph (No. 17), some of us believe that the fourth sentence, regarding "essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits of no divergence," requires considerable interpretation. Does the International Commission mean that it believes it has now covered all essential doctrinal matters concerning ministry and ordination, or does it mean that it believes no divergence from its own statement about these essentials should be admitted within our two churches from now on? Members of the International Commission have assured us that the former meaning is intended, but this is not obvious.

Finally, we note that the International Commission, in writing these seventeen paragraphs to describe "essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence," did not specify the tradition in both our churches that the presbyterate and episcopate can be conferred upon men only. This topic is the subject of considerable discussion, both pro and con, within our two churches in this country today.

In conclusion we take this opportunity to thank the members of the International Commission for this significant advance in progress towards the mutual recognition of our ministries. We are convinced this Statement merits careful study by the membership of both churches.

January 9, 1974

Statement From Bishops Hines and Allin

The agreed statement on Ministry and Ordination of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission is a second major milestone in the long journey toward reconciliation between our two Churches.

Like the first milestone, the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine adopted a year ago, the new document is grounded in the Scriptures and the teaching and practice of the Christian Church for many centuries before Anglicans and Roman Catholics parted ways. Careful study by theologians and Church authorities will, we are confident, show that both statements are in accord with the teaching and practice of the Episcopal Church.

The statement on the ministry will be welcomed by clergy and laity of the two Churches who have entered into covenant relationships at the local level and will stimulate the process of growing together in faith and fellowship.

These statements belong to a wider ecumenical context. Convergence in understanding of the Holy Communion is exemplified in studies of the World and National Councils of Churches. The statement on ministry builds on the fact that both Churches cherish the ordained ministry of Bishops, priests and deacons, but it does not pre-judge the relation of this ministry to presbyterial and congregational forms or seek to confine the gifts of the Spirit to narrow channels.

Our two Churches have made many judgmental statements about each other in the past. The task of reviewing the present relevance of such statements must begin with the understandings of sacrament and ministry which we share today. More miles of doctrinal exploration lie ahead of us, including the difficult terrain of authority and primacy.

The good beginnings made so far are grounds for hope that in the not-too-distant future we shall be able to see in each other the fullness and integrity of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. When and if this happens, millions of Christian people will rejoice in the Lord.

December 13, 1973

BCEIA Response to ARCIC Canterbury Statement

The members of the Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs consider it a privilege and a duty to respond briefly and affirmatively to the Canterbury statement of ARCIC. As Roman Catholic Bishops, we understand the Canterbury statement to parallel the Windsor statement. As the latter attempted to express a substantial agreement in answer to the question, What is the Eucharist, so the Canterbury statement is understood as a substantial agreement in answer to the question, What is the ordained ministry—that is, what is a Bishop, a Priest and a Deacon?

From the appended bibliography of official statements, both Roman Catholic and Anglican; of private scriptural and theological studies; and of international and national dialogues, it is evident that the Canterbury statement has profited from the wealth of material available on the study of ministry. For the moment it is beyond our scope to cite the remarkable parallels that can be made between the Canterbury statement and the rich official magisterial statements to be found on the Roman Catholic side in the 1971 Statement of the Synod of Bishops convened by Pope Paul VI on the Ministerial Priesthood. Similarly, many passages from Documents of the Second Vatican Council could be cited to show that the Canterbury statement does agree with official Catholic teaching. We refer to the First Chapter of (A.G.) *The Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church*. Likewise to (L.G.) *The Constitution on the Church*; and not least to (P.O.) *The Decree on Priestly Ministry and Life*.

As these modern documents of the Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church express the perennial doctrine of the Church in newer and clearer terminology, so the Canterbury statement follows very closely the understanding of the transmission of the deposit of faith as summarized for example in No. 10 of the *Constitution on Divine Revelation*.

The doctrinal principles repeated in the 1971 Synod of Bishops are found in the Canterbury statement.

While the Canterbury statement tells us what an ordained

minister is by the functions that he performs there is a clear understanding, as expressed in scholastic terminology, "operari sequitur esse." Consequently, the vocation and mission of the ordained minister is from Christ through the Church. The ordained minister represents not only the community, but acts as an ambassador of Christ and he is constituted such by the imposition of hands and the invocation of the Holy Spirit. His ordination is given once for all; it is permanent and cannot be repeated. The statement likewise emphasizes, as does the Decree on Priestly Ministry and Life of the Second Vatican Council, that the ordained minister is a minister of the Word and this ministry includes also his celebration of the Sacraments and in particular in the case of the Priest and Bishop the celebration of the Eucharist. By Ordination, the minister is gifted in a way superior to and distinct from that share in the Priesthood of Christ which all the baptized and confirmed have. Indeed, Ordination is for the service of all the People of God.

As Roman Catholic Bishops, we welcome the Canterbury statement. We hope that there will be widespread interest in the agreed statement and that our fellow Roman Catholics will give their honest reactions to it.

Limiting ourselves to these general observations, we encourage our subcommission involved in the ARC bilateral dialogue to probe the Canterbury statement more fully and make known to us their conclusions.

Finally, while recognizing the limited scope of the statement, we rejoice at the unprecedented achievements of the members of ARCIC. As we have encouraged wide diffusion of the previous findings of ARCIC and ARC, so we commend to our brother Bishops of the NCCB, the priests, deacons and religious and laity of the Roman Catholic Communion to a prayerful study of this agreed statement on the ordained ministry.

The Agreed Statement

The following is a statement from the Hierarchy Theology Commission on the Agreed Statement of the International Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission on Ministry and Ordination.

1. We welcome this further step in that "serious dialogue founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions" which the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury commended in 1966.

The statement is the work of a commission set up by the Holy See and the authorities of the World Wide Anglican Communion. As the Co-Chairmen say in their preface: "It is the result of the work of this officially appointed Commission and is offered to our authorities for their consideration. At this stage it remains an agreed statement of the Commission and no more." While, therefore, it will serve to form that common mind which is the necessary preliminary to any authoritative decisions by the two communions, it does not authorise any change in existing ecclesiastical discipline.

2. Anything said about the Eucharistic role of the minister, for example in para. 13, is to be understood in the light of the Agreed Statement on the Eucharist.

3. A merit of the statement is that, as in *Lumen Gentium*, the discussion of the ordained ministry is situated in the context of the ministerial nature of the whole Church, whose mission it is "to be the instrument by which this reconciliation in Christ is proclaimed, his love manifested, and the means of salvation offered to men." (para. 3)

4. The statement adequately secures what Roman Catholics emphasise when they distinguish between the priesthood of the ordained ministry and the priesthood of the whole people. Thus we welcome the declaration that "the action of the presiding minister . . . is seen to stand in a sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice." (para. 13)

One important sentence has been variously interpreted, namely: "Nevertheless their ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit." (para. 13)

We take this to mean that within the common Christian priesthood their ministry is a unique and particular gift of the Spirit.

5. The effect of ordination receives abundant testimony: the "qualification for exercising such a ministry is the gift of the Spirit." (para. 14) "In this sacramental act, the gift of God is bestowed upon the ministers with the promise of divine grace for their work and for their sanctification; the ministry of Christ is presented to them as a model for their own; and the Spirit seals those whom he has chosen and consecrated. Just as Christ has united the Church inseparably with himself, and as God calls all the faithful to life-long discipleship so the gifts of God to the ministers are irrevocable. For this reason ordination is unrepeatable in both our Churches." (para. 15)

6. If we have dissatisfaction to record, it is with a rather general tendency of the document to understress the hardness of the Gospel and the centrality of the Cross not only in the whole Christian life, but also and especially in the life and work of the ordained minister.

7. We would hope to see in a future statement on authority a fuller treatment of apostolic succession as entailing "fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles." (para. 16)

8. The statement draws upon careful historical analyses. Evaluation, however, of the doctrinal significance of the historical statements concerning the threefold ministry must await the further studies of the Commission on the Church and Authority.

9. Many Roman Catholics and Anglicans will find the language of this statement unfamiliar. The statement requires, therefore, careful, prayerful and repeated study, but within the limits of our examination of it we have not found anything incompatible with the Catholic faith. Roman Catholics will want to read it in conjunction with other and for them authoritative pronouncements. But we conclude with the hope that study of this document will lead to a deeper understanding of Ministry and Ordination.

George Patrick Dwyer, Archbishop of Birmingham; Bishop B. C. Butler, OSB; Bishop A. C. Clark; Frs. J. Crehan, SJ, L. Johnston, F. Kerr, OP, N. Lash, J. Mahoney, SJ, J. McHugh, R. Murray, SJ, M. Richards, W. Steele, P. Wilkinson; Mr. J. Coulson, Fr. P. Kelly, Secretary, Oscott College, Chester Road, Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire.

Guidelines for Roman Catholic—Episcopalian Marriages

FOREWORD FROM BISHOP CAMPBELL

I am happy to give my Imprimatur to these Guidelines, and I am filled with great joy that both the Most Rev. Joseph H. Hodges, Bishop of Wheeling and I are in full agreement as we take this step toward fulfilling Our Lord's command that we may all be one.

Faithfully yours,

Wilburn C. Campbell
Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese
of West Virginia

FOREWORD FROM BISHOP HODGES

Dearly Beloved of the Clergy, Religious and Laity of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Wheeling-Charleston:

"Jesus performed the first of his mighty works in Cana of Galilee" (Jn 2:11) at a wedding feast. It was a significant event worthy of his presence and special assistance. He would elevate the natural marriage bond to the dignity of a sacrament for all those who had been incorporated by baptism into the life of grace. In this spirit, and with this obligation, the Roman Catholic Church has always been concerned with protecting the sacrament of Matrimony.

Because marriage brings about new relations between two persons, along with special obligations to society, children, and above all to God, the Church by right and necessity has been involved whenever one of her members entered into this state of life. It is helpful when the partner in marriage comes of a sincere Christian tradition. Since Episcopalians recognize Jesus Christ as the Savior and Lord who sanctified marriage, we are happy to join with them in "Guidelines for Marriage" between Episcopalians and Roman Catholics in West Virginia.

I am happy to sign these Guidelines with the Rt. Rev. Wilburn C. Campbell, D. D., Bishop of West Virginia, and join with him in declaring them effective for one year from date of promulgation. It is understood that these are on a trial basis, with the intention of reviewing them for renewal at the end of that period. We pray that this joint effort may serve to protect the unity in marriage of Episcopalians and Roman Catholics, preserving Christian values and benefiting their progeny.

God bless all of you! May our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ be served by these efforts.

With deep appreciation to all who have participated in this effort,

Cordially yours in Christ,

Joseph H. Hodges
Bishop of Wheeling-Charleston

Part I: THEOLOGICAL STATEMENT

Roman Catholics and Episcopalians share a common belief about marriage. For us, marriage is primarily the work of God. We see married life as part of His divine plan. When Jesus Christ, the long-awaited Bridegroom of the Church entered human history, He elevated married life to one of the sacramental signs of union with Him. It stands as a covenant or agreement between a man and a woman and as a covenant or agreement of those two with God.

By virtue of the Sacrament of Matrimony, married Christians signify and share in the mystery of the unity and fruitful love which exists between Christ and His Church. Christian marriage asks of them a lifelong and faithful commitment. Through their married life, they receive certain benefits:

- a. They help each other to “grow in Christ” and attain salvation.
- b. They share the mutual joy of their union in heart, body and mind.
- c. They receive help and comfort from one another in prosperity and adversity.
- d. They have the privilege and responsibility of rearing and educating their children in the knowledge and love of the Lord.

Married persons have a significant contribution to make to both church and community. They should always be aware of their special role and gift among the people of God in His Church. As their mutual love orders their common life within the family, so also it directs them to share in shaping a society of human dignity.

Part II: PROCEDURES AND TOPICS FOR COUNSELING

Preamble

The following guidelines are intended as recommendations and practical suggestions, not as a set of inflexible rules. Every marriage has its own set of circumstances that may require, in the judgment of the pastor or parties, different treatment.

These guidelines are based on the actual present situation that prevails between the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches. They make no attempt to consider or solve historical and theological differences that still condition the relationship of the two churches. Such questions are being dealt with elsewhere, and their eventual resolution will obviously modify any set of policies such as these:

I—Initial Procedures

1. Given present social customs, the marriage will usually take place in the church of the bride.
2. The priest of the church where the marriage will take place should assume the primary responsibility for the marriage arrangements.

This responsibility includes:

- a. both the Roman Catholic and Episcopal priests have the responsibility of establishing that the couple is free to marry.
- b. pre-marital counseling. Appropriate materials for the pre-marital counseling are available from the Episcopal and Roman Catholic Diocesan Offices. The Episcopal Church normally requires a thirty (30) day notice before a wedding in order to provide ample time for these counseling sessions which are required by canon law. The Roman Catholic Church also requires sufficient notice in order that the proper instructions be imparted.

c. planning the marriage service, and

d. insuring that the couple comply with the requirements of the civil law.

3. As soon as one priest is contacted by the couple regarding the marriage, he should contact the priest of the other church, or a local priest of the same communion, so that they may discuss how the responsibilities mentioned above will be met. It is important that preparations and arrangements be done in a cooperative manner from the very first.

4. When possible, a joint counseling session should be planned so that both priests can be present with the parties to the marriage. Such a session would promote an appreciation of the mutual respect that exists between the churches, and provide the couple an opportunity to discuss differences and similarities in the way the two churches perceive and practice the Christian Faith.

5. If for any reason a priest refuses to solemnize a marriage and if the parties approach another priest who agrees to do it, the two priests should, if possible, discuss the problem to arrive at some mutual understanding. Each should respect the decision of the other, however the matter turns out.

II—Freedom To Marry

1. Both priests will be concerned that the two parties be free to marry and intend a regular Christian marriage.

a. The Episcopal priest will see that the Declaration of Intention required by his Church is properly signed.

b. The Roman Catholic priest will see that the MA, MB, and other forms required by his Church are properly filled out. He will also be responsible for obtaining from his Chancery the necessary dispensation to enter into a mixed marriage.

2. If both priests are to participate in the ceremony, the priest of the church where the marriage is to take place should obtain the necessary permission from his bishop for the other priest to take part in the ceremony.

3. If one or both of the parties has been married previ-

ously, both priests must present the situation to their respective Diocesan offices for resolution.

a. The Episcopal priest will be responsible for gathering the appropriate documentation and sending it to his bishop for decision.

b. The Roman Catholic priest will be responsible for presenting the case to the Chancery or Tribunal and doing the work ordinarily required to gain a decision in such cases.

c. It can happen that one Church will declare a person free to marry, while the other one will not. In such instances, the parties will decide what to do in good faith and conscience, and their decision should be respected. If the couple decides to marry, the officiating priest should inform them that their decision does not deprive them of the continuing ministry of their respective churches. However, neither the Roman Catholic nor the Episcopalian is free to receive the Sacrament(s) until the marriage conforms to the requirements of his or her Church. It would be an act of good faith for the officiating priest to notify the other priest of his action.

d. If it should happen that one priest decides to solemnize a marriage in which the other will not or cannot have any part, each priest should do his best to respect the good conscience of the other. Given the continuing difference in the outlook and practice in the two Churches, it is not unlikely that such situations will arise that significant demands will be placed on a priest's understanding and generosity.

III—Pre-Marital Counseling

1. It has already been suggested that wherever possible, both priests conduct a joint counseling session with the engaged couple. Yet, it is the primary responsibility of the priest of the church where the marriage will take place to counsel the couple in preparation for their marriage. Each priest must have the opportunity of counseling with the couple in order to bring out those particular points which are part of his Church's teaching and practice.

2. It is presumed that such counseling will include topics such as finances, an understanding of family background, personality differences, and sex.

3. Certain religious questions should receive special attention during the counseling sessions; for example:

a. Mutual respect: Each party should be led to a better understanding of the religious traditions and convictions embodied in the Church of the other party. Each should be encouraged to deepen his own faith and Church commitment, and to show an equal trust and respect for the commitment of his or her partner.

b. Worship: Although it is usually a good thing for a family to worship together, each party should be encouraged to worship in the Church to which he is united in faith. The parties should understand and respect the worship in the Church to which each is united in faith. This respect, as well as their bond with each other, could be strengthened if on occasion they worshipped together in one or the other Church.

c. Responsible Parenthood: This is a sensitive area and one in which the parties may have markedly different points of view. It should be thought through very carefully and discussed frankly. In discussing the matter of children, each priest should raise all aspects of responsibility—moral, social, spiritual, and economic—and should clearly express the teachings of his church on the matter. The counseling priest should be sensitive to the potential dilemma with which the parties must deal and carefully refrain from dogmatically imposing his personal point of view.

d. Religious Education of Children: Although the Roman Catholic Church no longer requires written or signed promises in this area, it still requires that the Roman Catholic party “make a sincere promise to do all in his power to have all his children baptized and brought up in the Catholic Church.” Here again, the parties themselves will have to work out how they will handle this issue.

However the couple deals with the matter of the children’s church affiliation, they should be urged to bring their children to a deep appreciation of the person and gospel of

Jesus Christ and a respect for the religious convictions of both parents. They should also make the children aware of large areas of agreement between Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches as well as the differences between them.

e. Marriage as a Sacrament: One area of agreement between the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches is their understanding of the nature of the Sacrament and their common belief that marriage is a sacrament. The sacredness and permanence of the marriage bond are affirmed by both Churches and for the same reasons. This places marriage on a very high plane, and should be stressed by both priests, perhaps in a joint counseling session with the couple.

Part III: THE WEDDING CEREMONY

By the time of the actual wedding ceremony, the couple and the two priests should have developed a mutual respect and understanding for the doctrines and disciplines of both Churches. The wedding ceremony may then serve as a public witness to this mutual respect and understanding. For this reason, it is hoped that both priests will be able to participate actively in planning and celebrating the marriage.

The Eucharist

If the marriage takes place in a Roman Catholic Church, it may, at the request of both parties, be celebrated in the context of the Mass. Since intercommunion is not yet a reality, the Episcopal party may not receive communion at such a Mass. If the Mass is to be a part of the marriage service, both parties should be made aware of this restriction.

If the marriage takes place in an Episcopal Church it may also, at the request of both parties, be celebrated in the context of the Holy Communion. Again, since intercommunion is not yet a reality, the Roman Catholic party may not receive Communion at such a service, even though the Episcopal Church permits all baptized persons to receive Communion. At this time, concelebration of the Eucharist by both priests is not permitted.

Since questions about intercommunion can be very delicate and may cause suffering and misunderstanding, patience and charity should be exercised by the parties and priests involved.

The Wedding Ceremony

Roman Catholic discipline requires that the Roman Catholic priest ask for and receive the vows in any marriage involving a Roman Catholic. A dispensation from this form, however, may be obtained from the Bishop, thereby enabling an Episcopal priest to perform this function. According to the Episcopal discipline, either priest may perform any or all parts of the service.

Beyond these minimal requirements, when both priests take part in the marriage, they may divide the various parts of the ceremony between them in whatever way they and the parties involved find congenial.

For the sake of illustration, the following examples are offered.

and many cause suffering and misunderstanding, patience and

THREE POSSIBLE PLANS FOR PARTICIPATION

For a marriage taking place in an Episcopal Church, using the Book of Common Prayer, 1928:

The Exhortation (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Charge to the Couple (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Betrothal (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Marriage Vow and Ring (Episcopal Priest)

The Prayers (pp. 302-303) (either Priest)

The Declaration and Blessing (bottom pp. 303-304) (Episcopal Priest)

For a marriage taking place in an Episcopal Church, using the Service For Trial Use, 1970:

The Exhortation (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Charge (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Betrothal (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Collect (Episcopal Priest)

The Lessons (Roman Catholic Priest)

The Homily (either Priest)

The Marriage (pp. 314-315) (Episcopal Priest)

Prayers (pp. 316-317) (either Priest)

The Blessing (p. 318) (Episcopal Priest)

For a marriage taking place in a Roman Catholic Church according to the Roman Catholic rite:

The Greeting and Collect (Episcopal Priest)
The Lessons (Episcopal Priest)
The Homily (either Priest)
The Rite of Marriage (Roman Catholic Priest)
The Prayer (either Priest)
The Nuptial Blessing (Roman Catholic Priest)

Recording the Marriage

The Episcopal Priest is required to record in his parish register any marriage in which he participates regardless of where it takes place. The Roman Catholic Priest is required to record any marriage involving a Roman Catholic in the parish where it takes place.

As a general rule, the priest who makes the declaration of marriage will sign and return the Civil Certificate of Marriage.

Joseph H. Hodges
Bishop of Wheeling-Charleston

Wilburn C. Campbell
Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese
of West Virginia

Feast of Pentecost
May 18, 1975

In early 1973, the Religious Unity Commission of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Wheeling-Charleston requested their Excellencies, Bishop Campbell and Bishop Hodges to appoint priests of their Dioceses to draw up guidelines for marriages between Episcopalians and Catholics in West Virginia.

Committee Members of the Episcopal Diocese of West Virginia:

Rev. John S. Greenman, Chairman
All Saints' Episcopal Church
4032 MacCorkle Avenue, S.W.
South Charleston, West Virginia 25309

Rev. Walter J. Mycoff
St. Matthew's Episcopal Church
1314 Bridge Road
Charleston, West Virginia 25314

Rev. Stephen Norcross
Formerly of the Episcopal Diocese of West Virginia

Rev. Richard H. Schmidt, Assistant Rector
St. John's Episcopal Church
1105 Quarrier Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Committee Members of the Wheeling-Charleston Roman Catholic Dioceses:

Rev. P. Edward Sadie, Chairman
St. Agnes Catholic Church
4807 Staunton Avenue, S.E.
Charleston, W. Va. 25304

Very Rev. Hilarion V. Cann
Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church
305 E Street
South Charleston, W. Va. 25303

Rev. Bernard W. Schmitt
St. Francis of Assisi Catholic Church
1023 Sixth Avenue
St. Albans, W. Va. 25177



