

THEOLOGY

VOL. LXXIV FEBRUARY 1971 NO. 608

Editorial

To the privilege, which we enjoyed, of attending the 1970 meeting of the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission is now added that of publishing its working papers for wider consideration. The three documents on Church and Authority, Church and Ministry, and Church and Eucharist, were drafted by sub-commissions and offered for discussion in the full Commission. They are published as working papers, not as in any sense a statement by the full Commission itself. The Secretaries of the Commission invite the communication of comments direct to them for the help of the Commission. We too would invite a theological correspondence in this journal, in the hope of keeping a close relationship between the thinking of the Commission and the thinking of the two Churches principally concerned. The papers are being published simultaneously in *The Clergy Review*, which circulates chiefly in the Roman Catholic community, with the same intent. Some readers may be slow to see their own personal difficulties or anxieties touched on in the papers: the very agenda, they may feel, is an old, unfinished one, left over by Hildebrand, the Council of Trent, Vatican I, and *Apostolicae Curae*, and does not reflect the practical difficulties of Christians today whose circumstances place them at the junction of two moral traditions, two concepts of authority, two life-styles. Yet there is advance. The fact that the papers exist to be published, and in this form, indicates that the era of exclusive claim (the exclusion was never mutual) is passing. At what pace it is passing may be gauged by two significant utterances made since the Commission rose. The Pope in his allocution at the canonization of the Forty Martyrs on 25 October 1970 could express

“the assurance that on the day when – God willing – the unity of the faith and of the Christian life is restored, no offence will be inflicted on the honour and sovereignty of a great country such as England. There will be no seeking to lessen the legitimate prestige and the worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican Church when the Roman Catholic Church – this humble ‘Servant of the Servants of God’ – is able to embrace her ever beloved Sister in the one authentic communion of the family of Christ.”

Those skilled in the interpretation of the language of allocution see movement here.¹ Bishop B. C. Butler, also, a Roman Catholic member of

¹ The passage is discussed by Dr E. L. Mascall in *The Tablet*, 12 December 1970.

the Commission, commenting on these words in *The Tablet* of 14 November 1970, interpreted them to mean

“that Lambeth, henceforward in full communion with the college of bishops and the Pope, its head, would continue to be the head of an ‘Anglican rite’ which would exist in these islands in parallel with the continuing Latin rite. (It should be borne in mind that ‘rite’, in this context, means much more than liturgical rite; it covers spirituality and theology, and can include what one may call ‘cultural tradition’.)”

And this, he thinks, might carry us on for “perhaps some centuries”, until “the desire for one or other of the two rites to be preserved would cease”.

This, we confess, is a time scale to which we warm.¹ It invites readers who felt threatened by Professor John Macquarrie’s article in *THEOLOGY* last October² to read it again, and to consider what might lie behind its language. But far be it from us to argue. Editors are at best but gatherers of crumbs. We would only urge the rich at their tables to be generous and to write.

The Venice Conversations

INTRODUCTION

The Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission met first at Windsor, January 9–15 1970. A decision taken and put into effect there was to divide the Commission, for part of the time, into three groups, each to begin the exploration of agreements and differences in the three areas of Church and Authority, Church and Eucharist and Church and Ministry. Fuller studies providing a basis for such exploration were given at Windsor from either side: on Eucharist and Ministry – by Dr Vogel of Nashotah House and Professor J. M. Tillard, OP (Ottawa); on Authority – by Bishop B. C. Butler and Professor Henry Chadwick, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

Brief drafts of a programme of joint work on each subject were agreed upon, and three sub-commissions were given the task of preparing fuller drafts for discussion at the next meeting, arranged for Venice, 21–28 September 1970. These drafts were submitted to discussion at Venice, further elaborated and amended, and a decision was taken that it would be in the interest of Anglican/Roman Catholic relations to publish them

¹ Though we chided to one or two other of Bishop Butler’s sentences, particularly when, after claiming that the essential visible union of the Church “inheres today in the Roman Catholic communion,” he urged the *moral* necessity of hastening personal reconciliation—to adapt a Reformation phrase—without tarrying for any. (p. 1099. col. b.)

² “Is Organic Union Desirable?” LXXIII, No. 604, p. 437.

as soon as possible, if the respective authorities were agreeable. It is important to make clear the reasons for this decision of the commission, and what the commission sees publication as implying.

The work of such a commission as this faces difficulties of a practical order. It is not always possible to organize work between meetings under ideal conditions and in exact accordance with a time-table. On the other hand it is vital that the work done and the progress made should be shared by a wider public, especially by other theologians. Hence the commission cannot wait to utter until it has reached finality.

The present documents simply indicate what has so far emerged from the work briefly described above. No member of the commission would wish to identify himself with every statement in any of the documents. They are not joint statements, nor statements of a doctrinal consensus, but they express work done in hard and serious collaboration and discussion. Their aim is to focus more precisely where that collaboration and discussion may continue, and to invite others to join in the search for unity by cooperation and comment.

Members of the commission would each feel free to participate in the further, wider discussion which it is hoped the publication of the drafts will promote.

How far the commission is from thinking it has reached satisfactory conclusions in these three fields may be gauged from the fact that it proposes to devote the whole of its next meeting, later in the present year, to examining work now being done by sub-commissions on three themes arising out of the document on "Church and Eucharist" here published. These three are: "The notion of sacrifice in the Eucharist in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology"; "The real presence in Anglican and Roman Catholic Theology"; "An examination in depth of our various Eucharistic rules".

This work will be both facilitated and enhanced in value by the comments and criticisms resulting from the present publication.

Finally the commission would like to record its conviction that the theological work here in question gravely needs to be supplemented by a process of growing together, which will be an encounter as wide as possible between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion in prayer, in practical collaboration and in common witness to Christian truth in the world of today.

Those taking part in the Conversations were as follows:

ANGLICAN DELEGATES

The Rt Revd H. R. McAdoo, Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin
(Co-Chairman).

The Rt Revd J. R. H. Moorman, Bishop of Ripon.

The Rt Revd E. G. Knapp-Fisher, Bishop of Pretoria.

The Very Revd Henry Chadwick, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

- The Revd J. W. Charley, Vice-Principal, St John's College, Nottingham.
 The Revd Dr Eugene Fairweather, Keble Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, University of Toronto.
 The Revd Canon H. E. Root, Professor of Theology, University of Southampton.
 The Revd Dr A. A. Vogel, Professor of Philosophical and Systematic Theology, Nashotah House, Wisconsin.
 The Revd Dr H. R. Smythe, Director, Anglican Centre, Rome (replacing for this meeting the Most Revd F. R. Arnott, Archbishop of Brisbane).
Consultant (Moral Theology)
 The Revd Canon G. R. Dunstan, Frederick Denison Maurice Professor of Moral and Social Theology, King's College, London.
Acting Secretary
 The Revd Michael Moore, General Secretary, Church of England Council on Foreign Relations.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DELEGATES

- The Rt Revd Alan Clark, Auxiliary Bishop of Northampton (Co-Chairman).
 The Rt Revd Christopher Butler, OSB, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster.
 The Revd Fr Barnabas Ahern, CP, Professor of Sacred Scripture, Rome.
 The Revd Fr Herbert Ryan, SJ, Professor of Historical Theology, Pontifical Faculty of Theology, Woodstock College, New York.
 Professor J. J. Scarisbrick, Professor of History, University of Warwick.
 The Revd Fr Georges Tavard, AA, Professor of Theology, Methodist Theological School, Delaware, Ohio.
 The Revd Fr Jean M. Tillard, OP, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Dominican Faculty of Theology (Ottawa) and in Brussels.
 The Revd Fr P. Duprey, WF, Under Secretary, Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.
 The Revd Fr E. J. Yarnold, SJ, Master, Campion Hall, Oxford.
Consultants (Moral Theology)
 The Revd Fr Maurice O'Leary, STL, Chairman, Catholic Marriage Advisory Council.
 The Very Revd Mgr Philippe Delhaye, Professor of Moral Theology at the Faculty of Louvain.
Secretary
 The Very Revd Canon W. A. Purdy, Staff Member of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.
World Council of Churches Observer
 The Revd Dr Gunther Gassmann, Research Professor at the Centre d'Etudes Oecumeniques, Strasbourg.

Church and Authority

1. The people of God, the community of the redeemed, the fellowship of the Spirit, the Body of Christ – this Church or congregation of believers is entrusted with the proclamation of the gospel to all the world in anticipation of the final coming of the kingdom of God. A *koinonia* of individual believers who respond to the call of God in faith, it is at the same time, as a community, a divine gift to its members. The community is made one by Christ through the Spirit, and all its members are united by their shared relation to their one Lord. All actions of the Church, notably baptism and eucharist, derive their meaning from an immediate reference to him, Who is the prime actor in both sacraments. Believers know the Word of God to be mediated to them in the Bible because its focus is found in him. The tradition of the community in Bible, ministry, catechesis, and liturgy is both witness to and preserver of the authentic doctrine and fellowship of the apostles.

2. Because it is to be the means of bringing reconciliation to the world the Church must be one in itself, undivided by barriers of class, education, culture, language and race. Because the Lord is Saviour of all the World, the Church must express this universality. Therefore local Churches are one not only in their shared receiving of the Word and sacraments but also in being constituted as a single family, as a universal church of churches, an *ecclesia* including also all departed saints.

3. A chief bond of the local and universal unity is found in the apostolic ministry of which the Lord is the giver. This ministry of oversight, with the preaching and sacramental life which it exists to serve, becomes integral to the sacred trust which is handed on from the apostolic age. As a vehicle of tradition, the ministry has often functioned as a strong brake on any hasty innovation or consciously radical shift in the direction taken by the Church. It has also been one of the main signs and instruments of present unity and historical continuity through the stormy vicissitudes of history. At moments of extreme crisis, under threats of disintegration, it has made large claims for its authority. To Ignatius of Antioch the Word spoken by the Spirit to the Churches was “Do nothing without the bishop.”

4. There are therefore three elements constitutive of a Church: (1) the profession of the apostolic faith, (2) the use of the sacraments, and (3) the oversight of a fully accepted apostolic ministry.

5. For both Anglicans and Roman Catholics authority is located in the tradition of the Christian community, of which the principal and supreme document is Holy Scripture. The authority of the creeds and definitions of Councils is recognized partly through their consonance with Scripture and partly through their reception by the people of God. They have also an inherent authority as the work of assemblies of men who, though fallible, meet under the inspiration of the Spirit, and are

exercising together the charisma of discerning the truth among the conflicting voices of debate.

6. The decisions of Oecumenical Councils, especially Nicaea and Chalcedon, which have been reached on central matters of the faith are accorded so deep and wide a consensus that there is no question of their being reversed. They do not proclaim new truths, though they may often have had to deny new errors. The teaching office of the Church is normally exercised through bishops, after consultation with theologians and others. In the Anglican Communion a special dignity and voice are located in the president of the Council of bishops, and when matters of deep pastoral concern are at stake he may speak with a special paternal authority. A committee cannot be a father in God.

The Roman Catholic view of the Koinonia and of Authority in the Church

7. The Roman Catholic teaching on the koinonia, although at present undergoing considerable development, can be most conveniently expressed in the form of the most authoritative recent statement, which is that of Vatican II. The Council distinguishes between the complete or "perfect" ecclesiastical communion (preserved, it is implied, in the communion of the Roman Catholic Church) and measures of imperfect or incomplete communion which associate other bodies with the Roman Catholic Church to the extent that these other bodies possess, acknowledge, and utilize elements of that Christian wholeness which as a whole and indefectibly survives in the Roman Catholic Church.

8. As formulated in Vatican II, the episcopate exercises its universal responsibility in the Church in collegial fashion, that is, through mutual consultation and participation of all in the process leading to a decision. On important matters of doctrine, the college, collectively or by its president, may decide to speak with ultimate authority. When such a decision formulates the content of the Revelation given once and for all to the Apostles, it is protected from error by the charism which is usually called "infallibility".

It is the Roman Catholic faith that the Bishop of Rome enjoys a special function of service and guidance in the Collegiality of the Episcopate. Yet this function takes place within the Church, whose assent (Vatican II) cannot fail to be given to infallible definitions although its *consent* is not constitutive of the truth of the defined doctrine.

In the language of the first and second Vatican Councils the function of the Bishop of Rome includes *potestatem ordinariam et immediatam* over all the Churches. As this power does not take away the "ordinary and immediate" authority of each bishop or the responsibility of the whole Episcopal college for the whole Church, all members of the College are to work together for the peace and harmony of its parts.

The Anglican view of the Koinonia and of Authority in the Church

9. The Anglican Communion has never claimed to be the unique and complete embodiment of the Body of Christ. From the end of the sixteenth century it has looked beyond its own borders, both to a recognition of apostolic faith and order present in the Roman Catholic Church (although regretting that this was overlaid with certain errors), to the Holy Orthodox Church and to non-episcopal Churches (with both of whom it has shared the hope that the See of Rome could cease to make claims to universal jurisdiction which appear divisive to non-Roman Catholics). While Anglicans have often regarded the split between Canterbury and Rome as analogous to that between Constantinople and Rome, and have assumed the validity of both Roman and Orthodox sacraments (including ordination), they have thought of the schism between Rome and Canterbury as parenthetical and impermanent, never as a happy division that we need not seriously lay to heart, but as a bleeding wound needing to be healed. And the possibility of a temporary division in the body seems imposed by the logic not only of the sixteenth century but by such other substantial movements in church history as the Eastern Schism and the Great Schism.

10. A modern Anglican would wish to say more about faith and less about order taken in isolation than was common in the nineteenth century. Anglicans share with the Roman Catholic Church the fundamental doctrinal pattern (of God, the Trinity, Creation, Man and sin, Incarnation, Redemption, Church, Grace, Sacraments, the Last Things), and are divided from it principally by the problem of papal authority (and what seems to Anglicans the occasionally autocratic style of magisterium), with the attendant problems of doctrines such as the Assumption which have been declared binding by papal declaration. Some questions of eucharistic theology remain to be clarified.

11. Any view of the papal authority likely to commend itself to Anglicans would have to make clear that a notion of "primacy of service" was central. Precise theological definition might well for many be less fundamental. It is unlikely that many Anglicans would be content with the 1870 definition as it has been expounded up to the present time in the Roman Catholic Church.

Anglicans believe that the commandment given to Peter is inherited in a general sense by the whole Church (to which the power to bind and loose is entrusted by the Lord in Matt. 18) and in a particular sense by every bishop of the *ecclesia catholica*. The Petrine duty of shepherding the flock is fulfilled by every act of the teaching ministry of the Church, whether exercised by individual bishops in their own dioceses, or by bishops in Council. As a bishop of the universal Church, the bishop of Rome certainly inherits this task, though not in such an exclusive sense that he possesses it as no other bishop or council of bishops can. When

he is seen to speak with the voice of the universal Church, he speaks a truly Petrine utterance. But this function does not exclusively inhere in the office of bishop of Rome as such. Anglicans attach great importance to the Lord's commission (or commissions) to St Peter; but they cannot accept either explicit or implicit assumptions that the Petrine text of Matt. 16 can be transferred to the bishops of Rome, or that "the Petrine office" and "the Papacy" are virtually synonymous and interchangeable terms.

12. In preference to infallibility, Anglicans have preferred to speak of the Church's indefectibility. The Lord has promised to be with his people to the end of the world. The Spirit is given to guide the Church into all truth. Yet the empirical Church remains a Community of men who are subject to blindness and sinfulness. Therefore any given definition of authority is open to the possibility of error, so that even general councils (which, for Anglicans, remain the highest authority under the word of God) are capable of one-sidedness, inadequacy, or other error (as, for example, Ariminum 359 and Ephesus 449). Yet the Church is indwelt by the Spirit and is not only safeguarded from a total and final departure from the truth but also granted continual correction. Anglicans see the classical definitions of Nicaea and Chalcedon as providing both a negative barrier to distortion and also a positive clarification and explication of the faith for the edification of the Church.

13. The original text of the statement on the papacy by Lambeth 1968 contained these words. "Within the whole College of Bishops and in oecumenical councils it is evident that there must be a president whose office involves a personal concern for the affairs of the whole Church. This president might most fittingly be the occupant of the historic See of Rome." The text then went on to suggest that a Papacy so understood would be regarded as "having a primacy of love, implying both honour and service, in a renewed and reunited Church." Even though these words, as they stand, were not included in the final text of the Lambeth 1968 Statement, many Anglicans would argue that they do represent something like a moderate Anglican view on the role of the Papacy in a reunited Church. The final statement of Lambeth 1968 included these words: "As a result of the emphasis placed on collegiality at the Second Vatican Council, the status of bishops in the Roman Catholic Church was in great measure enhanced, though the teaching of the First Vatican Council on the infallibility and immediate and universal jurisdiction of the Pope was unaffected. We are unable to accept this teaching as it is commonly understood today. The relationships between the Pope and the episcopal college of which he is a member are, however, still being clarified, and are subject to development. . . . We recognize the papacy as a historic reality whose developing role requires deep reflection and joint study by all concerned for the unity of the whole Body of Christ." If there are substantial Anglican hesitations about the papacy as such, it would not be

unreasonable to say that these generally have far more to do with the actual exercise of papal authority (at various periods in history) than with papacy itself or the subtleties of definition.

14. As a corollary to this view one could suggest that from an Anglican standpoint the papal office could serve in a united Church, at the very least, as a most valuable sign of the visible unity of Christ's Church. But it could also be much more than this. In the Anglican tradition, the notion of comprehensiveness (of unity and diversity, or diversity within unity) is especially cherished. But there would be a far more practical guarantee for comprehensiveness in an age of theological pluralism if in the Church's life and structure there were a visible focus not only of unity but also of final authority. Such a focal point could protect legitimate and enriching diversity from the tyranny of sectarianism. It could even be argued that only given such a safeguard can one take diversity as seriously as it must be taken in any Church which claims true Catholicity. One can see that the papal office, understood in this way (at least as a beginning) could well aid the fulfilment of one of the central convictions and hopes which make Anglicanism what it is.

Conclusion

15. It will be seen that within the disagreements and agreements many lines of convergence have already appeared. The theology of both Churches today recognizes the Primacy of Scripture. This point is no longer an obstacle to unity. The practice of both Churches also acknowledges the freedom of scholarly enquiry.

16. The principle of the Primacy of Scripture can be the basis for a conception of the hierarchy of truths (*Decree on Ecumenism*), which will help our growing together. The truths which are necessary to communion between the Churches are those which directly relate to the Incarnation and Redemption as recorded in the Scriptures. As the Malta Report (VII) of 1968 of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission already stated, "Both Communion are at one in the faith that the Church is founded upon the revelation of God the Father, made known to us in the Person and work of Jesus Christ, who is present through the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and his Church, and is the only Mediator between God and man, the ultimate Authority for all our doctrine. Each accepts the basic truths set forth in the oecumenical creeds and the common tradition of the ancient Church, although neither Communion is tied to a positive acceptance of all the beliefs and devotional practices of the other."

17. Differences concerning theologies and devotional practices should not constitute an obstacle to communion. Perhaps the same principles could be applied to our differences on the interpretation of papal authority. Rather should they provide a reason for working together towards further doctrinal convergence.

*

18. The question is bound to be raised whether our goal is union or something else. We are clear that our final goal is union, but there may be an interim stage on the way. None of us thinks that *communicatio in sacris* can be achieved without mutual agreement on a profession of faith.

Church and Eucharist

I. CHURCH

1. God calls all men to knowledge of His love which is revealed in creation and redemption. He calls His Church into being, and He calls men into His Church. Church is *ecclesia*.

2. It is to membership of a community that God calls men to respond by faith and commitment. In His Church they are intimately united with Him and one another in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Church is *communio*.¹

While it is agreed that Church is communion, it is apparent that Church and communion are not identical. Consideration must be given to the relationship between Church and communion.

Experience of relationships and work shared by members of different churches engaged in ecumenical activities makes it clear that communion cannot be confined within the limits of any particular denomination. There are degrees of communion. The measure of communion shared by members of different Christian churches is demonstrated by such a variety of facts as: a common faith in Christ based both on experience of His life and love, and on mutual acceptance of the Scriptures and the Creeds; on the assurance that only in Christ can salvation be found; upon agreement that all baptized into Christ share His priestly ministry; by participation in prayer and worship; and by the assurance that they are united in Him in faith, hope and charity.

3. In spite of the considerable measure of communion experienced by those who belong to different churches, they are not fully united in the Church. This is due to matters which remain at issue between them. For example:

Roman Catholics and Anglicans agree that Christ lives in the Church, and that He acts through the Holy Spirit with authority, through its magisterium. But they do not agree as to the locus of the magisterium or to the mode in which it is exercised. Anglicans believe that it is schism *within* the Church as well as separation *from* the Church which impairs communion – that the Church exists in the world in a divided state. Roman Catholics believe that the Church subsists in its essentials in the

¹ In this paper the word *communio* is used as a synonym for *koinonia* unless otherwise stated. *Koinonia* is created not by men but by God Whose gift it is. It denotes both the common life itself, and the fellowship with God and one another which is shared by those who participate in it.

Roman Catholic Church, and that other Churches either lack or do not fully possess the elements necessary to the existence of the Church.

4. God calls men into the Church to serve Him, one another and the world. Church is *diakonia*.

5. The characteristic service (*leitourgia*) of the Church is the Eucharist in which, with thanksgiving for all God's mercies in creation and redemption, Christ's members joyfully celebrate their unity and community with Him in this saving work, until He comes again. Church is *Eucharistic* community.

II. THE EUCHARIST

1. It is through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ that God reconciled men to Himself, and, in Him, offers unity to all mankind. Our relationship with one another as children of God is inaugurated by baptism into Christ through the Holy Spirit, and is expressed and deepened through the Eucharist.

2. The Eucharist is central in the obedience and worship of the people of God. It was instituted by our Lord in the context of the Passover. The Passover was the celebration of Israel's deliverance from slavery and of their constitution as God's people sealed by the Covenant of Sinai. It foreshadowed the universal deliverance from sin offered for the reconciliation of all men by Christ through the New Covenant sealed with His blood.

3. Christ's whole life, culminating in his death on the Cross, was the one true perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. He was raised from the dead and entered into His glory. He is the head of His body, the Church, who through the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist deepens the union of His members with Himself in His death and resurrection.

4. God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to the end that all who believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. It is God the Father who in Christ is reconciling all men to Himself.

When the Church gathers for the Eucharist it is Christ the Lord, crucified and risen, who gives thanks and unites us with His thanksgiving for all God's mercies in creation and redemption.

It is Christ the Lord who offers to the Father the total self-surrender which found its supreme expression in His death, and unites us with His perfect obedience to the Father.

It is Christ the Lord who brings us to repentance, forgives our sins and gives us grace to amend.

It is Christ the Lord who unites us with Himself in His intercession for ourselves and for all mankind.

It is from Christ the Lord that we receive the bread of life and the cup of salvation, and in Him that we are offered anew to the Father's service.

In the Eucharist therefore it is the whole Church which shares Christ's priesthood and is associated with His sacrifice, although the ordained minister who presides has particular liturgical functions as the representative of Christ and His people.

5. When His people gather for the Eucharist to commemorate His saving acts for our redemption Christ, sacramentally present, makes effective among us the eternal benefits of His victory on the Cross and elicits and renews our response of faith, thanksgiving and self-surrender. It is by Christ's activity through the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist that the life of the Church is built up, its fellowship strengthened and its mission furthered. It is in the Eucharist that the Church becomes most intensely itself. The identity of the Church as the Body of Christ is both expressed and effectively proclaimed by its being gathered around, and partaking of, His body and blood. In the whole action of the Eucharist, and in His sacramental presence in the bread and wine, the crucified and risen Lord according to His promises offers Himself to all His people.

6. In the Eucharist we proclaim the Lord's death until He comes. Receiving a foretaste of the kingdom to come, we are spurred to hasten its present realization on earth. We look back with thanksgiving to what Christ has done for us: we greet Him present among us: we look forward to His final coming in the fullness of His kingdom when "the Son Himself will also be subjected to Him who put all things under Him, that God may be everything to everyone" (1 Cor. 15: 28).

7. In the course of the Church's history several traditions have developed in expressing Christian understanding of the Eucharist: for example, various names have become customary as descriptions of the Eucharist: Lord's Supper, Liturgy, Holy Mysteries, Synaxis, Mass, Holy Communion. Some of these have acquired emotive content after divisions have arisen, and have been taken as slogans. Perhaps *the Eucharist* has become the most universally acceptable term. Underneath the use of differing terms lie the real problems of belief and practice.

8. Christ and the early Church, in expressing the meaning of His death and resurrection, found the language of sacrifice indispensable. For the Hebrew, sacrifice was a traditional means of communication with God. This involved a wide range of expression, for example, the Passover, which was essentially a communal feast; the Day of Atonement, which was essentially expiatory; the Covenant, which was essentially the establishing of communion between God and man. In the mind of the early Church there was a close nexus between the Cross as a sacrifice and the Eucharist. It was around this point that controversy was later to rage. Some parties took any sacrificial content in the Eucharist to detract from the "once and for all" nature of Christ's self-offering on the Cross, because they thought it meant regarding the Eucharist as a repeatable sacrifice in its own right. Others insisted on the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and by their language and practices appeared to lend colour

to these suspicions. We believe that this conflict can be transcended by a fresh understanding of the Passover. We all accept Christ's death and resurrection as having taken place once and for all in history. As the events of the Exodus were accepted as having happened once and for all, as the annual Passover sacrifice was seen by them as the *memorial* (i.e. the making effective in the present) of this event in the continuing life of Israel, so we see the Eucharist as the memorial of Christ's historical self-offering in the continuing life of the Christian Church. Against this background it is possible to think of the Eucharist in sacrificial terms, but when a phrase such as "the Sacrifice of the Mass" is used, this raises in the minds of many Anglicans historical objections which stem from past controversies. We suggest that the whole language of sacrifice, and the relevance of sacral terms when used in the modern Western situation, be reconsidered in the light of the Old and New Testaments.

9. Another recovered insight of recent years has been the sense of the Eucharist as the community meal. This goes back to the practice of the early Church where the Eucharist took place in the context of the *agapé*. This communal meal – the breaking of bread – which establishes fellowship between God and man and between men and men is a cardinal aspect of the Eucharist. By partaking of the one loaf and gathering round the same table at the invitation of the same Lord, we are one not only in commitment to Christ and to one another but also to the mission of the Church in the world.

10. The mode of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist has often been a cause of discord in the Western Church. This has led to arguments focussed too narrowly on the way in which Christ is present in the consecrated bread and wine. The real presence of the Risen Christ in the elements, as understood by the Western Catholic tradition, should be seen as a dynamic presence,¹ finding its fulfilment in the unity of the body of Christ and in the sanctification of the believer. The doctrinal explanation of *transubstantiation* has been linked with a specific philosophical system which is now open to question and need not necessarily continue to be an obstacle to unity. The meaning of the term *real presence* which is also subject to many different interpretations is in great need of serious reconsideration.

III. EUCHARISTIC PRACTICE

I. *Holy Communion*

The Anglican Church, in common with the Eastern Churches and in conformity with the practice of the primitive Church, normally administers Communion in both kinds. This practice is not intended to deny that the whole Christ is present in either species, but to show obedience to

¹ The term 'dynamic presence' is not intended to restrict the presence of Christ to His power alone.

Our Lord's command, to adhere to primitive norms, and to express as fully as possible the unity of priest and people in sharing the eucharistic meal.

Anglicans find no insuperable practical difficulties in administering a common cup with reverence even to large numbers including children. If some of the consecrated elements be left over, the priest consumes them himself or calls on some of the communicants present to assist him with their consumption.

When it is difficult to convey the consecrated wine from the church building to sick persons it is a not uncommon practice to reserve the sacrament by intinction and to administer it in that manner, or, less frequently, in one kind.

In the Roman Catholic Church a growing number of communicants are now aware of the desirability of receiving Communion in both kinds, and are availing themselves of the permission granted by the Church for this practice. It seems likely that the knowledge that this is practicable will stimulate the growth of this practice.

2. *Admission to Holy Communion*

It is on grounds of discipline not doctrine that Anglicans generally admit members to Communion only after their Confirmation. Confirmation is at present normally administered, after a period of instruction, to those between the ages of 9 and 15. Confession is not obligatory but may be recommended in preparation for both Confirmation and Holy Communion.

Western Roman Catholics admit children of about seven years to Communion, frequently before they have been confirmed and sometimes before Confession.

In both our churches these practices are at present being re-examined.

IV. EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY IN A DIVIDED CHURCH

It is a painful fact that although we are all baptized into the one Church we cannot yet fully share in one another's Eucharist.

The Lambeth Conference, 1968, suggested these norms for Anglicans with regard to intercommunion.

"Whenever intercommunion is proposed between Churches we believe that there should first be found a basic agreement on the meaning of the Eucharist. Any consensus between Churches should include mention of those essential elements to be found in any service of the Eucharist" (Report, p. 128).

The Conference also recognized that there is a place for "reciprocal intercommunion" between Churches which have not yet achieved full unity but are working towards that end (Report, p. 127). The Provincial Synod of the Church of the Province of South Africa has since given permission for individuals "on ecumenical occasions and in cases of

special pastoral need to participate in such measure as their consciences allow, in the Eucharistic Services of other Churches holding the apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and summarized in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds."

Since Vatican II the position of the Roman Catholic Church has been set out in the Council Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* No. 8, and the Directory *Ad totam Ecclesiam*, No. 55, as well as the directive of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, 5 October 1968, which reads as follows:

"These texts determine quite precisely the conditions required for an Anglican or a Protestant to receive Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church. It is not sufficient that a Christian belonging to one of the Confessions referred to above is in fact well disposed, and on his own initiative asks for Communion from a Catholic Minister. There are two conditions which must first be fulfilled: that the person has the same faith concerning the Eucharist that is professed by the Catholic Church; and that the person is unable to approach a Minister of his own Confession."

The directive adds that "a Catholic in similar circumstances may not ask for these sacraments except from a Minister who has been validly ordained."

NOTE: FUTURE WORK

We have been much encouraged both by a deeper appreciation of matters upon which we agreed and by a clearer understanding of those upon which we differ. In respect to these differences we believe that we can begin to see various possible lines of convergence. But we recognize that much more work must be done on those aspects of the *Eucharist* to which some attention has been given in this paper. In addition we have not yet been able to give adequate consideration to three important matters:

1. Eucharist as great Thanksgiving.
2. Real Presence.
3. Reservation.

Church and Ministry

1. "Christ's Church militant here on Earth" we believe to be a unique and visible Communion of men and women, incorporated sacramentally into Christ, living in the Spirit, entrusted with the proclamation and ministering of the Gospel. This Gospel is, ultimately, Christ himself and the truth about Him; or, more simply, Christ Himself as the Revelation of God and Saviour. Christ Himself lives in and with His Church, His Body, as it passes through time to the End, in such a way that He is always both the Lord of the Church and its Saviour.

2. Tensions within the Church in the course of its history have caused

the People of God to find the focus of their unity at different points (the apostolic message, the symbol of faith, the episcopate, the papacy, etc.), and to stress this or that point as an indispensable “mark” of fellowship or communion. We are not agreed on the precise forms in which such “marks” of the Church are to be understood or received, but we are agreed on the necessity of an understanding of the Church which is centred in Christ Himself, through whose unique mediation and advocacy all graces come to the Church, including the grace of “ministry”.

3. Scientific, scriptural and historical studies have shown that “ministry” (*diakonia*) has taken many forms. We understand “ministry” after the pattern of Christ’s own ministry recorded for us in the Gospels, and mediated both to us and to the world in and through the ongoing corporate life of the Church. The Church witnesses in the world to the presence within itself, in a unique way, of the Lord of the world who is also the world’s Redeemer. This witness is made primarily in terms of ministry, or *diakonia*, undertaken by the People of God as they listen to the world, learn from the world, and make accessible to the world “the unsearchable riches of Christ”. Salvation is not merely proclaimed in words, but effected in liturgy, pastoral care and the simplicity of service. As the sphere and instrument of God’s Salvation, the Church is chosen not for its own sake alone, but for the ministering of salvation to the world. Thus its rhythm of life, like that of its Saviour, is one of death and resurrection. A guardian of an inheritance but also a pilgrim through history, it must be ready when the Holy Spirit prompts for the pain of giving up the mere accretions of history if in that way it may renew itself for the fulfilment of God’s plan and the service of his people. The life by which it lives and which it shares is the life of Christ, so that ministry as service to the world is to be understood as the vocation of all the baptized.

4. The vocation to the Sacred Ministry, or to Holy Orders, we understand to be a special vocation accompanied by a special grace given by Christ Himself, through His Spirit, for the work of building up His Body from within.

5. The priesthood of Christ is shared in a special way by those who have received holy orders. This is a gift of Christ through his Spirit which carries with it the privilege and obligation of serving the eucharistic community in the ministry of Word and Sacrament and by the witness of a sacrificial life. Priests are men of the Church, called to a special mission to fulfil the Father’s will of salvation in the continuing work of the Son through the power of the Holy Spirit. They give a life-time commitment to a sacramental ministry in the community of the Church and service for all mankind.

6. It is sad that Anglicans and Roman Catholics, while sharing deep understanding of the *nature* of ministry, differ on the question of where full and true ministry may be found.

7. The urgency of the new situation here is that some Anglicans and

Roman Catholics nonetheless feel impelled to practice *communicatio in sacris*, though the prevalence of this varies greatly in different parts of the world.

8. We wish to emphasize the new character of the present situation – a situation in which the problem of ecclesial unity is central. A primary responsibility of ministering to the people of God is promoting unity. In his great prayer for unity, the Lord prayed first for the apostles. The responsibility of the ordained ministry in the two Churches for promoting unity can only be fulfilled when bishops with their clergy take the lead in the search for ways and means of healing the divisions which afflict the people of God.

The Apostolic Ministry

9. The ordained ministry exists and acts in and for the Church. Its authority is derived, however, not from the whole body of Christians by delegation, but from Christ through the apostles whom he chose and commissioned. The historical relation of the traditional threefold ministry to the apostles has not yet been traced in any detailed way, but in both our Churches the several orders of that ministry are accepted, as sharing, in varying degrees, in the apostolic commission, and the episcopate is recognized as bearing a distinctive responsibility and exercising a distinctive authority.

10. Differences arise at the point where we begin to consider the relation between the episcopate as a whole and the Bishop of Rome, for whom Roman Catholic dogma claims a unique position in the Church – a position founded on the unique role of Peter among the apostles. Anglicans commonly question both the historical succession of the Roman bishops from Peter and the exercise by the latter of a distinctive office to which anyone might have succeeded. They believe that the “Petrine office”, rather than being limited to Peter himself, was shared by his fellow apostles, and indeed, in some way, by the whole community, to which the power to bind and loose was entrusted by the Lord (in Matt. 18), and that this office is inherited in a general sense by the whole Church, and in a particular sense by every bishop of the *ecclesia catholica*. In their view, the Petrine duty of shepherding the flock is fulfilled by every act of the teaching ministry of the Church, whether exercised by individual bishops in their own dioceses or by bishops in council. As a bishop of the universal Church, the Bishop of Rome certainly inherits the Petrine office, though not in such an exclusive sense that he possesses it as no other bishop or council of bishops can. It may indeed be possible to envisage a papal primacy of honour and service, but such a primacy can ultimately be justified only as a useful historical development within the life of the Church.

11. It can hardly be doubted that the view just outlined expresses the broadest Anglican consensus. Nonetheless, at the present time some

**

Anglicans would raise such questions as the following, with some expectation of an affirmative answer.

(a) In the light of modern scholarly exegesis must we not reconsider the refusal of some Anglicans to see in the New Testament texts a primacy of responsibility and service entrusted to Peter? To put the point more strongly, is there not a basis in the New Testament for speaking of a Petrine office, peculiar to Peter himself, within the apostolic college and community?

(b) While the claim that the Petrine office has been transmitted to the Roman bishops presents historical difficulties which to Anglicans may seem insuperable, can we not recognize that, in the age of the fathers, the Roman primacy, exercised as a primacy of responsibility and service, played a providential role in the Church's life, and that it may well be called to play a similar role in the new and critical situation of our own time – and indeed in the future? Furthermore, insofar as this primacy reflects the model of the original Petrine office, may it not be acknowledged as (by imitation, if not by direct succession) truly "Petrine"?

12. Whatever answer is given to such questions as these, there would seem in any case to be some basis for dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on the existence of a special papal ministry within the Church. Further exploration of this issue should, in our view, be treated as urgent.

13. In the closest conjunction with such a study, attention should also be given to those disputed questions which bear on the nature of the papal ministry. We refer here to such points as the "infallible magisterium" and "universal jurisdiction" claimed for the Bishop of Rome by the Roman Catholic Church.

14. In urging immediate and serious study of the various problems connected with the papal ministry in the Church, we recall the words quoted in the Joint Declaration of Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury: ". . . forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth to those things which are before. . . ."

The Problem of Orders

15. As we grow in awareness of the Holy Spirit abiding in the Church and moving members of both our Communion towards that unity of which he is the source, we also become increasingly aware of the problems raised by the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*. This doctrinal pronouncement depends upon a theological judgment which is expressed in the technical language of Roman canon law, and which rests upon certain theological principles.

16. The question here is whether the *new* situation with which we are faced – a pastoral situation – calls for a new policy in the Roman Church. To show this, we should have to show that a development of doctrine has occurred with regard to the theological presuppositions of the Bull.

This development, like that of the doctrine of religious liberty by Vatican II, would have to be shown to be consistent with the principles which had supported a quite different practice in the past. Change of practice of such magnitude could occur in the Roman Church if it were shown clearly that doctrinal development had taken place and that a *new pastoral situation* required that practice be changed to make it consistent with doctrine. But Roman Catholic doctrine only develops properly if it remains consistent with the dogma of the Catholic Church. If a consistent development of doctrine is to be demonstrated, we must show that no dogma has been denied, but that theological presuppositions have been changed.

17. The *nature of the study* we would recommend here would be circumscribed historically and theologically: *historically* it would involve tracing which of the arguments from the Roman Commission of 1896 found their way into the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*. *Theologically* it would involve

- (a) analysing the arguments to see what the theological assumptions behind them were.
- (b) examining whether Roman Catholic theology can show a genuine and consistent development of doctrine with regard to those assumptions from 1896 to the present.

This study would be a contribution to that wider judgment which we hope will eventually be made – whether there is sufficient doctrinal convergence between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion to permit them to see one another as sharing fully in the reality of the one Church.

The Philosophical Theology of I. T. Ramsey

H. P. OWEN

My aim in this article is to summarize and assess the main elements in the philosophical theology (or, conversely, religious philosophy) of I. T. Ramsey, formerly Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford and now Bishop of Durham. I write for two reasons. First, I do not think that his thought has received the detailed attention it deserves. Secondly, I myself have found it very illuminating. I shall base my discussion on *Religious Language*.¹ As I see it, Dr Ramsey is concerned, essentially, to maintain the following theses.

1. Religion consists in both discernment and commitment. Thus Dr Ramsey quotes Bishop Butler with approval for the view that “religion

¹ SCM edition, 1969. All my references, unless otherwise indicated, will be to this work.