

APPENDIX A
THE BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS
BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES
AND OTHER CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONS

A THEOLOGICAL REVIEW AND CRITIQUE
BY THE STUDY COMMITTEE
COMMISSIONED BY
THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF
THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA
REPORT OF JULY 1972

Editor's Note: At the business meeting of September 1, 1972 the Board of Directors of the Catholic Theological Society of America voted unanimously to: a) accept the reports of the Dulles, Connery, and Reich committees without expressing agreement or disagreement with the contents; b) express gratitude to the chairmen and committee members for the work they have performed for the Society; c) publish the three reports in the *Proceedings* for 1972, with the approval of the chairmen; d) encourage independent publication as well for a wider audience in view of the purpose of the studies; e) welcome and encourage reactions from the members of the CTSA on these reports; f) provide a forum for these reactions at the 1973 convention of the Society in New York; g) publish this resolution for the information of the members—this in the *Proceedings* of 1972.

INTRODUCTION

At its meeting in Baltimore on June 14, 1971, the Board of Directors of the Catholic Theological Society of America (CTSA) voted to establish three study committees in order to put the expertise of the CTSA more effectively at the service of the Church and the world today. One of these committees was asked to investigate and report on the present status and future prospects of the bilateral ecumenical consultations between Roman Catholics and the various Protestant and Orthodox Churches in the United States.

In a letter to the chairman of this Study Committee, dated June 14, 1971, Rev. Carl Peter, President of the CTSA, further specified the goals of the committee as follows:

A theological review and critique of the present status of the various consultations established by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical Affairs plus a reasoned statement indicating future steps that should be taken as a result of the consensus that has been generated so far. Such questions should be posed: Is there consistency or not between the various positions taken by Roman Catholic theologians in different consultations? Are there serious issues of division that have not been faced either by mutual agreement or perhaps even by oversight? Are there convincing grounds theologically for the conclusions reached? If not, are there at least sufficient grounds for taking the conclusions reached with the utmost seriousness and for testing them further? Finally what future steps are called for in the view of the Committee?

Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, bishop of Kansas City—St. Joseph, Chairman of the Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (BCEIA), and Rev. John F. Hotchkin, Executive Director of the BCEIA, indicated their pleasure that the CTSA was undertaking a review of the dialogues and signified their willingness to support and assist the work of the CTSA Committee by making available materials and information on file with the BCEIA.

In the course of October 1971 the Study Committee was established with the following members:

Rev. Msgr. Myles M. Bourke
Sister Agnes Cunningham, S.S.C.M.
Rev. Maurice C. Duchaine, S.S.
Rev. Avery Dulles, S.J. (*Chairman*)
Rev. Richard P. McBrien
Rev. Msgr. Austin B. Vaughan

The committee requested and received the advice and cooperation of the following three consultants:

Rev. John T. Finnegan (mixed marriages)
Prof. Joan V. O'Brien (status of women)
Rev. John J. Reed, S.J. (mixed marriages)

The committee met for two all-day general sessions. The first of these was held on Jan. 25, 1972 at the BCEIA offices, 1325 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C.; the second on May 15, 1972 at the Interchurch Center, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. There was also an extensive exchange of opinions among members of the Committee by telephone conversations and mailings. The text was put in final form at a meeting under the direction of the chairman at Pope John XXIII Seminary, Weston, Mass. on July 8, 1972.

The committee found that, up to and including June 1972, the BCEIA has sponsored, from the Roman Catholic side, conversations with the following eight Christian denominations or communions (names of the non-Roman Catholic sponsoring agencies in parentheses):

1. The American Baptist Convention (Division of Cooperative Christianity). This consultation, known as the American Baptist—Roman Catholic Dialogue, has held six meetings from April 3, 1967 to April 13-14, 1972.
2. The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) (Council on Christian Unity). Eight meetings from March 16, 1967 to March 8-9, 1972.
3. Episcopal Church (Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations). This consultation, entitled "The Anglican—Roman Catholic Consultation" (ARC) has held twelve meetings from June 22, 1965 to June 12-15, 1972.

4. Southern Baptists (Ecumenical Institute—Wake Forest University). Four meetings from May 8, 1969 to Feb. 1-3, 1971.

5. Orthodox (Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops of America). Seven meetings from Sept. 29, 1966 to Nov. 4, 1971.

6. Lutheran Churches (U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation). Sixteen meetings from March 16, 1965 to Feb. 18-21, 1972.

7. Methodist Church (The United Methodist Church). Eight meetings from June 28, 1966 to Feb. 25-26, 1972.

8. Presbyterian—Reformed (North American Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches). This consultation, known as "The Roman Catholic—Presbyterian Consultation Group," has held fourteen meetings from July 27, 1965 to Oct. 28-30, 1971.

In the present report the following abbreviations will be used for the consultations just listed:

AmBaptCath

DisCath

ARC

SoBaptCath

OrthCath

LuCath

MethCath

PresCath

The meetings or sessions of each of these consultations will be designated by Roman numerals following the dialogue group. Thus ARC IV refers to the fourth Anglican-Roman Catholic meeting.

The available materials for study fall into three main categories: minutes of discussions, position papers, and official reports and consensus statements. The minutes of the discussions are summaries drawn up for the benefit of participants. They do not attempt to set forth a full account of the opinions expressed, nor do they, for the most part, reflect the positions taken by groups. In many cases the discussion minutes are considered as confidential memoranda for the use of the participants only. The position papers, by their very nature, represent the private opinions of individuals, even though in

some cases the authors attempt to interpret the positions of the churches to which they belong. The most important source materials for the present study were therefore judged by this Committee to be the official reports and consensus statements. The latter, especially, demand consideration since they represent conclusions and recommendations calling for evaluation and reaction.

The following official reports and consensus statements came to the attention of this committee:

1. AmBaptCath V (April 23-24, 1971), "Growing in Understanding," published in pamphlet form by Publications Office, USCC, Washington, D.C., 1972.
2. DisCath II (Sept. 25, 1967), "Summary Memorandum: The Nature of the Unity We Seek," *Mid-Stream* 7,2 pp. 47-48.
3. DisCath III (Apr. 29, 1968), "Summary Memorandum: A Responsible Theology for Eucharistic Intercommunion in Divided Church," *Mid-Stream* 7,2 pp. 90-91.
4. ARC IV (May 29, 1967), "Statement on the Eucharist," in *A/RC-Doc* (a collection of documents on Anglican—Roman Catholic relations) (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1972), pp. 3-4.
5. ARC VII (Dec. 8-11, 1969), Statement (Summary of the discussion to date with objectives and projections for the future), *A/RC-Doc*, pp. 9-22.
6. ARC XI, "Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity: Methodological Considerations," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9,2 (Spring 1972), pp. 445-48; cf. *Catholic Mind*, April 1972, pp. 61-69.
7. ARC XI-XII, Comment on the Windsor Statement, not yet published.
8. OrthCath IV (Dec. 13, 1969), "An Agreed Statement on the Eucharist," published in *Diakonia*, vol. 5 (1970), p. 72.
9. OrthCath V (May 20, 1970), "An Agreed Statement on Mixed Marriages," not published.
10. OrthCath VII (Nov. 4, 1971), "An Agreed Statement on Mixed Marriages," a revision of OrthCath V, not yet published.
11. LuCath II (July 6, 1965), "The Status of the Nicene Creed as Dogma: Summary Statement," in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: NCWC, 1965), pp. 31-33.
12. LuCath III (Feb. 10, 1966), "Baptism: Joint Statement,"

in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1966), p. 85.

13. LuCath VI (Sept. 29, 1967), "The Eucharist: Joint Statement," in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 3 (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1968), pp. 187-97.

14. LuCath XI (Feb. 19, 1970), "Eucharist and Ministry: Joint Statement," in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 4 (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1970), pp. 7-33.

15. MethCath V (Sept. 20, 1968), "Some Shared Convictions About Education," not published.

16. PresCath VII (May 9, 1968), Statement by the Theology Section of the Consultation on "Ministry of the Church," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 5,2 (Spring 1968), pp. 462-65.

17. PresCath XI (May 14, 1970), Statement by the Theology Section of the Consultation on "Ministry in the Church" (an amplification of the preceding statement), in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 686-90.

18. PresCath XI (May 14, 1970), Statement by the Worship and Mission Section of the Consultation on "Women in Church and Society," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 690-91.

19. PresCath XIV (Oct. 28-30, 1971), Statement of the Worship and Mission Section of the Consultation on "Women in the Church" in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9,1 (Winter 1972), pp. 235-41. (This statement was apparently retouched after having been accepted in substance at the meeting here mentioned.)

20. National Council of Churches Study Commission Statement, "The Eucharist in the Life of the Church: An Ecumenical Consensus," published in *The Ecumenist* 8,6 (Sept.-Oct. 1970), pp. 90-93. (This is the only multilateral statement of its kind produced in the United States with Roman Catholic participation.)

Other important documentation concerning the Consultations is contained in *Issues and Answers*, a collection of speeches from SoBaptCath IV (Feb. 1-3, 1971) (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1972); and in *Reconsiderations* (New York: World Horizons, 1967), a volume containing position papers and discussion summaries growing out of PresCath III, IV, and V. Position papers and discussion

summaries concerning AmBaptCath I and II are published in *Foundations* 10,2 (1970) and 11,3 (1971). Various position papers from different dialogues have appeared in periodicals such as *Dia-konia*, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, *Jurist*, *One in Christ*, *Presbyterian Life*, and *Worship*.

The reports and joint statements issued by the Consultations differ markedly from one another in style, length, scope, and detail. The majority are very succinct: they state bare conclusions in summary form without supporting argumentation and without indicating differences of opinion among the participants. They usually fail to indicate what is considered obligatory doctrine within a given communion and what is considered a free position open to discussion. Among the longer reports on the program of the dialogue are the statements of AmBaptCath V and ARC VII. The most elaborate theological consensus papers are those of LuCath VI on Eucharist and LuCath XI on Eucharist and Ministry. The PresCath XI statement on Ministry in the Church is of intermediate length and is being further expanded.

From the point of view of content, the majority of the consensus statements fit into the following seven categories:

- Goals of the Consultations
- The Doctrine of Ordained Ministry
- The Status of Women
- The Doctrine of the Eucharist
- Intercommunion
- Mixed Marriages
- Method for Doctrinal Agreement

In the present report, which focuses on the consensus statements and joint reports, the seven chapters correspond to these seven classifications. The reader should of course bear in mind that the consensus statements do not in all cases do justice to the many fine ideas that were set forth in prepared position papers and in oral discussion.

Although individual sections of the following report are primarily the work of different members and teams of the study committee, all the chapters take cognizance of discussions held by the entire committee. In an early draft and once again in penultimate form, the

report was submitted to all committee members for their comments and emendation. In the final editing an effort has been made to reflect the thinking of each member of the committee. Unless otherwise indicated, the positions taken in the report are deemed consonant with the views of all members of the committee.

In conclusion, the Committee wishes to thank Rev. Carl Peter, President of the CTSA, and the Board of Directors of the CTSA for their generosity in commissioning this study and defraying the expenses involved. Appreciation is also extended to the BCEIA, which through its chairman, Bishop Charles H. Helmsing, and its executive secretary, Rev. John F. Hotchkin, has greatly assisted this Committee by many forms of advice and cooperation.

I. GOALS OF THE CONSULTATIONS

A. DOCUMENTS

Prior to the initiation of the bilateral consultations now in progress in the United States, Vatican II, in its Decree on Ecumenism, set forth some of the advantages to be expected from such consultations. Through dialogue among competent experts from different churches and communions, the Council declared, "everyone gains a truer knowledge and more just appreciation of the teaching and the religious life of both Communions." As a spirit of concord and brotherly cooperation is established, the Council went on to say, "the result will be that, little by little, as the obstacles to perfect ecclesiastical communion are overcome, all Christians will be gathered, in a common celebration of the Eucharist, into that unity of the one and only Church which Christ bestowed upon His Church from the beginning" (Decree on Ecumenism, no. 4, in W. M. Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* [New York, 1966], pp. 347-48).

Later on in the same Decree, speaking of the obstacles to eucharistic communion between Catholics and Protestants, the Decree added: "For these reasons, dialogue should be undertaken concerning the true meaning of the Lord's Supper, the other sacraments, and the Church's worship and ministry" (Decree on Ecumenism, no. 22; Abbott, p. 364).

Among the consensus statements of Roman Catholic theologians

involved in consultation with those of other confessions in the United States, three deal explicitly with the question of the goals of bilateral conversations:

1. The "Summary Memorandum" of the second Consultation between the representatives of the Council of Christian Unity (Disciples of Christ) and of the BCEIA, Kansas City, Missouri, September 27, 1967 (*Mid-Stream*, 7,2 1967-68, pp. 47-48). Abbreviation: DisCath II.

2. The "ARC VII Statement" of the seventh Consultation between representative theologians of the Episcopal and the Roman Catholic Churches in the United States, December 8-11, 1969, in Boynton Beach, Florida (*Documents on Anglican—Roman Catholic Relations*, Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1972, pp. 9-22). Abbreviation: ARC VII.

3. The pamphlet *Growing in Understanding* which was a result of the fifth meeting of the American Baptist—Roman Catholic Dialogue Commission, April 23-24, 1971, in Detroit, Michigan (Washington, D.C.: USCC, 1972). Abbreviation: AmBaptCath V.

B. SUMMARY OF DOCUMENTS

1. DisCath II recognizes the value of preserving the diversity that exists between the two communions, as well as manifesting more fully in community life and worship the unity that already in some way exists. This brief statement sees the foundation of Christian unity in what God has done in Jesus Christ as the life-giving mystery on which the past and present life of the Church is based. It is from this reality that the two basic values of diversity and unity emerge.

The document specifies two bases for desirable diversity: the inexhaustibility of the mystery of Christ, which has given rise to a great variety of expressions even in the New Testament itself, and the pluralism of our culture, which brings us to a heightened awareness of the complexity of the Christian tradition.

As the churches become more aware of their mutual sharing of the life of Christ in spite of their diversity, they recognize their need to manifest this basic unity more fully. They must face the question of responsible eucharistic intercommunion, since the Eucharist is

both an expression of unity and a means to further unity. The fullness of unity desired by Christ requires corporate and organizational expressions, so that the churches can assume responsibility for their common life and mission.

2. ARC VII, in a fuller discussion of goals, insists that the pastoral situation in our day urgently calls for Christian union. A fragmented Christianity in America today finds it difficult to contribute the healing and cohering influences so clearly needed. Vatican II is seen as a promise of the renewal and rediscovery of the Christian commitment and as having raised hopes for a united Christendom. The two communions are conscious of sharing a greatly treasured Christian tradition and are deeply committed to preserve it in contemporary American life. Finally the members of ARC feel the urgency to move toward a position of organic unity.

In its projections, the Consultation declares, "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" (p. 13). The progress achieved thus far is a source of encouragement to press forward. The members do not wish their efforts to be prejudicial to their respective churches' ongoing efforts with other communities toward the goal of "full ecclesial unity among all Christians" (*ibid.*).

ARC VII also sees its task within the wider goal of human unity, that full Christian reconciliation might be a visible sign of the possible unity of all mankind.

Three stages are suggested in the restoration of full unity: a re-encounter through personal dialogue; a growing together, in which ARC VII calls for a common creed and a statement on the mutual recognition of ministeries; and finally full communion and organic unity. In the interim growing-together stage, ARC VII offers four possible points of departure: a) the Concordat establishing communion between the Old Catholics and Anglican churches; b) the nature of uniatism within the Roman Catholic Church; c) the proposals of the Second Vatican Council about relationships between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches; d) the services of reconciliation in the many proposed church unions involving Anglicans.

By full communion ARC VII understands the "intention to arrive at the oneness for which Christ prayed" (pp. 17-18). This should not be an agreement to disagree while sharing the Eucharist, nor should organic unity be equated with a particular form of government. In full communion there should be "a common profession of faith and a sufficient compatibility of polity to make possible a united mission to the human family" (p. 18), without prejudice to appropriate cultural and liturgical variety.

3. AmBaptCath V envisions the original purpose of their dialogue as twofold: to eliminate misconceptions and thereby achieve mutual enrichment and good will; and "to develop fruitful areas of exploration," especially for use in local dialogues throughout the country (pp. 1-2).

C. POINTS OF CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE

All three dialogue groups have as their particular goals the removal of misunderstandings, the helping of their communities to grow in greater awareness of existing unity, the fostering of mutual enrichment and growth, and the freeing of possibilities for fuller union.

The three statements stress the value of variety within unity, as called for by the cultural pluralism of our day and by an awareness of the complexity of the Christian tradition. Their lack of a common vocabulary notwithstanding, AmBaptCath V found many areas of substantial agreement which seemed to transcend the limitations of language. DisCath II speaks of the inexhaustible mystery of Christ and the responsibility of Christians to achieve common expressions of faith, better manifesting the unity given by Our Lord, without detriment to legitimate diversity. ARC VII, while acknowledging the importance of cultural and liturgical variety, is nevertheless committed to "the necessity of a common declaration of faith between Catholics and Anglicans" (p. 18).

Both DisCath II and ARC VII call for some degree of organizational unity. DisCath II merely states the principle that fullness of unity requires corporate expression. ARC VII specifies that this should not be equated with identical structural forms, but implies

a "sufficient compatibility of polity" (p. 18). ARC VII also presupposes that "a mutually acceptable statement concerning episcopacy and priesthood" is to precede the reconciliation of ordained ministries (p. 17). According to both statements the purpose of common organizational features is to serve the mission of the Church. DisCath II speaks in terms of common life and mission; ARC VII in terms of a united mission to the human family as well as a wider reconciliation with other Christian churches.

By listing in some order the various goals mentioned in these statements, we may be able to see more clearly how the specific goals of the dialogues fit into the context of the wider goals of ecclesial and human unity.

1. Proximate Goals:
 - a. To clarify certain traditional points of disagreement;
 - b. To study points of common concern.
2. Intermediate Goals:
 - a. To deepen, strengthen, and enrich the life of both communities in their mission toward the world;
 - b. To attain a limited measure of spiritual, liturgical, doctrinal, and organizational unity.
3. Ultimate Goals:
 - a. To unite the participating churches in full communion in a context that preserves legitimate variety;
 - b. To unite all Christian churches;
 - c. To unite all mankind.

D. EVALUATION

None of the consensus statements under examination above contains anything this Committee finds unorthodox by Roman Catholic standards.

Unfortunately, the question of goals has seen little development in the publications of dialogue groups. Of the three documents studied above and which speak explicitly of goals, AmBaptCath V's treatment was very brief, DisCath II only afforded a summary reflection, and ARC VII, which offered the most serious treatment of goals, did so in a limited range of development.

We might present some examples of the problems involved. DisCath V is understandably vague as to what would be necessary for a common expression of faith and common organizational structures. The issue of the mutual recognition of ministries, which is to be discussed in the next chapter, and the problem of doctrinal agreement, discussed in the seventh chapter, are both crucial here.

ARC VII calls for a "common profession of faith" (p. 18). To some extent this already exists in the ancient creeds of the Church which are recited by Anglicans and Roman Catholics alike. Would a current profession of faith be different? Would it have to include all elements considered as "substantials" by the current body of theological opinion in either church? The applicable principles are treated in Chapter VII of this report.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We commend the participants of these three consultations for their efforts to set forth the goals in view, and recommend that the other dialogue groups sharpen their own sense of purpose. It would be of value if each group made a reflective study of how its goals have changed and developed in view of its ongoing experiences and increasing mutual understanding.

2. It might help to distinguish among proximate, intermediate and ultimate goals, especially where corporate union seems remote. Reflection on intermediate goals might clarify possibilities of cooperation for restricted purposes.

3. The importance of dialogue on the national level is a value that is taken for granted in many of the statements but has not been explicitly discussed. We recommend this discussion without prejudice to the importance of international conversations. One of the reasons for the great value of national dialogues is the importance of preserving the cultural pluralism alluded to in both ARC VII and DisCath II.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF ORDAINED MINISTRY

The consensus statements considered in this report are the following:

1. The Anglican—Roman Catholic Statement of December 1969 (ARC VII) giving a summary of the meetings of that bilateral conversation group from June 1965 through December 1969. The meetings in which ministry was discussed were ARC III (October 1966), V (January 1968) and VII. Each of these statements is available in *A/RC-Doc* (USCC, 1972). Abbreviation: ARC.

2. The Reformed-Presbyterian—Roman Catholic Statement of May 14, 1970, published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 686-90. This has been revised several times since its first publication in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 5,2 (Spring 1968), pp. 462-65 and a further revision, not available to the authors of this report, is to be published in the near future. Abbreviation: PresCath

3. The Lutheran—Roman Catholic Statement on Eucharist and Ministry published in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 4 (1970). Abbreviation: LuCath.

A. SUMMARY OF THE STATEMENTS

1) *Lutheran—Roman Catholic*

Although this was the last of the statements to be published, it will be considered first because of its substance and relative length. The statement is divided into three chapters; the first, "Common Observations on Eucharistic Ministry," the second, "Reflections of the Lutheran Participants," the third, "Reflections of the Roman Catholic Participants." However, it is noted that "in the course of discussions, all three chapters were seen, in effect, to be a 'common statement,' since neither side disagreed with what the other was saying to its church or churches" (p. 67).

In the first chapter a distinction is made between *ministry*, "the task of proclaiming the gospel to all, believers and unbelievers," which belongs to the entire Church, and *Ministry*, a particular form of service within and for the sake of Christ's Church in its mission to the world. Minister (upper case) refers, in this statement, to the person to whom this Ministry has been entrusted.

The ministry is a priestly service "such as that of ancient Israel" (1 Peter 2:5.9 and Exodus 19:5-6 are cited). In Jesus Christ the

people of God have a high priest and sacrifice, and all who are united with Jesus by baptism and faith share in his priesthood. This "priesthood in Christ" is a ministry from God to men, a ministry which "represents the concerns of God to men and those of men to God." In order that it may be accomplished, God bestows within this ministry various gifts for ministering, including the special Ministry "of preaching the gospel, administering what the church came to call sacraments, caring for the faithful" (p. 10). That is the Ministry to which the statement applies.

That Ministry is directed to the world (evangelizing, witnessing, serving) and to fellow Christians ("building up in Christ those who already believe"). It stands with the people of God under Christ but also speaks in Christ's name to his people. It is apostolic, i.e. it has "some sort of succession" to what is apostolic whether in doctrine, practices, or authority. Among Catholics, "apostolic succession" has meant succession in ministerial office; for Lutherans "the stress has been on succession in apostolic doctrine" (p. 12). The latter was also stressed in the New Testament and patristic periods, but in the latter there was also acknowledgment of succession in office as an important means to ensuring doctrinal succession.

Entrance into the Ministry is by ordination which, for Catholics, is a sacramental act. Lutherans in ordaining invoke the Holy Spirit for the gifts of the Ministry; they see ordination as a setting apart for specific service in the Church and for the world, and regard it as having a once-for-all significance; thus, there is "a considerable convergence between the Catholic and the Lutheran understandings of ordination," and both are agreed that "ordination to the Ministry is for a lifetime of service and is not to be repeated" (pp. 12-13).

The diverse ways in which Catholic and Lutheran Ministries have been structured and implemented "appear to us to be consonant with apostolic teaching and practice," and the members of the consultation are agreed that "the basic reality of the apostolic Ministry can be preserved amid variations in structure and implementation, in rites of ordination and in theological explanation" (p. 14).

In the second chapter, the Lutheran participants assert their belief that the Roman Catholic Church meets the criteria of churchly character, and that "its episcopal structure and polity does not in

itself constitute a problem for the Lutherans As long as the ordained Ministry is retained, any form of polity which serves the proclamation of the gospel is acceptable" (p. 19). Especially since Vatican II's calling proclamation of the gospel a "primary duty" of Roman Catholic priests, there is no reason to deny that they are "competent Ministers of the gospel and the sacraments" (p. 20), hence there is no reason for doubting the validity of the Roman Catholic Eucharist. The Lutherans see the common statement as removing some obstacles that separate Roman Catholics and Lutherans, but "there are still problems to be discussed before we can recommend pulpit and altar fellowship" (p. 21).

The Lutherans end by declaring their "historic conviction that the Roman Catholic church is an authentic church of our Lord Jesus Christ" and urge that the Lutheran churches represented in the dialogue "declare formally their judgment that the ordained Ministers of the Roman Catholic church are engaged in a valid Ministry of the gospel, announcing the gospel of Christ and administering the sacraments of faith as their chief responsibilities, and that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are truly present in their celebrations of the sacrament of the altar" (p. 22).

It is clear that the major Lutheran concern is with fidelity to the gospel, and that the Lutheran participants' favorable judgment on the validity of the Roman Catholic Eucharist, and indeed on the churchly character of the Roman Catholic communion is based on their belief that the gospel is truly proclaimed by the ordained Ministry of the Catholic Church. This is in line with their understanding of apostolic succession as principally succession in apostolic doctrine.

In the third chapter the Catholic participants note that while "the traditional Roman Catholic outlook" would be that the Lutheran Ministry is essentially defective since it is not entered into by ordination from a bishop claiming historical succession to the apostles, there are historical and theological grounds for a positive appraisal of that Ministry.

The New Testament evidence about who celebrated the Eucharist is sparse. The concept "apostle" is not univocal in the New Testament, and even so, there is no evidence that only an apostle or one

in succession to him could celebrate. The evolution to a celebration only by a bishop or by an episcopally ordained presbyter is early, but even after that became the rule, there were exceptions to the general rule that the only Minister of the Eucharist was one ordained by a bishop. These offer "some precedent for the practice by the Lutherans" (p. 25) (non-episcopal ordination).

Theologically, the recognition by Vatican II of the Reformation denominations as churches, the preservation of doctrinal apostolicity in the Lutheran churches, the agreement made in the joint statement on the Eucharist of both Catholics and Lutherans on "the real presence and on the sacrificial character of the Lord's supper" indicate that the difficulties which Catholics felt on these points "no longer seem insuperable" (p. 26).

The Catholics note "a gratifying degree of agreement" with the Lutherans "as to the essentials of the sacred Ministry" (p. 27). Specifically, they found that the Lutherans hold that the Ministry is of divine institution; that it includes both preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments; and that there is a distinction between it and the general ministry of all believers. On the last point their concept of the distinction is not as clear-cut as that expressed by Vatican II, i.e., that this Ministry differs in essence and not only in degree from the common priesthood of all believers. Yet the Augsburg Confession states that ". . . no one should be allowed to administer the word and the sacraments in the church unless he is duly called." While Lutherans rarely call ordination a sacrament, in this dialogue they have affirmed "what to us would be the essentials of Catholic teaching on this subject, namely, that ordination to a sacred Ministry in the church derives from Christ and confers the enduring power to sanctify" (p. 29).

The Catholics recognize the doctrine of Trent on sacred orders as the most serious obstacle to a favorable evaluation of the Lutheran eucharistic Ministry. But they note that the Tridentine canons (DS 1610; 1777) are not specifically directed against Lutheran views on the Ministry but against those of the Reformers in general; hence it is difficult "to determine Trent's attitude towards *Lutheran* eucharistic Ministry. In regard to an estimation of Trent's canons, the participants of the dialogue point out that some hold that the Council

simply declared that those who were not "rightly ordained" could not exercise a *legitimate* Ministry, and that the canon in question deals not with "invalidity" but with "illicitey." "Another approach," which they apparently favor, is that Trent's condemnation must be seen in the light of the Council's understanding of Reformation theology concerning the Church, the sacraments and the Eucharist. Since the present Lutheran theology on these points is not that which Trent repudiated, the Council's view on the Ministry of the Reformers, insofar as it applies to the Lutherans, may have been pertinent to past times, but not to the present (p. 31).

The "reflections" of the Catholics conclude with a statement in which they assert that they "see no persuasive reason to deny the possibility of the Roman Catholic church recognizing the validity of this [the Lutheran] Ministry," and they ask the authorities of the Catholic Church whether "the ecumenical urgency flowing from Christ's will for unity may not dictate" such recognition, and, correspondingly, recognition of "the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharistic celebrations of the Lutheran churches" (p. 32).

Certain clarifications are then added: the Catholic statement prescinds from speaking directly to the question of Lutheran orders in the past; by appealing for *church* action, it stresses the belief that the problem should not be solved on the level of private action; it does not suggest that the age-old insistence on episcopal ordination within the Catholic Church be given up; it applies only to the Lutheran churches which are parties to the bilateral conversation; the Catholic participants "are not in a position to affirm" that recognition of valid Ministry must or should lead to sharing the eucharistic table.

2. *Reformed-Presbyterian—Roman Catholic*

The statement indicates the concern of the members of the consultation with "full intercommunion" at the beginning of the dialogue; then they realized that "this end lay far beyond us, because the traditions of which we are a part have been separated for centuries and because there was not full acceptance amongst us of each other's ministries." The consultation then turned its attention

to "practical questions about the church's ministry to the world," but this has forced the participants to look back to the question of ministry in order to seek a way of reconciliation whereby the ministry to the world might be better served. In the process they have been brought "to recognize in the ministry" of each other "rich and necessary elements which both of us affirm" (p. 687).

The consultation affirms "a general ministry or common priesthood of all who are baptized," which needs "to be magnified and lived out more within both our traditions." Within this general ministry there are "ministers called and ordained to represent Christ to the community and the community before Christ (p. 688). This representation has "traditionally" been exercised through the proclamation of the word and the celebration of the sacraments. The ordained ministry is "one particular gift of the Holy Spirit," and ordination to it is, "therefore, also a gift of the Spirit—it is a commissioning of persons by the church and an invocation of the Spirit to empower them for their ministry." This ministry is not "distinguished from the rest of the people by superiority of status or function, but by difference of service. It has its origin in the election and calling of the risen Christ." It exists to serve and lead the community of which it is part by preaching and celebrating the sacraments, but it also exists to serve the world and the Lord himself.

The statement recognizes that there are differences between the two traditions "yet to be formulated and discussed," e.g. apostolic succession and ministry, the Eucharist as sacrifice, and "the meaning of permanency in contemporary ministry." The points of agreement on ministry at the moment are: "the Holy Spirit is the source of our ministry and in the ordination liturgy is called upon to bestow this gift; ordination is a designation to the service of the church in the world; the act of ordination has a permanent significance" (p. 688).

3. *Anglican—Roman Catholic*

In its published form, the Anglican—Roman Catholic statement on ministry is the shortest of the three under consideration here. "Both churches hold firmly for the necessity of an ordained ministry in which are included the three orders of bishops, priests (presbyters) and deacons" (ARC III; *A/RC-Doc*, p. 10). ARC V studied "the

necessity and role of the ordained priesthood and the relationship of this ministry to the common priesthood" and concluded that "there was no basic difference of understanding on these topics and that whatever minor differences of understanding did exist, they did not *in themselves* constitute the barrier to the two Churches celebrating and receiving communion together" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 11). ARC VII speak of "our common belief in the role of bishops as bearers of an apostolic office and as 'the visible principle and foundation of unity' in their particular churches" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 15) and states that "our next step in ARC should be to move on toward mutual recognition of ministry" (p. 16), since the consultation has achieved agreement on the Church as a eucharistic fellowship, on the theology of the celebrant, and on the nature of eucharistic sacrifice. ARC endorses a statement of the international Anglican—Roman Catholic Preparatory Commission which says *inter alia* that the mutual recognition of ministry "presents a particular difficulty in regard to Anglican Orders according to the traditional judgment of the Roman Church," but urges a very serious consideration of the question "in the light of modern theology" (p. 16). Only after a sufficient agreement on the nature of the priesthood and the meaning to be attached to the word "validity" in the context of the theology of the Church can the theology of ministry be applied to the Anglican ministry of the present. According to the international statement, the investigation should bear on "historical events and past documents" only to the extent that they can throw light on the present situation (p. 16).

If a mutually acceptable statement on episcopacy and priesthood can be made, the consultation hopes "to recommend the reconciliation of the ordained ministries of the two churches without 'reordination' or 'conditional ordination'" (p. 17). However, the Anglican—Roman Catholic efforts toward mutual recognition of ministries must not be regarded as prejudicial to the Consultation on Church Union or to the other bilateral conversations in which both churches are participating.

B. POINTS OF CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE

All three statements agree that the special or representative ministry can be properly understood only within the context of the gen-

eral ministry of the whole Church, and as one of the many gifts of the Spirit which have been given within the Christian community.

There is agreement that the specifying note of the special ministry is the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments; LuCath and PresCath are explicit on this, but it is certainly implied in ARC's statement that there is no basic difference of understanding [between Anglicans and Romans] on the role of the ordained priesthood (cf. *A/RC-Doc.* p. 11).

All agree that entrance into this ministry is by ordination. LuCath states that while Lutherans have been reluctant to use the word "sacrament" of ordination, "their consistent practice . . . shows a conviction concerning the sacramental reality of ordination to the Ministry" (p. 12). PresCath's description of ordination is equivalently a sacramental description (cf. p. 688). ARC does not touch that question in its discussions on ministry, but the sacramental nature of ordination is implied in the "Statement on the Eucharist" of ARC IV which speaks of the ministerial priest as "empowered by his ordination to make present Christ's sacrifice for His people" (*A/RC-Doc.*, p. 4). LuCath regards ordination as permanent in its effect, and unrepeatable. PresCath is less clear on that point, for while it calls the "permanent significance" of ordination a point of agreement between the parties to the consultation, it also gives as one of the points of difference "the meaning of permanence in contemporary ministry" (p. 688). It may be significant that in the 1968 version of the statement, the participants pointed to the fact that "reordination is not practised" among them, without drawing any conclusion about the unrepeatable nature of ordination. That reference to the *de facto* situation is not found in the 1970 version.

While LuCath lays stress on the substantial agreement of both sides on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist as one of the reasons why mutual recognition of their ministries seems possible, and ARC also speaks of agreement on that subject, PresCath gives "the eucharist as sacrifice" as one of the remaining differences yet to be discussed.

A striking divergence is that while LuCath recommends mutual recognition of ministries, and ARC VII regards a statement in that sense as "the next step in the dialogue," PresCath does not speak

directly to that subject. Yet it does recommend "limited eucharistic sharing" because "both of our churches have moved towards a greater recognition of a common eucharistic faith" (pp. 689-90).

ARC's assertion of "the necessity of an ordained ministry in which are included the three orders of bishops, priests (presbyters) and deacons" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 10) is not really a divergence from the other statements, since this is presumably said in reference to the necessity of the Anglican—Roman Catholic preservation of this ordering of the ministry. ARC's endorsement of the other bilateral conversations supports this interpretation. The ARC assertion, then, does not differ substantially from that of the Catholic participants of LuCath who affirm that the apostolic Ministry is retained in a preeminent way in the episcopacy, the presbyterate, and the diaconate (LuCath p. 33).

C. EVALUATION

Considering its *genre littéraire* LuCath is remarkable for its depth and completeness, and the other statements suffer notably in comparison in that regard. However, in fairness to ARC it must be said in the first place that it does not pretend to be a statement on ministry but simply a statement of the progress of the consultation from its beginning, out of which one has to join together bits and pieces on ministry; secondly, ARC, as a consultation between episcopal churches, did not have to deal with some of the questions raised in LuCath.

All three statements speak of the common priesthood of the faithful, and PresCath calls for a "magnifying" of that doctrine. Yet neither that consultation nor ARC gives any consideration to its source and its meaning. Since each holds that the special ministry can be rightly understood only within the context of the common priesthood, that omission is a major weakness. LuCath (rightly, so it seems) bases the doctrine on the union of Christians with Jesus, their high priest, and with his sacrifice.

ARC and LuCath rightly stress that a common eucharistic faith and a common understanding of the role of the ordained minister in the celebration of the Eucharist are prerequisites for a mutual

recognition of ministries. In LuCath such recognition is clearly recommended to the church authorities by the Lutheran participants (p. 22). The recommendation of the Roman Catholic participants is less explicit, and more cautiously worded (p. 32), but the latter's assertion that they "see no persuasive reason to deny the possibility of the Roman Catholic church recognizing the validity of this [the Lutheran] Ministry," and their question to the authorities of the Roman Church whether such recognition may not be dictated by "the ecumenical urgency flowing from Christ's will for unity" seems, at least to some members of this committee, to be certainly a recommendation for recognition of the Lutheran Ministry. However, the committee (with one exception) thinks that the grounds for Roman Catholic recognition should be made clearer. In their opinion, the Catholic participants' statement that they do not "attempt to decide whether recognition by the Roman Catholic church would be constitutive of validity or merely confirmatory of existing validity" is unsatisfactory. This committee would agree that it is not necessary to "solve the problem" of "Lutheran orders in the past" before recognizing the validity of Lutheran Ministry as it now exists (cf. p. 32). But the committee (again with one exception) believe that a basis must be given on which recognition can now be extended; by allowing the constitutive/confirmatory alternative to remain undecided, the Catholic members of the consultation leave the basis for the recognition ambiguous.

PresCath's saying that "traditionally" the function of the ordained ministry has been proclamation of the word and administration of the sacraments is susceptible of different interpretations. Is it merely a statement of fact, or is it meant to suggest that those functions might become peripheral functions of the ministry, at least in some cases, without loss to the distinctive character of the ordained ministry?

What is the meaning of that consultation's statement that the ordained ministry is not "distinguished from the rest of the people by superiority of status or function"? If "superiority of status" means ecclesiastical lordship, one can accept the implied condemnation as faithful to the gospel, but the rhetoric is unfortunate. The Pauline churches were marked by different charisms, all worked by

the Spirit, but certainly not all of equal importance. And it would be hard to justify the claim that at least some of them (apostleship, teaching) did not have a permanent character which gave a "status" to those so gifted. That is even clearer in the case of the various functions which Paul and the author of Ephesians number among the charisms. If the "apostles and prophets" are the foundation of the Church (Eph. 2:20), they certainly have a superiority of function to miracle workers, healers, and administrators.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Further study on the common priesthood and its relation to the eucharistic celebration of the Church should be done by all the consultations represented by these statements.

2. Clarification is needed on the Lutheran understanding of the relation between the common priesthood and the ministerial priesthood.

3. In the view of the majority of our committee, a more positive study is needed of the grounds for possible recognition of the ordained ministry of the Lutheran churches by the Roman Catholic Church.

4. It would be desirable to obtain information on Anglican reactions to the LuCath consensus on the ordained ministry.

5. ARC's suggestion of programs for the diffusion of information about the consultation, and about the theological and historical grounds on which its conclusions are founded should be implemented not only by the authorities of the Anglican and Roman churches, but by those of all the churches engaged in the bilateral conversations.

III. THE STATUS OF WOMEN

A. DOCUMENTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

The status of women as a theological question is related both to the search for new models of church and ministry and to the demand for the promotion of women in ecclesial and human society. The recent development of this topic as an ecumenical question accounts for its limited treatment in the consensus statements issued by

Roman Catholics in consultation with theologians of other Christian confessions in the United States.

The status of women is discussed in three statements, all emanating from the Reformed-Presbyterian—Roman Catholic Consultation (PresCath):

1. "The Ordination of Women," art. 5 of the paper, "Ministry in the Church" issued by the Theology Section of PresCath XI (May 14, 1970), published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 686-90. Abbreviation: PresCath XI.

2. "Women in Church and Society," issued by the Worship and Mission Section of PresCath XI (May 14, 1970), published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 690-91. Abbreviation: PresCath XIa.

3. "Women in the Church," issued by the Worship and Mission Section of PresCath following the fourteenth meeting of the Consultation (Oct. 28-30, 1971), and published, with the omission of the appendix, in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9,1 (Winter 1972), pp. 235-41. Abbreviation: PresCath XIV.

These statements differ from one another in length, content, and concern. PresCath XI discusses the ordination of women briefly but comprehensively. PresCath XIa contains the progress report of a study on women along with a confession of guilt for "discrimination based upon sex" in both the Church and the social order (par. 2). PresCath XIV is a statement of recommendations to the BCEIA and to the North American Area Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches concerning women in the churches represented in the PresCath consultation (par. 1).

B. EXTENT OF AGREEMENT

These three statements are both similar and complementary. All recognize: a) the "ambiguity of woman's position in the world" (PresCath XI); b) the challenge of the women's liberation movement to the injustices of concepts regarding women "as they have rooted themselves within the life of the church" (PresCath XIa, par. 4); c) the conclusions of an "ever growing number of theological investigations . . . made in recent decades in various

churches" concerning the ministerial role of women (PresCath XIV, par. 12).

PresCath XI discusses the ordination of women in the context of "the historical situation of the church" (par. 1) and attends to the ways in which the "relativities of history" have affected the role of women in society and in the Church. It takes note of a "growing consensus" among theologians of both the Roman Catholic and Reformed traditions that there is "no insurmountable biblical or dogmatic obstacle to the ordination of women" and asserts that "ordination of women must come to be part of the church's life" (par. 2). It calls for the establishment of "an ecumenical commission composed of women and men to study the role of women in religion and society" (par. 4).

PresCath XIa presents evidence "of the difficulties encountered by women as they live out their role in society, and especially of Christian women as they seek to fulfill their ministry within both the church and the world" (par. 1). It concludes that "Christian women must be welcomed into decision-making positions within the church" and that "further study should be given to the ordination of women to the special ministries within the church" (par. 7).

PresCath XIV presents the case for the essential equality of the sexes, making use of many quotations from the New Testament and from documents such as the Vatican II Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. PresCath XIV contends that the failure of church and society to implement these principles is an injustice. The statement closes with three recommendations that may be summarized as follows:

1. that qualified women be given full and equal participation in policy and decision making, and voice in places of power, in the churches on local, regional, national, and world levels;
2. a) that seminary education in all the churches be opened to qualified women; b) that qualified women be admitted to ordination; c) that in those churches where the ordination of women presents theological difficulties and no theological study of the matter has been made, a theological committee be established immediately to investigate the problem and make recommendations;
3. that the North American Area Council, World Alliance of

Reformed Churches and the Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs establish and fund an Ecumenical Commission on Women, inviting other churches involved in bilateral consultations with the Roman Catholic Church to join with them on an equal basis in responsibility and funding for this commission and in sharing the fruits of its labors.

C. GENERAL EVALUATION

The consensus statements on the status of women, although issued by only one consultation, represent a major breakthrough in the discussion of this question. Each of the three statements respects the historical reality of woman as a human person who is both ecclesial and societal. There is a straightforward petition for "justice, freedom, and full personal dignity for women" (PresCath XI, par. 10) without appeal to confusing arguments based on "rights," sociological or religious. The gospel is affirmed as the norm for a prophetic judgment which the Christian must bring to the values of world and society. The "signs of the times" are discerned as the norm for a prophetic judgment which humanity must bring to ecclesiastical customs and institutions.

In general the line of thought represented by these statements appears to be consonant with the Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World (arts. 9, 20, and 60) and with the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, which states (art. 9): "Since in our time women have an ever more active share in the whole life of society, it is very important that they participate more widely also in the various fields of the Church's apostolate."

As regards the ordination of women, this committee agrees with the PresCath consultation that there are no clear obstacles to this in revelation or Christian dogma. It would be important, however, not to force women abruptly into patterns of ministry that have been developed with a view to an exclusively male clergy.

This committee welcomes the PresCath statements on the status of women as a sincere and promising fruit of courageous ecumenical dialogue. The recommendations voiced by PresCath XIV represent a vision and a hope that call for serious consideration and appropriate implementation.

Some of the recommendations of PresCath are closely paralleled by the following proposal made by the 1971 Synod of Bishops:

We also urge that women should have their own share of responsibility and participation in the community life of society and likewise of the Church.

We propose that this matter be subjected to a serious study employing adequate means: for instance, a mixed commission of men and women, religious and lay people, of differing situations and competence.

(*Catholic Mind*, March 1972, p. 59)

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that other bilateral consultations take advantage of the excellent statements made by PresCath on the status of women. These statements, in the opinion of the present Committee, provide an excellent example of how this important and delicate matter can be forthrightly and prudently handled.

In the Roman Catholic Church, we believe, the following points ought to be incorporated into pastoral and catechetical programs:

1. Fuller recognition should be given to the ministerial roles actually being exercised by women, both lay and religious, especially within diocesan and/or parochial structures.

2. The thought and practice of the early Church on the ministries of women should be more deeply investigated and better publicized.

3. An effort should be made to acquaint clergy and laity with the present concern of the churches for the status of women and with the progress of discussion of this question, as reflected in the declarations of Vatican II, those of the 1971 Synod of Bishops, and the consensus statements considered above. (A lengthy collection of policy statements on the status of women emanating from various denominations is contained in the appendix to PresCath XIV).

4. Clergy and laity should be made more aware of the activities of bishops and of NCCB subcommittees presently working on the questions of women in church and society, of women in the ministry, and of women in pastoral and/or ordained ecclesial service.

5. The recommendations of PresCath XIV are to be investigated

in discussion, writing, and teaching, and where possible and fitting, implemented.

IV. THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

A. DOCUMENTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

The centrality of the Eucharist to the lives of the churches, the bitter controversies surrounding the Eucharist in earlier centuries, and the possibilities for new agreements in light of modern exegesis and ecclesiology—these and other factors have combined to make the doctrine of the Eucharist a favorite theme of contemporary ecumenical discussion.

Among the consensus statements issued by Roman Catholics in consultation with theologians of other Christian confessions in the United States, the following treat thematically of eucharistic doctrine:

1. The Anglican—Roman Catholic "Statement on the Eucharist" issued at their fourth consultation, May 29, 1967, and published in *A/RC-Doc* (USCC, 1972), pp. 3-4. Abbreviation: ARC IV.

2. "The Eucharist: A Lutheran-Roman Catholic Statement" composed at the meeting of Sept. 29 to Oct. 1, 1967, and published in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 3 (USCC, 1968), pp. 187-98. Abbreviation: LuCath.

3. Summary Memorandum, "A Responsible Theology for Eucharistic Intercommunion in a Divided Church," issued by the RC Consultation with the Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ), April 29 to May 1, 1968, and published in *Mid-Stream* 7,2, pp. 90-91. Abbreviation: DisCath.

4. "An Agreed Statement on the Eucharist" issued by the fourth Orthodox—Catholic Consultation, Dec. 13, 1969, and published in *Diakonia*, vol. 5 (1970), p. 72. Abbreviation: OrthCath.

5. NCC Multilateral Statement "The Eucharist in the Life of the Church: An Ecumenical Consensus," published in *The Ecumenist* 8,6 (Sept.-Oct. 1970) pp. 90-93—which in many ways reflects the agreements previously reached in Bilateral Conversations. Abbreviation: NCC.

6. Anglican—Roman Catholic "Comment on the Windsor State-

ment" (unpublished), issued at their eleventh consultation, Jan. 24, 1972 (Abbreviation: ARC XI), and revised at their twelfth consultation, June 15, 1972 (Abbreviation: ARC XII).

These statements are very different from one another in length, in scope, and in depth. DisCath deals primarily with intercommunion and touches only briefly on other aspects of eucharistic doctrine. LuCath is a very detailed treatment of agreements and disagreements between Lutherans and Roman Catholics, especially with regard to the Eucharist as sacrifice and the real presence. NCC is a wide-ranging statement covering many points, including some not disputed among Christians. OrthCath is a brief compendium of eucharistic doctrine under the form of six propositions with an introduction and conclusion. ARC IV deals principally with the Eucharist as sacrifice. ARC XI deals with issues raised by the Windsor Statement (see below), especially with regard to sacrifice and real presence.

All these statements should be read with an awareness of their situation within the larger dialogue going on among Christian denominations both in the United States and on the world level. Of special importance for background are the following four documents:

1. The Section Report on Worship at the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Montreal, 1963. Abbreviation: Montreal.
2. The section on the Eucharist in *Consultation on Church Union: Principles* (Cincinnati, 1967). Abbreviation: COCU.
3. "The Eucharist in Ecumenical Thought," a statement submitted by the Faith and Order Working Committee to the WCC Fourth Assembly at Uppsala, 1968. Abbreviation: WCC.
4. The Agreed Statement on the Eucharist issued at Windsor, England, by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Sept. 1971. Abbreviation: Windsor.

B. EXTENT OF GENERAL AGREEMENT

Nearly all the statements remark on the surprising unanimity disclosed by the consultations. DisCath states this somewhat blandly:

"The Scriptures describe the Eucharist for each of us, and we have discovered that our understandings of the Lord's Supper are more similar than we had expected." The NCC is optimistic though guarded: "Aware of the limitations of this statement, they [the authors] are nevertheless able to rejoice and be grateful for the wide and growing agreement on many aspects of eucharistic thought that have formerly been controverted" (no. 1). LuCath begins by recording "our profound gratitude to God for the growing unity on this subject [the Eucharist] which we see in our day" and notes that their report is "simply one manifestation of a growing consensus among many Christian traditions on the Lord's supper" (p. 187).

Three dialogue groups appear to claim that they have arrived at substantial agreement, at least with regard to certain issues. ARC IV claims this with regard to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist: "We believe that it is of utmost importance for the clergy and laity of our two churches to acknowledge their substantial identity in this area of Eucharistic doctrine and to build upon it as they go forward in dialogue. Whatever doctrinal disagreements may remain between our churches, the understanding of the sacrificial nature (of the Eucharistic [*sic*]) is not among them" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 3).

In response to Windsor's claim of substantial agreement regarding the total doctrine of the Eucharist, ARC XII indicates certain reservations as to whether the clergy and faithful of both communions would be able to agree that the positions enunciated by Windsor are an adequate expression of their eucharistic faith. This consultation also calls for more clarity in Windsor's notion of sacrifice and urges greater breadth in its understanding of real presence.

LuCath reports substantial agreement with regard to two issues on which the statement concentrates because these issues have been "especially divisive in the past" (p. 187)—the Eucharist as sacrifice and the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. On these two points, the theologians conclude, "the progress has been immense. Despite all remaining differences in the ways we speak and think of the eucharistic sacrifice and our Lord's presence in his supper, we are no longer able to regard ourselves as divided in the one holy catholic and apostolic faith on these two points" (p. 198).

OrthCath lists six propositions on which the representatives of

the two churches find themselves in a "remarkable and fundamental agreement." They do not report any remaining disagreements on eucharistic doctrine, but observe that "we are aware that serious differences exist in our understanding of the Church, eucharistic discipline, and pastoral practice, which prevent us now from communicating in one another's churches."

There is also significant agreement among the various groups that the doctrine and celebration of the Eucharist, to be meaningful, must be understood in the context of the doctrine and life of the whole Church, as People of God, Body of Christ, and Temple of the Holy Spirit (ARC IV, OrthCath, DisCath, and NCC).

C. SPECIFIC AREAS OF DISCUSSION

1) *The Eucharist as Sacrifice*

The question of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist is expressly raised in all the statements but one (DisCath), and is affirmatively answered. In each case, moreover, care is taken to clarify the point that the Eucharist is not a sacrifice in addition to that of Christ, but that Christ makes himself present in the Eucharist as the once-for-all sacrifice.

NCC, repeating verbatim a statement previously made by COCU, declares: "Christ is present as the crucified who died for our sins and rose again for our justification, as the once-for-all sacrifice for the sins of the world who gives himself to the faithful" (no. 10).

ARC IV conveys the same point: "The sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is not just the sacrifice of the Cross, but the sacrifice of Christ's whole life of obedience to the Father, which culminated in His death on the Cross and His glorious Resurrection" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 4). Later the Eucharist is described in this statement as the sacrifice of the people of God, who are participants in Christ's priesthood.

ARC XII is not fully satisfied by the treatment of sacrifice in the Windsor statement. Some of the ARC members, this report observes, "feel that a statement of this kind should clearly affirm that the eucharist is a sacrifice" and "would like to see greater clarity as

to the notion of sacrifice as the word is used in the statement." (The implication here seems to be that Windsor's restriction of Christ's sacrifice to "his death on the cross" without reference to his resurrection, is unwarranted.)

LuCath provides a full treatment of the theme of sacrifice. It accepts COCU, as quoted above, regarding Christ's presence in the Eucharist as the one sacrifice for the sins of the world. "On this Lutherans insist as much as Catholics, although, for various reasons, Lutherans have been reticent about speaking of the Eucharist as a sacrifice" (p. 188). LuCath then adds a paragraph about the Eucharist being the sacrifice of the Church as well as that of Christ. The eucharistic assembly, LuCath says, "'offers Christ' by consenting to the power of the Holy Spirit to be offered by him to the Father" (p. 189).

The propitiatory value of the sacrifice is raised in three of the statements: OrthCath, LuCath, and NCC. The first seems to register agreement on the matter: "Through celebration of the Eucharist the redemptive blessings are bestowed on the living and the dead for whom intercession is made." LuCath, on the other hand, reached agreement in a broader area; namely that the Eucharist is propitiatory insofar as it is "efficacious for the forgiveness of sins and the life of the world." However, the statement also says that Lutherans reject what they have understood Trent to teach about the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice "offered for the living and the dead." Then LuCath adds: "We have not discussed this aspect of the problem; further exploration of it is required." Some apprehension on the part of Lutherans regarding Mass intentions and Mass stipends is confessed; but the more recent developments in Catholic practice, discouraging the private celebration of the Eucharist, are noted with satisfaction. NCC, too, speaks of the Eucharist as communicating and showing forth the forgiveness and reconciliation of the Father wrought by the sacrifice of the Son (nos. 2, 5, and 9).

2) *Real Presence*

Second only to sacrifice, real presence is the topic most fully treated in the consensus statements. DisCath speaks in very general terms: "We remember the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,

experience his presence among us as the living and saving Lord of the Church . . ." (p. 90). This reference to the presence of the living Lord shows that the Eucharist is not, in the minds of the signers of this statement, a merely figurative or commemorative rite.

NCC is clear on the fact of real presence but, like each of the other statements, it is silent about the moment when this occurs: "The power of the Spirit through the Word makes Christ really present throughout the eucharistic action in his body and blood given to the people as the consecrated bread and wine are distributed and received by the faithful according to the words of institution" (no. 10, p. 92).

LuCath is emphatic on the reality of Christ's presence: "We affirm that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is present wholly and entirely, in his body and blood, under the signs of bread and wine." As to the time, the statement declares: "The true body and blood of Christ are present not only at the moment of reception but throughout the eucharistic action" (p. 193). The traditional Roman Catholic emphasis on the moment of consecration (when the priest recites the words of institution) is not mentioned as a point of agreement or of disagreement here nor, as just indicated, in any of the other statements.

Both LuCath (p. 192) and NCC (no. 8, p. 91) speak of the manifold or multiple presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in a manner similar to Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (no. 7).

OrthCath, in keeping with the traditional emphasis of the former communion in particular, underlines the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic consecration: "In this eucharistic meal, according to the promise of Christ, the Father sends the Spirit to consecrate the elements to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ . . ." Indeed, the mention of the role of the Holy Spirit is missing from DisCath alone.

In ARC IV real presence is not treated except as implied in the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. Christ's sacrifice is said to be present. ARC XII expresses misgivings about the rather static affirmation of the real presence in Windsor's assertion that "the bread and wine, . . . in this mystery, become his body and blood." Such language, it is noted, could "suggest a restrictive understanding

of the real presence." ARC XII recommends a rephrasing that would do more justice to those theologies "that insist as well on a more dynamic or spiritual interpretation of the real presence."

None of the consensus statements lends support to the idea of a merely commemorative or figurative understanding of Christ's presence in the sacrament. All make it clear that Christ is present in a living and saving way, though his presence is mediated by the consecrated elements (see LuCath, pp. 192-93). LuCath, like ARC XII as just quoted, rejects a "spatial or natural manner of presence" (p. 192).

In the consensus statements we are examining, the term "transubstantiation" is discussed only by LuCath. The term is here accepted insofar as, in many modern Catholic expositions, it is understood as an emphatic affirmation of the fact of Christ's becoming present and effecting a real change in the elements. LuCath notes, however, that Lutherans shy away from the term "transubstantiation" because it seems to them to imply a rationalistic attempt to explain the mystery of Christ's presence and to capture it in a rigid metaphysical framework. At best, the Lutherans insist, the conceptuality associated with "transubstantiation" is misleading (see pp. 195-96).

The question of the permanence of Christ's presence after the end of the liturgy is dealt with in LuCath but not in the other consensus statements. While accepting the practice of distributing communion to the sick after the conclusion of the liturgy, the Lutherans here express hesitations about the Roman Catholic practice of adoring the sacrament. They note with satisfaction that, according to a recent Roman Catholic instruction, the primary and original purpose of reservation is to make provision for communicating the sick. The whole question of the use of the sacrament outside the liturgical service of the Lord's Supper is recognized as one in which "our historical divergences are being overcome, although we are unable at present to speak with one voice" (p. 193).

3) *The Ordained Ministry*

Three of the statements speak of the roles of the laity and of the ministerial priesthood in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

LuCath mentions the question only to bracket it as an "important omission" (p. 198) and to reserve it for treatment in connection with the later study, *Eucharist and Ministry*, already examined in our Chapter II. ARC IV says that in the eucharistic offering the priesthood of the people of God finds its fullest expression; then it adds: "Such sacramental offering of the whole people is made possible through the special action of the ministerial priest who is empowered by his ordination to make present Christ's sacrifice for His people (p. 4). NCC holds that "the principal minister or celebrant of every Eucharist is Christ, the one mediator and high priest of the New Covenant. The liturgical ministers are those authorized or recognized by the eucharistic community in which the service is held" (no. 12, p. 92). Mention is then made of the urgency of achieving mutual recognition of ministries, especially because of the implications this would have for eucharistic sharing.

4) *Holy Communion*

The question of communion is generally dealt with rather perfunctorily in the consensus statements, and may be treated very briefly here. Several of the statements (DisCath, NCC, and ARC IV) remark on the importance of Holy Communion as a sign and instrument both of our union with Christ and our mutual union as Christians with one another. They add, moreover, that the eucharistic meal is a foretaste and pledge of the heavenly supper (NCC no. 10, DisCath). OrthCath observes that through holy communion the faithful are "nourished as the One Body of Christ and built up as Temples of the Holy Spirit." This statement also places a welcome emphasis on the connection between communion and mission: the faithful "accept the mandate of service of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to mediate salvation to the world."

LuCath mentions only one controversial point concerning communion—the divergence of practice regarding communion under both kinds. The cup for the laity is not seen as constituting a serious obstacle since, on the one hand, the Lutheran confessions "do not deny the sacramental character of communion administered to a congregation in one kind only" and since, on the other hand, Vatican II has reintroduced in the Western Church "to a modest but sig-

nificant extent" the practice of communion under both kinds for the laity (p. 195).

D. GENERAL EVALUATION

The consensus statements on the Eucharist, studied in convergence, represent a dramatic advance beyond the polemical formulations of previous centuries. The positions taken by the various consultations are remarkably consistent with one another and at the same time provide a healthy mutual complementarity, insofar as they tend to accent what Catholics share in common with one or another of the other traditions. Thus DisCath emphasizes religious experience, LuCath emphasizes the primacy of Christ, ARC emphasizes sacrifice, and OrthCath emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit. These differences of shading do not introduce any real inconsistency into the positions adopted by Roman Catholics in the various consultations.

This committee, on the basis of its study of the reports, endorses the positions taken as being both theologically sound and ecumenically constructive. It commends the participants in these dialogues for their excellent and responsible work. The subject of eucharistic doctrine has proved very fruitful, and the findings of the various consultations, if fed back into the theological teaching and liturgical practice of the several churches, should prove beneficial to all concerned.

While the expressions of consensus in all the statements are to be welcomed, it is particularly helpful that in several cases (ARC IV, LuCath, and apparently OrthCath) the participants have felt able to report that they have reached "substantial agreement" at least with regard to certain questions, such as the real presence or the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. From the standpoint of method, the most valuable of the consensus statements would seem to be LuCath, because it carefully delimits the area of "substantial agreement" and also calls attention to a number of problems that were not adequately discussed and to others that were discussed without full agreement being obtained. In this way LuCath sets a useful agenda for the ecumenical theology of the coming years.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

The consensus statements, in the opinion of this Committee, provide a helpful guide for theological speculation and religious education in the several churches. We would hope that in Roman Catholic reflection, preaching, and writing the following points, clearly brought out in the consensus statements, would receive more emphasis than in the past:

1. That the one sacrifice of Christ, completed in his crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, is fully sufficient. The Eucharist does not "add" anything to Christ's sacrifice except in the sense of making it visible and present so that it takes hold of men, so to speak, in a given place and time, thereby raising the Church to a new level of participation in Christ's own sacrificial act.

2. That the dogma of transubstantiation, as currently understood in Roman Catholic teaching, intends to affirm only the fact of Christ's presence and of the radical change effected by God in the elements. It does not impose any particular explanation of that change; still less does it demand that theologians subscribe to the Scholastic analysis of substantial change in terms of the Aristotelian principles of matter and form, substance and accident. In view of the reinterpretation of transubstantiation in modern theology the term itself may be misleading; but none of the alternate terms that have been suggested are themselves free from objection.

3. That Anglicans and Protestants, in many cases, do not deny, but vigorously affirm, as Roman Catholics do, the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and the real presence in the Eucharist of Christ as the living and saving Lord of the Church. This fact is not without bearing on the vexing problem of intercommunion.

4. That the doctrine and celebration of the Eucharist can make sense only when understood in the context of the doctrine and life of the whole Church, as People of God, Body of Christ, and Temple of the Holy Spirit, rather than in a Christological context alone (e.g. as the grace-bearing acts of Christ).

The following points, among others, would seem to call for greater theological study in order that the existing tensions and

disagreements among Christian confessional bodies may be alleviated or cleared up:

1. The correct understanding of propitiation and of the propitiatory value of the Mass.
2. The value of Masses celebrated in a private manner, as compared with participation in a communal eucharistic celebration.
3. The importance of the "moment of consecration" as marking the beginning of the "real presence."
4. The permanence of Christ's sacramental presence and the veneration to be paid to the reserved sacrament.
5. The possibility of making the practice of communion under both kinds the general usage of the Roman Catholic Church in the Western rite.
6. Evaluation of alternate ways of conceptualizing and expressing the "how" of Christ's sacramental presence.
7. A comparison of the eucharistic relationship between the ordained minister and Christ, on the one hand, and the whole worshipping community and Christ, on the other.
8. The relationship between ecclesiology and eucharistic theology; i.e., how do differing views of Church determine our understanding of the Eucharist?

V. INTERCOMMUNION

A. DOCUMENTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

The following consensus statements make explicit mention of intercommunion:

1. "Eucharist and Ministry: A Lutheran-Roman Catholic Statement," in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 4 (USCC, 1970), pp. 7-33. Abbreviation: LuCath.
2. The Reformed-Presbyterian—Roman Catholic Statement of May 14, 1970, published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7,3 (Summer 1970), pp. 686-90. Abbreviation: PresCath.
3. Disciples of Christ—Roman Catholic Summary Memorandum, "A Responsible Theology for Eucharistic Intercommunion in a Divided Church," issued by their third consultation, April 29-May 1,

1968, published in *Mid-Stream* 7,2 pp. 90-91. Abbreviation: Dis-Cath.

4. The Anglican—Roman Catholic Statement of their seventh consultation, Dec. 8-9, 1969, published in *A/RC-Doc* (USCC, 1972), pp. 9-22. Abbreviation: ARC.

5. The Orthodox—Catholic "Agreed Statement on the Eucharist" from their fourth consultation (Dec. 13, 1969), published in *Diakonia*, vol. 5 (1970), p. 72. Abbreviation: OrthCath.

6. The NCC Multilateral Statement, "The Eucharist in the Life of the Church: An Ecumenical Consensus," published in *The Ecumenist* 8,6 (Sept.-Oct. 1970), pp. 90-93. Abbreviation: NCC.

B. CONTENTS OF THE STATEMENTS

1. LuCath deals directly with ministry. a) It mentions that one meeting devoted to the problem of receiving communion in each other's eucharistic celebrations led to a recognition that a solution was not possible until the problems of the ministry were squarely faced. b) It expresses a Lutheran affirmation of the validity of Lutheran ministry and sacraments, and of the churchly character of the Roman Catholic community and the validity of the Roman Catholic Church's ministry and sacraments. c) Despite this, the Lutheran participants acknowledge the presence of canonical, traditional and psychological barriers to eucharistic sharing in both communities. A great deal of theological work remains to be done. They cannot recommend pulpit and altar fellowship at the present time, since the common statement that has emerged from this dialogue does not provide an adequate basis for the establishment of such fellowship. d) The Catholic participants indicate (among many other considerations bearing upon validity of ministry) that the question of an authentic eucharistic ministry in a worshiping community is intimately related to an evaluation of that community as a part of the Church. They acknowledge the Lutheran communities with which they have been in dialogue as truly Christian churches. They find serious defects in the arguments customarily used against the validity of the eucharistic ministry of the Lutheran churches; they see no persuasive reason for denying the possibility of Roman

Catholic Church recognition of the validity of the ordained ministry in the Lutheran churches; they ask Catholic Church authorities whether ecumenical urgency may not now dictate acknowledgement of this Lutheran ministry and of the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic celebrations of Lutheran churches. e) The Catholic participants indicate that the matter should be resolved by the respective churches, not by private action. f) They do not wish to apply the conclusion reached here to other than Lutheran churches. g) They do not discuss "the implications that a recognition of valid Ministry would have for intercommunion or eucharistic sharing," nor do they "affirm that the one must or should lead to the other" (p. 33). They point out, however, that the Ecumenical Directory of the Secretariat for Unity allows Catholics to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist, in circumstances involving sufficient reason or urgent cause, from one who has been "validly ordained."

2. PresCath a) acknowledges that, "given the new state of the question, we are compelled in faith to recognize the risen Christ present and at work for the healing of his people in the ministry and eucharist of each of our traditions" (p. 689). b) The consultation insists, however, that "there is a serious division between Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians over the ecclesial reality" itself. This division is indeed "serious enough to preclude general eucharistic sharing for the present" (p. 689). c) On the other hand, since both churches have clearly moved toward "a greater recognition of a common eucharistic faith," PresCath urges their respective churches to "designate specific occasions on which invitation may be offered to celebrate together" and thereby to implement some "limited eucharistic sharing" (p. 690).

3. DisCath follows similar principles. a) Through baptism we have a unity in the Lord Jesus Christ that our unhappy divisions have not been able to destroy. b) Through the Eucharist, we experience a communion with him and with each other—even when we celebrate the Eucharist separately, our awareness of communion with the same Lord involves an awareness of union with one another. c) Our understandings of the Eucharist are more similar than we expected. d) The nature of the Church is discernible principally in the fellowship of the Lord's Supper. e) Even within the officially

expressed statements of our churches at present, there is sufficient theological justification *in principle* for some eucharistic sharing. f) Since urgent theological, ecumenical and pastoral reasons make some eucharistic sharing desirable in our country now, DisCath urges the two churches to explore as rapidly as possible the circumstances and procedures for responsible eucharistic sharing.

3. ARC VII raises a number of points. a) It mentions that the question of intercommunion was inconclusively discussed at an earlier consultation (ARC II). b) It states that there are no basic differences on the necessity and role of the ordained priesthood that would "*in themselves* constitute the barrier to the two Churches celebrating and receiving communion together" (p. 11). c) The consultation acknowledges that "some concerned Christians are already finding ways for expressing their shared commitment . . . beyond the bound of the formal church structures" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 13). d) Since both a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry are among the conditions required for intercommunion, ARC proposes to take up immediately the questions of orders, episcopal collegiality, the papacy, and the authority and teaching office in the whole Church. e) Further agreements on the topics already listed may give more light on possible stages or steps of partial eucharistic communion between the Roman Catholic Church and the churches of the Anglican Communion.

5. OrthCath, after expressing six important points of theological agreement regarding the Eucharist, concludes nevertheless that "serious differences exist in our understanding of the Church, eucharistic discipline, and pastoral practice which prevent us now from communicating in one another's churches."

6. NCC no. 12 declares that "the question of mutual recognition of various eucharistic communities and their ministries . . . is an ecumenical problem which must be overcome" if we are to resolve the problem of eucharistic sharing. The absence of agreement on this matter obscures the catholicity of the Eucharist.

C. POINTS OF CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE

1. The desirability of some intercommunion now is expressed by PresCath and DisCath.

2. ARC, LuCath, OrthCath, and NCC urge further study of those issues which now seem to make intercommunion unacceptable.

3. OrthCath alone however explicitly rejects eucharistic sharing under any circumstances today. On the other hand, DisCath seems least troubled by the conventional theological barriers to intercommunion.

4. Except for DisCath, each of the Consultations agrees that the principal issues now preventing intercommunion are our respective understandings of the ordained ministry in particular and of the nature of the eucharistic community in general.

5. None of the statements favors introduction of intercommunion on the basis of individual initiatives rather than by action of church authorities. ARC acknowledges that to some extent unauthorized intercommunion is taking place.

D. EVALUATION

1. Although the problem of intercommunion has been adverted to in most of the consultations, nowhere does it receive the kind of sustained theological analysis that it requires.

2. Certain important aspects of the problem have thus far been neglected: a) How much overall unity in faith (beyond belief in the Eucharist) is required? b) What are the requirements of unity in charity? c) Are there any requirements for unity in church discipline? In what way does the Eucharist represent communion with a specific church? (OrthCath is at least conscious of this problem.) d) What is the basis for the distinction between full and partial eucharistic communion among Christians of separated churches?

E. RECOMMENDATION

That there should be immediate further study of the questions listed in IV,2 above.

VI. MIXED MARRIAGES

A. DOCUMENT UNDER CONSIDERATION: GENERAL REMARKS

Among the various consensus statements issued by Roman

Catholic theologians in consultation with those of other Christian confessions in the United States, only one treats the problem of mixed marriage: "An Agreed Statement of Mixed Marriages" (unpublished), *OrthCath VII* (November 4, 1971).

The document recognizes that "under the conditions of modern life these mixed marriages will continue to take place." It recommends the counseling of couples by pastors of both churches in a manner that is ecumenically sensitive.

One of the most difficult problems will have to do with the Christian upbringing of the children. "Specific decisions should be made by the couple only after informed and serious deliberation. Whether the decision is made to raise the children in the Orthodox or Catholic tradition," the statement urges, "both partners should take an active role in the Christian upbringing of the children and in establishing their marriage as a stable Christian union."

Each partner should be reminded of the obligations of mutual respect for their religious convictions and practices and of mutual encouragement for continued spiritual growth.

Since the requirement for the presence of an Orthodox priest at a marriage ceremony involving a member of the Orthodox Church is more stringent than that of the Roman Catholic Church, *OrthCath VII* recommends that "the Catholic Church, as a normative practice, allow the Catholic party . . . to be married with the Orthodox priest officiating." This procedure would be followed, however, only after consultation by the partners with both pastors.

The consensus statement concludes with an agreement to engage in further study of the traditional teaching of both churches on the subject of marriage.

B. EVALUATION

1. The extreme brevity and condensation of the statement makes it difficult to understand the reasoning behind some of its recommendations.

2. The most significant item in this document is its proposal that the married couple may decide for themselves, "after serious and informed deliberation," whether the children are to be raised in the

Orthodox or Catholic tradition. This represents a notable departure from the current legislation of both churches, in the direction of freedom.

3. The statement restricts the freedom of the Catholic party in respect to the celebration of the marriage, and this is in apparent contradiction of the "principle of reciprocity" contained in the *Ecumenical Directory* (Part I, art. 43, May 14, 1967).

However, there is no compromising here of the Catholic Church's traditional view that the parties themselves are the ministers of the sacrament. On the other hand, the Orthodox, for whom the priest is the minister of the sacrament, would not be able to make a similar gesture without compromise.

The recommendation that the Catholic Church follow the suggested manner of celebration "as a normative practice" is evidently intended to distinguish such a concession from the *ad hoc* permissions which are now given.

4. There is no direct mention here of the separate, but closely related, topics of common worship and eucharistic sharing. However, it is clear from a reading of the results of an earlier dialogue, Orth-Cath IV, that such a discussion would have been hopelessly complicated and the potential gains achieved on the mixed marriage question, lost.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The question of mixed marriages has been neglected almost totally by the various dialogue groups, at least in their consensus statements. Few issues have such immediate pastoral significance. We urge every other group to address itself to this issue.

2. There is broad and extensive research now being done concerning Canon 72 of the Synod of Trullo (691) on the matter of the diriment impediment of mixed-religion for the Orthodox who is involved in a mixed marriage. Discussions between Catholics and Orthodox might usefully proceed with his research and the changing practice of the Catholic Church in mind. (See, for example, the *Decree on Catholic-Orthodox Marriages*, Congregation for the Oriental Church, February 22, 1967, and the *Decree on the Eastern Catholic Churches*, art. 18).

3. OrthCath might further pursue the question of mixed marriages by providing an expanded text or a commentary on the present text, explaining the theological reasoning behind the recommendations made, and addressing itself to such questions as the following: a) What is the basis for the distinction between "pastoral" and "theological" problems as treated in the document? b) What is the specific theological grounding for the "pastoral" recommendation of free choice in the religious upbringing of the children? c) In Section II,1, does the term "normative" imply that the Roman Catholic party would have to be dispensed if the officiant at the marriage were to be a Roman Catholic? Could the phrase "as a general concession" be substituted for the document's wording, "as a normative practice"?

VII. METHOD FOR DOCTRINAL AGREEMENT

A. DOCUMENTS UNDER CONSIDERATION: GENERAL REMARKS

Among the consensus statements issued by Roman Catholic theologians in consultation with those of other Christian confessions in the United States, only two treat the problem of doctrine from a methodological point of view:

1. The summary statement, "The Status of the Nicene Creed as Dogma in the Church" issued by the second Lutheran—Roman Catholic consultation (Baltimore, July 6-7, 1965), published in *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: NCWC, 1965) pp. 31-32. Abbreviation: LuCath II.

2. The memorandum, "Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity: Methodological Considerations," issued by the eleventh Anglican—Roman Catholic consultation, (New York, January 23, 1972) published in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 9,2 (Spring 1972), pp. 445-48. Abbreviation: ARC XI.

These two statements are very different from one another, not only in length but also in substance and style. LuCath I addresses itself to specific dogmatic questions (the mystery of the Blessed Trinity and the Lordship of the Son) and specifies certain topics (e.g., the relationship between Sacred Scripture and the Church's teaching authority) which might fruitfully be pursued as a means

of diminishing whatever differences remain in the understanding of such dogmas. ARC XI, on the other hand, mentions specific dogmatic controversies only to illustrate a methodological principle. It is intent rather upon developing principles that can be applied to *any* dogmatic controversy.

B. DOCUMENTS UNDER CONSIDERATION: SPECIFIC REMARKS

1. LuCath I focuses upon the articulation of faith in the Nicene Creed and underlines the extent of dogmatic agreement which exists between our respective traditions: a) our common confession of faith in the Lordship of Jesus and in the Holy Trinity; b) our common acceptance of the Nicene Creed as a faithful expression of the biblical testimony concerning the Son and his relationship to the Father, even though the council had to do so in nonbiblical terms in order to answer the Arian question; c) our common acknowledgement of our redemption in Christ and our acceptance of the Nicene Creed as both doxology to the Father and dogma about the Son; d) our common recognition that the Nicene Creed does not exhaust the richness of Scripture regarding the person of Christ; and e) our common awareness of the twofold function of authoritative teaching: *negatively*, to repudiate erroneous teaching, and *positively*, to assert the truth as revealed by God.

LuCath II acknowledges that there are differences between the two traditions in the way by which doctrine is certified as dogma, i.e., the differences in the way doctrine receives ecclesiastical sanction. This difference, in turn, proceeds from a different understanding of the Church's movement from kerygma to dogma. LuCath II asks: a) What is the nature of the teaching authority of the Church?; and b) What is the role of Scripture in relation to the teaching office of the Church? The problem of dogmatic development is identified as a crucial one today (1965) and as being in the forefront of LuCath II's common concerns (pp. 31-32).

2. ARC XI insists that the goal of ecumenical dialogue is "not to produce a statement of minimum essentials by which one Church can measure the orthodoxy of another, but to deepen, strengthen, and enrich the life of both" (p. 445). The statement asserts, as a

fundamental principle, that no formulation of faith can ever adequately express the mystery of God. Because of the transcendence of God, we can speak of God only in symbolic ways and these will always bear the "stamp of particularity." This applies even to the early councils on the doctrines of the Trinity and Christ. Significantly, this point is not mentioned in LuCath II's "Summary Statement" on these very dogmas.

Such an approach to dogmatic formulations leads to a major practical conclusion: namely, the recognition "that Christians who are orthodox in their faith may express it in varying formulations" (p. 446).

ARC XI rejoices in how much the two communions share already: Sacred Scripture, the credal formulations of the ancient Church, and a substantial body of intellectual and spiritual traditions. "Some other doctrinal formulations," the statement suggests, "are generally seen as obstacles to full communion" (p. 446). Although there is no specific indication of what these might be, the context indicates that these are post-Reformation formulations.

ARC XI provides six methodological principles for addressing the problem of doctrinal and dogmatic disagreement:

1. *Paradoxical Tension*: We must recognize the peculiar ambiguity in theological and dogmatic statements (e.g., the Bible is—is not—the Word of God). Such ambiguity springs from the inherent tension between God's self-disclosure and man's capacity for understanding.

2. *Contextual Transfer*: We must appreciate the cultural context of each doctrinal formulation and be prepared to find a new language and even new concepts to express the same truth.

3. *Relative Emphasis*: Not all doctrinal statements are equally important and some are regarded today as much less important than they were regarded at the time of formulation.

4. *Doctrinal Pluralism*: Within a single church one and the same formula often receives different theological interpretations. The same situation of divergence often occurs between one church and another. It is possible to support a variety of theological expressions among different groups of Christians.

5. *Empathetic Evaluation*: Each church should seek to praise

the dogmatic formulations of the other. One should not condemn all that one would not personally wish to say.

6. *Responsive Listening*: Each church should listen to the criticisms of its own formulations and consider the possibility of improving them in order to remove the occasion for offense.

C. EVALUATION

We know that if the LuCath II dialogue were held today, seven years later, the participants would surely be able to advance considerably beyond the general, schematic remarks of its "Summary Statement." There is by now a substantial amount of theological literature on the questions raised by LuCath II. The methodological statement of ARC XI has evidently profited from some of that discussion.

ARC XI, indeed, is the only document of a bilateral group which clearly specifies and recommends a method for achieving doctrinal agreement. Undoubtedly, it would have been unrealistic to have expected a statement of this kind early in the history of the bilateral conversations. The concern for method in any field usually follows direct involvement in the discussion of the substantive questions of the field itself. Perhaps it is a sign of the coming of age of these ecumenical dialogues that one of the major groups should at this time have turned its attention to this important area, however inchoatively.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

ARC XI, in the opinion of this Committee, provides a helpful guide for theological writing and religious education in the several churches. We would hope that each of the six principles mentioned in that consensus statement would receive more emphasis in the Catholic Church, particularly in the public remarks of various bishops and diocesan officials and in the lectures, teaching, and writing of theologians and other educators.

We recommend that:

1. The principles enunciated in ARC XI be simplified and expanded upon for presentation at every level of church life: clergy

conferences, episcopal seminars, theological institutes for religious communities, conventions, and popular writing and lecturing.

2. The theological discussion of such problems as dogmatic development and magisterium not be treated as a philosophical problem alone, but that they should be considered in the context of a doctrine and theology of the Church (e.g., how does one speak, after all, of the papal and episcopal magisterium apart from the notion of collegiality?).

3. Additional questions having a bearing on method be placed on the agenda for future discussion; namely, a) biblical inspiration and the continuation of the teaching charisms in the post-biblical Church, b) the infallibility and/or indefectibility of the Church, c) the infallibility of the pope, d) the distinctive teaching ministry of the bishops, corporately and individually, and especially e) the meaning of apostolic succession. The last of these issues seems to us to be the decisive ecumenical question for our day and, in lieu of its resolution, we shall not soon come to agreement on such practical matters as intercommunion and the mutual recognition of ministries.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

This Study Committee is convinced that the bilateral conversations have already been of great service in the revitalization of all the communions involved. They have helped to overcome prejudices, to establish friendship and trust, to suggest realistic ecumenical goals, and to prompt a healthy reexamination of the doctrinal positions that have become habitual in the various confessional traditions. The consensus statements studied in this report attest to important convergences in traditionally disputed areas, notably the doctrine of the ministry and of the Eucharist. Without wishing to neglect other important achievements, we hail these results with particular satisfaction.

We take this occasion to express our gratification at the imaginative leadership that prompted the BCEIA, in pursuance of the mandate contained in the Decree on Ecumenism (arts. 4 and 22), to establish the bilateral consultations from the Roman Catholic side. The NCCB is also to be thanked for the continued support it has

given to these consultations. It is essential, in our opinion, that these consultations be continued in order that the good fruits of the dialogues thus far, and their promise for the future, not be lost. The international consultations, indispensable as they are, cannot take the place of conversations at the national level. In the words of Cardinal Jan Willebrands, "Dialogue on the world level, inevitably tempted to great abstractions, is balanced by national and regional dialogue" (*A/RC-Doc*, p. 37).

The most productive conversations thus far would seem to have been LuCath, PresCath, and ARC, each of which has published a series of important consensus statements. Notwithstanding some shortcomings, such as those alluded to in the body of this report, LuCath is in many ways the most exemplary of the consultations. We single out for special praise: a) the high theological caliber of the contributions, both in the working papers on both sides and in the consensus statements; b) the practice of publishing both theological position papers and consensus statements; c) the practice of mentioning in consensus statements both the points of agreement and those points on which, for one reason or another, full agreement has not yet been reached; d) above all, the orderly continuity of the dialogue, which has progressed systematically from baptism, through Eucharist, to ministry, and, in its present phase, to teaching authority and papacy. In this consultation there has been excellent follow-up of issues raised in early stages of the dialogue.

Praise and gratitude are due to all who have contributed in financial and other ways to the publication, in attractive low-cost volumes, of the LuCath proceedings. We hope that, even at some cost in terms of time, effort, and expense, the high level of accomplishment in these dialogues may be sustained in the future.

We close with two sets of recommendations addressed respectively to the dialogue groups and to the sponsoring agencies with regard to the future conduct of the consultations.

To the dialogue groups:

1. To pursue a systematic plan rather than to jump discontinuously from one topic to another.
2. To keep up regular publication of background papers and consensus statements.

3. To provide sufficient theological argumentation for the positions taken.

4. To mention non-agreements as well as agreements.

5. To make clear recommendations as to the follow-up expected on the part of the churches, whether by way of study or by way of action.

6. To continue to grapple with the crucial questions pertaining to various aspects of ministry. In proper context, this investigation must focus more explicitly on topics such as: a) biblical inspiration and the continuation of the teaching charisms in the post-biblical Church, b) the infallibility and/or indefectibility of the Church, c) the infallibility of the pope, d) the distinctive teaching ministry of the bishops, corporately and individually, and especially e) the meaning of apostolic succession, a problem that underlies many disputes concerning the validity of ministries and eucharistic sharing.

7. Not to attend exclusively to traditionally disputed doctrinal points but courageously to address presently divisive practical issues such as mixed marriage, Christian education, and Church-State issues (including matters such as divorce and abortion laws). Although these subjects have not been ignored, they have not been pursued as thoroughly as some others.

To the sponsoring agencies:

1. To improve dissemination of the results of the consultations. The primary responsibility for publicity should probably be assigned to the ecumenical officers and commissions of the individual denominations and, should it come into being, to the ecumenical board proposed in paragraph 3 below. The responsible agencies of the various churches should take steps to ensure that the clergy and laity are kept informed of the theological developments taking place in the consultations. The dialogues could profitably be presented for study in episcopal seminars (which might well be ecumenical in composition), diocesan clergy conferences (to which clergy of other denominations might appropriately be invited), adult education programs, and popular literature.

2. To follow up the reports of consultations with appropriate formal action by the churches as such. The normal practice thus far

in the Roman Catholic Church has been for the NCCB to receive the reports and forward them to the Papal Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. Beyond this, we urge that the bishops should, as the circumstances may indicate, sponsor further studies, issue doctrinal declarations, or give pastoral directives. In the absence of some implementation of the principles accepted by the bilateral groups, the gap between theological discussion and pastoral practice will widen to the point where the value of further discussion will inevitably be challenged on all sides.

3. To establish an ecumenical board, with Roman Catholic participation, having the following tasks: a) to oversee and coordinate the consultations in the United States with one another, with consultations in other nations, and with the international dialogues; b) to publicize the progress and results of the consultations; c) to keep track of the theological convergences and divergences; d) to sponsor, as occasion requires, trilateral and multilateral conversations, as was done, for instance, in the case of the NCC consultation on the Eucharist mentioned in Chapter 4 of this report.

Consideration might be given to placing the ecumenical board here suggested under the aegis of the Faith and Order Commission of the NCC, provided that such a step would not be unacceptable to those communions which are not now members of Faith and Order.

4. To improve selection of members of the consultation teams. From the Roman Catholic side this might mean: a) a more clearly defined process for the selection of participants in the dialogues; b) involvement of more bishops in the consultations, especially bishops having adequate theological knowledge, pastoral experience, and good ecumenical relations in their dioceses; c) use of agencies such as the CTSA to make recommendations of qualified theologians, whether priests, religious, or lay; d) granting eligibility to any qualified scholar in good standing to serve, even though he be a priest who has been dispensed from the obligation of celibacy. (This recommendation, which corresponds to a resolution of the CTSA adopted on June 16, 1971, is supported by the present committee, except that one member wishes to have his reservations recorded.)

5. To make suitable provision for the preservation and accessibility of records and reports of all bilateral consultations to which

the Roman Catholic Church is not a party. We note with satisfaction that the Faith and Order Commission of the NCC is already collecting such materials and depositing them in a national archives for ecumenical consultations now being set up at the William Adams Brown Ecumenical Library at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. We urge that the BCEIA and other ecumenical agencies and officers give full cooperation to this important project. Such an ecumenical depository will help to prevent unnecessary duplication of effort among the various consultations and will greatly assist future historians in their research.

The preceding recommendations, we believe, are not only sound in principle but also represent directions already being taken by many dialogue groups and sponsoring agencies. For optimum results, however, it will be necessary for Christians of all denominations to sense more keenly the urgency of greater unity in faith, witness, communion, and service to the world. It is especially important that the official leaders of the churches, like the Good Shepherd and the Prince of Pastors, should look upon the unity of the entire flock of Christ as a matter of paramount pastoral concern.

COMMITTEE ON BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS

Avery Dulles, S.J., *Chairman*
Myles M. Bourke
Agnes Cunningham
Maurice C. Duchaine, S.S.
Richard P. McBrien
Austin B. Vaughan