

REV. ADELBERT DENAUX

THE ANGLICAN—ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE  
AND ITS RECEPTION

**Abstract.** Article explores the process of recognition and/or reception of the agreed statements of the Anglican—Roman Catholic dialogue by the Churches involved, namely, the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. By Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, it understands the official dialogue between both communions on an international level, which was entrusted to the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC). Article presents different stages of the dialogue, its place within its mandating churches and its results. The notions of “reception” and “recognition” provide a hermeneutical key to interpret ARCIC influence over both Churches, ecumenical movement and ecumenical theology.

**Key words:** ARCIC, dialogue, reception, recognition, Roman Catholic Church, Anglican Community.

In this paper, we explore the process of recognition and/or reception of the agreed statements of the Anglican Roman Catholic dialogue by the Churches involved, namely, the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. By Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue, we understand the official dialogue between both communions on an international level, which was entrusted to the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC).<sup>1</sup>

---

Rev. Prof. Dr. ADELBERT DENAUX—Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at KU Leuven; address for correspondence—e-mail: adelbert.denaux@theo.kuleuven.be

<sup>1</sup> One can find a collection of all official texts of and about ARCIC I in *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity*, ed. Christopher Hill and Edward J. Yarnold (London: SPCK/CTS, 1994). ARCIC II has issued six documents: (1) *Salvation and the Church: An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, ARCIC II (London: Catholic Truth Society/Church House Publishing, 1987); (2) *The Church as Communion: An*

## RECEPTION AND RE-RECEPTION

With respect to the notion of “reception,” we take as a working hypothesis the description adopted at the Faith and Order meeting in Louvain (1971): “Reception represents the process by which the local churches accept the decision of a council and thereby recognize its authority. This process is a multiplex one and may last for centuries. Even after the formal conclusion of such a process and the canonical reception of a council’s doctrinal formula, usually through a new council, the process of reception continues in some way or other as long as the churches are involved in self-examination on the basis of the question whether a particular council has been received and appropriated properly and with justification. In this sense we can say that in the ecumenical movement the churches find themselves in a process of continuing reception or re-reception of the councils.”<sup>2</sup> As is clear from this description, “reception” is a fundamental reality that qualifies the life of the Church since its inception. It is especially linked to the life of the Church expressing itself in the Councils of its leaders, i.e. bishops. The definitions of Councils have to be ‘received’ by the local churches. This notion is then extended to the ecumenical movement in that its processes are seen as a particular realisation of the broader process of reception taking

---

*Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II* (London: Catholic Truth Society/Church House Publishing, 1991) (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 77 [1991,2], 87–97); (3) *Life in Christ. Morals, Communion and the Church. An Agreed Statement by ARCIC II* (Rome, London, 1994) (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 85 [1994,1], 54–70); (4) *Clarifications of Certain Aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of the First Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Iridis Cassidy, President Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity* (Rome, London, 1994) (= *PCPCU Information Service*, Nr. 87 [1994,4], 237–242); (5) *The Gift of Authority: Authority in the Church III: An Agreed Statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission ARCIC*, published for the Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (London: Catholic Truth Society/Toronto: Anglican Book Centre/New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 1999) (= *PCPCU Information Service*, Nr. 100 [1999/I] 17–29); (6) *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ (An Agreed Statement)* (Harrisburg, PA/London: Morehouse, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> It was the WCC’s New Delhi assembly (1961) which requested Faith and Order to undertake a study on “Councils and the Ecumenical Movement,” the result of which was published as *Councils and the Ecumenical Movement* (World Council Studies, 5) (Geneva: WCC, 1968), esp. 15 ff. See Anton Houtepen, “Reception,” in *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. Nicholas Lossky et al. (Geneva: WCC, <sup>2</sup>2002), 959–960. The quotation is taken from *Documentary History of Faith and Order*, ed. Günther Gassmann (F&O Paper, 159) (Geneva: WCC, 1993, 226–235: “The Council of Chalcedon and Its Significance for the Ecumenical Movement (1971),” esp. 230.

place continuously in the life of the Church of Christ or of the (divided) churches. In fact, the ecumenical movement is given an ecclesial status in that it is assimilated to the dynamic process of reception qualifying the Church as a whole. Ecumenical reception then is not so much an intra-church process of local churches receiving the decisions of their Councils or synods. Rather it is an inter-church process where divided churches enter into a process of receiving each other's traditions of living the apostolic faith, but also of a mutual re-receiving of the doctrinal decisions of the councils of the undivided Church. In an ecumenical context implying the tragedy of separation of Christian churches, the fundamental reality of reception often takes the form of a re-reception. It is not by accident that in ecumenical circles the notion of "re-reception" has been coined and is used frequently.

In its agreed statement *The Gift of Authority* (1998), ARCIC has seen the link between the broader process of reception and the process of re-reception in the context of the search for unity between divided churches. On the one hand, it describes the broader notion of reception as follows: "Apostolic Tradition is a gift of God which must be constantly received anew. By means of it, the Holy Spirit forms, maintains and sustains the communion of the local churches from one generation to the next. The handing on and reception of apostolic Tradition is an act of communion whereby the Spirit unites the local churches of our day with those that preceded them in the one apostolic faith. The process of tradition entails the constant and perpetual reception and communication of the revealed Word of God in many varied circumstances and continually changing times" (GA, 16). As can be seen in this description, the notion of reception is not limited to the formal act of a local church receiving the definitions of a council or synod.<sup>3</sup> Reception (παράλαμψίνω [*paralambanō*]) is related to tradition (παράδιδωμι [*para-didōmi*]). Its object is ultimately the Gospel of Jesus' death and resurrection, as the Apostle Paul already notes in 1 Cor 15,1–2: he transmitted the Gospel to the church of Corinth which he himself had first received and which the Corinthians received in turn. It is this Gospel that is handed on in the Apostolic Tradition and is received in each local church. The reception of conciliar definitions by a local church is the solemn and formal realisation of this broader process of reception.

---

<sup>3</sup> ARCIC is aware of this legal dimension of the process of reception, even when it surprisingly uses the notion of 'recognition': *Authority in the Church I* (1979), par. 17, speaks about the "recognition of conciliar decisions" and remarks that one of the factors contributing to it was their conformation by the principal sees, especially the see of Rome.

On the other hand, the Commission recognises that: “Within the Church the memory of the people of God may be affected or even distorted by human finitude and sin. Even though promised the assistance of the Holy Spirit, the churches from time to time lose sight of aspects of the apostolic Tradition, failing to discern the full vision of the kingdom of God in the light of which we seek to follow Christ. The churches suffer when some element of ecclesial communion has been forgotten, neglected or abused. Fresh recourse to Tradition in a new situation is the means by which God’s revelation in Christ is recalled. This is assisted by the insights of biblical scholars and theologians and the wisdom of holy persons. Thus, there may be a rediscovery of elements that were neglected and a fresh remembrance of the promises of God, leading to renewal of the Church’s. Amen.” There may also be a sifting of what has been received because some of the formulations of the Tradition are seen to be inadequate or even misleading in a new context. This whole process may be termed re-reception” (GA, 25). Understood in this way, the notion of re-reception implies the idea that reception is not a linear process in the life of the church. Reception of the Apostolic Tradition by the church is a never ending process, a continuing dynamism. It needs a constant renewal because of the changes of time and culture, and because of human finitude and sin. It is to the latter situation that GA 25 is mainly pointing. It humbly recognises that the process of reception in the life of churches can go astray, because “some element of ecclesial communion has been forgotten, neglected or abused.” Partial reception of the Apostolic Tradition might impair the communion of a local church or tradition with other local churches of traditions. Hence the need for re-reception, and the usefulness of this notion in an ecumenical context. Where partial or defective reception of the Tradition has led to divisions between Christian churches or traditions, re-reception becomes a means of ending processes of divided reception and turning back to full communion.

#### RECEPTION AND RECOGNITION

In a remarkable study,<sup>4</sup> Gerard Kelly has pointed to the process of “re-cognition,” a notion related to but not identical with that of “reception” and

---

<sup>4</sup> Gerard Kelly, *Recognition. Advancing Ecumenical Thinking* (American University Studies. Series VII. Theology and Religion, 186) (New York a.o.: Peter Lang, 1996). At the basis of this book lies a doctoral dissertation completed under the guidance of Prof. J.M.R. Tillard, Ottawa, 1992.

which commonly precedes the latter. The process of recognition has been an important element in the methodology of the Faith and Order Commission (FOC). Although the word can be found already in documents that pre-date the first World Conference on Faith and Order (1927), the practice of recognition and the reflection on its theological basis has been developed more consciously in the process leading to the Lima document *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*<sup>5</sup> (BEM, 1982), and to the study document *Confessing the One Faith*<sup>6</sup> (1991). The BEM document was sent to the churches in order to initiate a process of recognition, as becomes clear by the four questions put to them:

- “the extent to which your church can recognize in this text the faith of the Church through the ages;
- the consequences your church can draw from this text for its relations and dialogues with other churches, particularly with those churches which also recognize the text as an expression of the apostolic faith;
- the guidance your church can take from this text for its worship, educational, ethical, and spiritual life and witness;
- the suggestions your church can make for the on-going work of Faith and Order as it relates the material of this text on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry to its long-range research project “Toward a Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today.”<sup>7</sup>

The document *Confessing the One Faith* identified the various elements of the process of recognition as follows:

“The process of recognition implies that each church is called to recognize:

- the apostolic faith in its own life and practice;
- the need for repentance (*metanoia*) and renewal as a consequence of seeing where they are not faithful to the apostolic faith;
- other churches as churches where the apostolic faith is proclaimed and professed.”<sup>8</sup>

In the eyes of G. Kelly and his promoter, J.M.R. Tillard, “recognizing is not synonymous with sealing communion, with receiving. It is a matter of moving forward on the basis of understanding rather than will.”<sup>9</sup> Reception in the legal sense, that means a canonical reception where two or more churches

<sup>5</sup> Faith and Order Paper, 111 (Geneva: WCC, 1982).

<sup>6</sup> Faith and Order Paper, 153 (Geneva: WCC, 1991).

<sup>7</sup> *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (see n. 5), x.

<sup>8</sup> *Confessing the One Faith* (see n. 6), 5.

<sup>9</sup> Kelly, *Recognition* (see n. 4), xxv.

ches share full canonical communion, and which would allow for intercommunion, is the final stage of a long process of recognition during which churches reach a degree of communion which allows them to be called “sisters” in the faith. Reception is impossible without a foregoing process of recognition. Mutual recognition between churches is possible even when formal reception of each other as churches is not yet possible.<sup>10</sup>

The first level of recognition in an ecumenical context has to do with the dialectic between a text and an individual church, between agreed statements and the churches mandating their theologians to draft them. Do the churches involved recognise the apostolic truth in the texts proposed to them? Do the churches involved recognise in their own existence the more or less perfect way this truth is lived? The second level of recognition has to do with the dialectic between the churches involved in a dialogue. Recognising both that the apostolic truth is present in the common statement presented to them, and recognising that this apostolic truth is present in their own life and witness up to a certain degree, they are now able to come to a mutual recognition of each other as ‘sister churches.’ In spite of the doctrinal, liturgical, spiritual and ethical differences still present, they recognise that there exists a certain degree of communion in faith between them. This presence of apostolic truth in the other is a challenge for both, the deficiency of apostolic truth in the other forbids full communion.<sup>11</sup>

Only then does a real reception of what the churches have recognised become possible, in which they make the common agreement their own possession and model their life on it. According to J.M. Tillard, such an ecumenical reception implies two key moments: a moment of faith, and a moment of conversion. First it is a “yes” given to the truth which has been recognised: “It is an act of faith, an act of adherence to what is recognized as the authentic expression of what God has revealed. It becomes part of our lives. It may involve a point of doctrine or a prescription which up until now has been excluded, or it may be a matter of harmony with our own and thus the object of communion.”<sup>12</sup> Secondly, it is a moment of conversion in the life of the churches involved: “It is impossible that whoever understands the meaning of the truth of faith, once its presence has been recognized, would not seek to give up anything standing in the way of complete conformity to it. Today this is the difficult challenge which the last decades of the ecume-

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 217–218.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, xxviii, 217–218.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, xxviii.

nical movement present to confessional families. Do they agree to change, even in their traditional Confession of Faith, what the common research of all the churches has revealed as either insufficient or even erroneous? For many, such a conversion often means a radical change which places their identity in jeopardy. ... Nevertheless, if we really want the communion of truth, which authentic unity demands, then it is necessary.”<sup>13</sup> Hence one can understand, even if one does not accept, that churches refuse to recognise the seriousness or the relevance of what has been proposed by the members of the dialogue structures. A common way of avoiding the challenges rising from the proposed consensus texts is taking the confessional point of view or even the confessional formulations as the norm of judging ecumenical agreements.

It seems to us that a distinction between the two notions makes sense, although recognition could be seen as a particular moment or moments within the overall process of reception. Reception has as its object the Gospel, the Apostolic Tradition, more particularly the definitions of Councils expressing the apostolic truth in certain circumstances, as far as this inheritance is received in time and space by the local churches. Recognition, used in an ecumenical context, has as its object a text, more particularly a common statement, in which theologians of two or more churches try to find a common expression of the Gospel and the Apostolic Tradition anew beyond the limits of division, as far as the churches concerned recognise in this text an authentic expression of the apostolic faith. Secondly, recognition has as its object another church, as far as a church recognises that this ‘sister’ church has received anew in its life and doctrine the Apostolic Tradition, be it only partially. The subject of these respective processes of recognition and reception are primarily the churches, even if one can distinguish the different actors playing a role in this process (like theologians, the people of God, the bishops, etc.).

#### ARCIC ON RECOGNITION AND RECEPTION

The members of ARCIC have used both terms ‘recognition’ and ‘(re)reception’ in their statements. However, they do not make such a clear distinction between the terms as the author mentioned above. Although they know about the legal and final meaning of ‘reception’, they commonly use it in a broader

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, xxix.

sense, so that both terms partially overlap. Moreover, the early documents of ARCIC prefer the term ‘recognition’, the later documents the term ‘reception.’”

Already in 1968, the Joint Preparatory Commission recognised that the divergences between Anglicans and Roman Catholics since the sixteenth century have arisen not so much from the substance of the common Christian inheritance<sup>14</sup> as from the separate ways of receiving it (Malta Report, 4). Its members envisaged three stages in overcoming these divergences. The first stage was already reached and had been recognised by the Pope and the Archbishop in their Common Declaration of 1966, although some issues of hermeneutical nature should be clarified (Malta Report, 5–6). Secondly, they “recommend that the second stage in our growing together begin with an official and explicit affirmation of mutual recognition from the highest authorities of each Communion” (Malta Report, 7). From what follows, it would seem that the object of this mutual recognition is precisely this common Christian inheritance.<sup>15</sup> This mutual recognition is but the beginning of this second stage. It should be followed by all kind of common action and collaboration on different levels and in several fields of the life of both churches. Thirdly, “the final stage in our quest for the full, organic unity of our two Communions” (Malta Report, 17) would imply a set of issues and demands which they are not able to envisage yet in detail, such as “fundamental theological and moral issues between us where we need immediately to seek together for reconciling answers” (Malta Report, 17). In view of the fact that the fulfilment of the final aim is far from imminent, the Commission raises the question of “accepting some measure of sacramental intercommunion apart from full visible unity” (Malta Report, 18). The members agree that among the conditions required for such an intermediate step of

---

<sup>14</sup> This common inheritance is described as follows: “We record with great thankfulness our common faith in God our Father, in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit; our common baptism in the one Church of God; our sharing of the holy Scriptures, of the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and the teaching of the Fathers; our common Christian inheritance for many centuries with its living traditions of liturgy, theology, spirituality, Church order, and mission” (Malta Report, 3).

<sup>15</sup> “It would acknowledge that both Communions are at one in the faith that the Church is founded upon the revelation of God the Father, made known to us in the Person and work of Jesus Christ, who is present through the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and his Church, and is the only Mediator between God and Man, the ultimate Authority for all our doctrine. Each accepts the basic truths set forth in the ecumenical Creeds and the common tradition of the ancient Church, although neither Communion is tied to a positive acceptance of all the beliefs and devotional practices of the other” (Malta Report, 7). Paragraph 7 repeats what is said in par. 3 in slightly different wording.



intercommunion “are both a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry” (Malta Report, 19). The latter is particularly difficult because of the traditional judgement of the Roman Catholic Church on the validity of the Anglican Orders. Hence a study is needed on the nature of priesthood and the meaning of the word ‘validity’ in this context. In addition, a theological study should be undertaken on the nature of authority “with particular reference to its bearing on the interpretation of the historic faith to which both our Communion are committed.” Some other matters related to this are mentioned, such as “the unity and indefectibility of the Church and its teaching authority, the Petrine primacy, infallibility, and Mariological definitions.” These are issues where “real or apparent differences between us come to the surface” (Malta Report, 20).

We note that the Malta Report uses the word recognition in connection with two concepts: the common Christian inheritance of the apostolic faith, which both Communion already recognise (Malta Report, 3 and 7), and the ministry, the recognition of which is still to come (Malta Report, 19). Secondly, it speaks each time of “mutual recognition,” thus stressing the reciprocity of the process of recognition in both Communion entering into a dialogue. In one case it is even said that the mutual recognition should come from the highest authorities of both churches. Thirdly, the Malta Report designs a comprehensive programme of mutual recognition and reception, which should finally lead to the “full, organic unity of our two Communion.” It even distinguishes at least three stages in this process, leaving somewhat vague, however, their precise content. And finally, most importantly, it links the theological rapprochement to a practical one. It must be said that the “theological agenda” put forward is focused on doctrinal rather than on moral matters, on *fides* rather than on *mores*. At a distance of almost forty years, the Malta Report can still inspire the Anglican—Roman Catholic dialogue by the depth, the broadness and the balance of its vision. To put it in the words of Mary Tanner: “Certain things do stand out: the strong commitment to the goal of full, organic unity; the intention of moving by steps into clearly marked, and officially sanctioned, new stages of relationship; and the determination to keep theological progress and practical progress together.”<sup>16</sup> It remains to be seen how and to what extent this ambitious pro-

---

<sup>16</sup> Mary Tanner, “The Vision of Malta: A Way for the Future?,” in *AGAPÈ. Études en l'honneur de Mgr Pierre Duprey M. Afr. Evêque Tit. de Thibar* (Analecta Chambesiana, 3; Institut d'études supérieures en théologie orthodoxe), ed. Jean-Marie Roger Tillard (Chambésy-Genève: Centre orthodoxe du Patriarchat Œcuménique, 2000), 153–168, esp. 157.

gramme has been realised, within ARCIC itself, and within the Communion giving it a mandate.

The Final Report of ARCIC I never uses the word ‘reception’ and makes little use of the notion ‘recognition’, commonly in the sense of “mutual recognition of sacraments and ministry” (Preface, 9). It is aware that “agreement on the nature of ministry is prior to the consideration of the mutual recognition of ministries” (Ministry and Ordination, 1973, par. 17). The sequence presupposed here is that ecumenical ‘agreements’ on certain issues, such as ministry, may lead to the mutual ‘recognition’ by the churches of their ministries, and this should finally end up in a mutual ‘reception’ of both Communion. One focus of the Commission has been to come to an agreement on the specific ministry of the Bishop of Rome, because it points “to the possibilities of mutual benefit and reform which should arise from a shared recognition of one universal primacy which does not inhibit conciliarity” (Elucidation on Authority in the Church, 1981, par. 8). In 1990, the members of ARCIC II affirm that a real progress in mutual understanding has been achieved and that there exists a significant degree of doctrinal agreement even upon subjects which preciously divided Anglicans and Roman Catholics: “This new understanding enables them to recognise in each other’s church a true affinity” (Church as Communion, 1990, par. 49). However, they also echo the concern of Pope John Paul II that “the ordination of women to the episcopacy appears to ... effectively block the path to the mutual recognition of ministries” (Church as Communion, 1990, par. 57).

It is in the two last documents of ARCIC II, *The Gift of Authority III* (GA, 1998) and *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ* (Mary, 2005), that the members of ARCIC were becoming fully aware that their study of ‘authority’ and ‘Marian doctrine and devotion’ was in itself an exercise of mutual recognition and reception, and that their use of these notions is more frequent than in previous documents. Sometimes, both terms are used together. This points to the awareness that a sharp distinction is inadequate, but that both recognition and reception are part of one dynamic process, although recognition always precedes reception. The opening sentence of the two famous paragraphs of GA explaining what it means by reception and re-reception (par. 24–25) is an illustration of this: “Throughout the centuries, the Church receives and acknowledges as a gracious gift from God all that it recognises as a true expression of the Tradition which has been once for all delivered to the apostles” (GA, 24). This sentence deals with the Church as a whole. But it is also true for the life within the church: “The bishops, the

clergy and the other faithful must all recognise and receive what is mediated from God through each other. Thus the *sensus fidelium* of the people of God and the ministry of memory exist together in reciprocal relationship” (GA, 30). The following paragraph applies the same combination to the process of rapprochement between divided Christian communities: “When Christian communities are in real but imperfect communion they are called to recognise in each other elements of the apostolic Tradition which they may have rejected, forgotten or not yet fully understood. Consequently, they have to receive or reappropriate these elements, and reconsider the ways in which they have separately interpreted the Scriptures” (GA, 31). This is especially true with respect to what GA calls “a renewed exercise and reception of universal primacy” (GA, 51), or “a re-reception of the exercise of the primacy by the Bishop of Rome” (GA, 62).<sup>17</sup> This particular case of re-reception is situated within the larger “necessity of constant reception of Scripture and Tradition, and of re-reception in particular circumstances” (GA, 52).

Even more, the members of ARCIC are convinced that the agreement they have reached about Mary “is itself a product of a re-reception by Anglicans and Roman Catholics of doctrine about Mary” (Mary, 80) in recent history. Indeed, the developments in both Communion since Vatican II “opened the way for re-reception of the place of Mary in the faith and life of the Church” (Mary, 77). Therefore, the theologians of ARCIC hope “that the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion will recognize a common faith in the agreement concerning Mary which we here offer. Such a re-reception would mean the Marian teaching and devotion within our respective communities, including differences of emphasis, would be seen to be authentic expressions of Christian belief” (Mary, 63). They are aware, however, that there is another condition to be fulfilled before this can happen: “Any such re-reception would have to take place within the context of a mutual re-reception of an effective teaching authority in the Church, such as that set out in *The Gift of Authority*” (Mary, 63). The Mary document thus shows that the Commission considers its own work as part of a process that already is going on in the life of both churches, which made their Common Statement possible. They even consider their agreement as a catalyst justifying their hope that both Communion recognise their common faith in the

---

<sup>17</sup> See on this: Erwin McManus, “The Re-reception of Papal Primacy by ARCIC II,” *One in Christ* 37 (2002), 1: 16–30.

agreement concerning Mary, and finally re-receive it in such a way that there is no ground for division whatsoever in this matter.<sup>18</sup>

TO WHAT EXTENT WAS THE ‘FINAL REPORT’ RECOGNIZED  
OR RECEIVED BY BOTH CHURCHES?

ARCIC I submitted its ‘Final Report’ to the authorities of the Churches from which it had received its mandate. The Commission thought that it had “reached agreement on essential points of Eucharistic doctrine” (Eucharistic Doctrine, Preface), a “consensus” about the nature of ministry, i.e., “on essential matters where it considers that doctrine admits no divergence” (Ministry and Ordination, 1973, par. 17: Conclusion), “a consensus on authority in the Church and, in particular, on the basic principles of primacy” (Authority in the Church I, 1976, Nr. 24), and a certain convergence on the four problems related to primacy which had not yet been solved: the interpretation of the Petrine texts of the New Testament, the meaning of the language of ‘divine right,’ the affirmation of papal infallibility, and the nature of the jurisdiction ascribed to the bishop of Rome as universal primate (Authority in the Church II, 1981, Nr. 1). The members of the Commission expressed the hope that: “The convergence reflected in our Final Report would appear to call for the establishing of a new relationship between our Churches as a next stage in the journey towards Christian unity” (Final Report, Conclusion). The churches were asked to respond two questions, which were in line of the inspiration of the Malta Report: (i) whether the statements were consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans and Roman Catholics, and (ii) whether The Final Report offered a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete steps towards the reconciliation based on agreement in faith.<sup>19</sup> The official response from both Communion did indeed come, even from the highest level, which in fact is exceptional when one looks at how rarely other dialogues have been recognised by the highest authorities of the churches involved. As to bilateral dialogues in which the Roman Catholic Church is involved, the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification by the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church (1999) is another such example.

---

<sup>18</sup> See also Paolo Gamberini, “Maria e la ‘ri-recezione’ ecumenical: un accordo tra cattolici e anglicani,” *La Civiltà cattolica* 156, 3738 (2005): 113–127.

<sup>19</sup> I didn’t find direct evidence for this, but I refer for these two questions to Mary Tanner, *The vision of Malta: A Way for the Future?* [n. 16], 162.

In preparation for the 1988 Lambeth Conference the Anglican Consultative Council sent copies to each Province and asked for their opinion about the Final Report. The answers of 19 of the 29 Provincial Synods were summarized and discussed in the Emmaus Report (1987).<sup>20</sup> The 1988 Lambeth Conference (Resolution 8) issued a twofold assessment of the documents. On the one hand it stated that it “recognises the Agreed Statements of ARCIC I on Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and their Elucidations, as consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans and believes that this agreement offers a sufficient basis for taking the next step forward towards the reconciliation of our Churches.” However, what the next step might be was not made explicit. With respect to Authority in the Church (I and II), together with the Elucidation, the Conference did not go so far. It agreed to welcome these documents “as a firm basis for the direction and agenda of the continuing dialogue on authority,” but an analysis of the content of the Statements on authority was not given.<sup>21</sup>

In the Roman Catholic Church the Report was sent by Card. Willebrands, President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, to all Episcopal Conferences to ask for their evaluation. Some responses were published afterwards, namely, those of the United States, England and Wales, and France.<sup>22</sup> It is not known how many Episcopal Conferences finally sent a response. However, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith was quick to publish its Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC I and to send them to the Chairmen of the Episcopal Conferences and to the patriarchal Synods of the Eastern rites “in a spirit of contribution to the dialogue and in order that the faithful

---

<sup>20</sup> *Emmaus Report* (London: ACC/Church House Publishing, 1987).

<sup>21</sup> *The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988: The Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops* (London: ACC/Church House Publishing, 1988), 210–212, esp. 211; Resolution 8.3: “Welcomes *Authority in the Church (I and II)* together with the *Elucidation*, as a firm basis for the direction and agenda of the continuing dialogue on authority and wishes to encourage ARCIC II to continue to explore the basis in Scripture and Tradition of the concept of a universal primacy, in conjunction with collegiality, as an instrument of unity, the character of such a primacy in practice, and to draw upon the experience of other Christian Churches in exercising primacy, collegiality and conciliarity” (= Hill & Yarnold, *Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1], p. 153).

<sup>22</sup> Bishop’s Conference of England and Wales, *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1985) (= *The Tablet*, 11 May 1985, 491–495; Hill & Yarnold, *Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1], 94–110); U.S.A. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, “Evaluation of the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission,” *One in Christ* 21 (1985):320–329; La Conférence Épiscopale Française, “Évaluation du Rapport final de l’ARCIC,” *La Documentation Catholique* 67 (1985): 867–876.

would more easily appreciate the Final Report of ARCIC in the light of the fundamental principles of the Catholic doctrine.”<sup>23</sup> The official response of the Roman Catholic Church (Catholic Response to the Final Report) finally appeared in 1991.<sup>24</sup> In general the Catholic Response gave “a warm welcome to the Final Report” and called it “a significant milestone not only in relations between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion but in the ecumenical movement as a whole.” It expressed its gratitude for the achievement of points of convergence and even of agreement. It judged, however, that it was not yet possible to state that a substantial agreement was reached regarding the Eucharistic Doctrine and the Ordained Ministry, nor that the Statements on these matters correspond fully to the Catholic doctrine. For this reason, the Response asked for further clarifications on several points.

With respect to the two Agreed Statements on Authority in the Church, the Catholic Response recognises that, even if no substantial agreement has been reached, but only a certain convergence, there is nevertheless encouraging

---

<sup>23</sup> This document was dated 29th March 1982 and published in *Osservatore Romano* in English on 6th May 1982 (= Hill & Yarnold, *Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1], 79–91: *Observations of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the Final Report of ARCIC I [1982]*). On 30th October 1982, in the Campo Santo Teutonico at Rome, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, delivered a lecture entitled: “Probleme und Hoffnungen des anglikanischen-katholischen Dialogs,” published in *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 12 (1983): 244–259 (English translation: “Anglican-Catholic Dialogue—Its Problems and Hopes,” in Hill & Yarnold, *Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1], 251–282). Cardinal Ratzinger mentions the shock felt by some at the hasty reaction by an official organ of the teaching authority of the Pope. He explains that this merely shows that ARCIC I had not taken sufficient account of the concrete ways authority is exercised in the two communions (*Ibid.*, 252–253).

<sup>24</sup> “Riposta cattolica al ‘Rapporto Finale’ della prima commissione mista internazionale tra la Chiesa cattolica et la Comunione anglicane (ARCIC-I) (1971–1981),” *L’Osservatore Romano*, 6 Dec. 1991: 10; English translation: “Catholic Response to ARCIC-I,” *L’Osservatore Romano: Weekly Edition in English*, 16 Dec. 1991: 21–22; cf. *Response of the Holy See to the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, 1982: with a Statement from the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales* (London: CTS Publications, 1991 (= Hill & Yarnold, *Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1], 156–166). We refer to the edition of Hill and Yarnold which, in contrast to the original publication, is numbered. C. Hill and E. Yarnold (*Anglicans and Roman Catholics* [n. 1]) collect the most important reactions from official bodies (the Roman Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the French Roman Catholic Episcopal Commission for Christian Unity, and the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation in the United States), from members of ARCIC (H. Chadwick, C. Hill, and E. Yarnold), and from experts (F. Sullivan, J. Vercauteren, and J. McHugh). A critique that was frequently heard was that the *Catholic Response*, in comparing the ARCIC expressions of faith more with the formulations than with the content of Catholic faith, did not do sufficient justice to the ecumenical method of ARCIC, which has always tried to express the common faith in formulations which go beyond the times of division.

progress on certain points.<sup>25</sup> Despite all this, there are still other areas that are essential to Catholic doctrine on which complete agreement or even, at times, convergence has eluded the Commission (Catholic Response, 9–10), and where the Statements of ARCIC I are not consistent with Catholic faith. They concern more specifically the nature of the primacy of the bishop of Rome and the infallibility of his Teaching Office (Catholic Response, 11–12, 14). The Catholic Response focuses on four points: Firstly, there is the question of the relationship between the Teaching Office of the Church and the assent or reception of the faithful.<sup>26</sup> Secondly, the Catholic Church has difficulties with the assertion of the Final Report that the scope of doctrinal definitions by the Councils which are free from error, is limited to ‘fundamental doctrines’ or ‘central truths of salvation.’<sup>27</sup> A third difficulty concerns the view of ARCIC I as to the measure in which the *communio* with the See of Rome affects the “ecclesial” status of a Christian community.<sup>28</sup> Finally, the manner in which ARCIC I speaks of the role of Peter among the twelve (Authority II, 3 and 5), does not express the fullness of the Catholic faith, as it is defined by the First Vatican Council, namely, that the bishop of Rome inherits the primacy from Peter who received it ‘immediately and directly’ from Christ (DS 3055; cf. LG, 22), and from which it becomes clear that the primacy of the bishop of Rome belongs to the divine structure of the Church.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> More specifically the Catholic Response underlines the fact that Anglicans recognise that a “primacy of the Bishop of Rome is not contrary to the New Testament, and is part of God’s purpose regarding the Church’s unity and catholicity” (Authority II, 7). If this is taken with the statement made by His Grace Archbishop Runcie during his visit to Pope John Paul II in 1989 (cf. *PCPCU Information Service* n° 71 [1989, III-IV] 111–123, esp. 118) and the reference to infallibility in *Authority II*, then one can rejoice in the fact that centuries of antagonism have given way to a reasoned dialogue and theological reflection undertaken together (*Catholic Response*, 9).

<sup>26</sup> “For the Catholic Church, the certain knowledge of any defined truth is not guaranteed by the reception of the faithful that such is in conformity with Scripture and Tradition, but by the authoritative definition itself on the part of the authentic teachers” (*Catholic Response*, 15).

<sup>27</sup> “The Catholic Church believes that the Councils or the Pope, even when acting alone, are able to teach, if necessary in a definitive way, within the range of *all* truth revealed by God” (*Catholic Response*, 16).

<sup>28</sup> “It is the teaching of the Second Vatican Council that a church not in communion with the Roman Pontiff lacks more than just the visible manifestation of unity with the Church of Christ which subsists in the Roman Catholic Church” (*Catholic Response*, 17).

<sup>29</sup> From a Catholic viewpoint, it is not possible then to accept the interpretation given by ARCIC I, that the divine institution of the primacy does not include “that the universal primacy as a permanent institution was directly founded by Jesus during his life on earth” (*Authority II*, 11). “The Catholic Church sees rather in the primacy of the successors of Peter something positively intended by God and deriving from the will and institution of Jesus Christ” (*Catholic Response*, 18).

This survey of the two high level official responses shows that both Communion could only partially recognise their own faith in the agreements of ARCIC I.<sup>30</sup> The most obvious reservations are expressed with respect to the issue of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome and of authority. In addition, it shows that they only gave a response to the first question put to them, but remained silent about the second question. Mary Tanner rightly complains: “In neither official response was the second question given serious attention. So, the Malta vision of keeping faith and life together, and the warning that unless they were, the theological work would remain the preserve of the theologians, went unheard.”<sup>31</sup> And yet, she remarks, many of the responses of Anglican Provinces and those from the Episcopal Conferences that were published<sup>32</sup> gave due attention to the second question and contained valuable suggestions in that respect.<sup>33</sup> But their remarks were not integrated into the official responses on the highest level.

In a common declaration issued by Pope John Paul II and Dr. R. Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury, on the occasion of the visit of the Pope to the Church of England (May 1982), both Church leaders communicated their decision to start up a new International Commission. The task of the new Commission (ARCIC II) would be to continue the work already begun: “to examine, especially in the light of our respective judgments on the Final Report, the outstanding doctrinal differences which still separate us, with a view towards their eventual resolution; to study all that hinders the mutual recognition of the ministries of our Communion; and to recommend what practical steps will be necessary when, on the basis of our unity in faith, we are able to proceed to the restoration of full communion.”<sup>34</sup> Remarkably, this common declaration seems to be aware of the necessity of both theological study of the still remaining doctrinal differences and the practical steps that are to be taken on the way to come to full communion.

---

<sup>30</sup> See also Catherine E. Clifford, “Reception of the Final Report,” *One in Christ* 32 (1996), 2:106–117.

<sup>31</sup> Tanner, *The vision of Malta* [n. 16], 163.

<sup>32</sup> See note 22.

<sup>33</sup> See Tanner, *The vision of Malta* [n. 16], 163–164.

<sup>34</sup> “Common Declaration of Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury (May 29th 1982),” *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 49 (1982, II/III): 46–47, esp. 47.



---

THE WORK OF ARCIC II  
A CONTRIBUTION TO MUTUAL RECEPTION

Looking back on the process from today, it is clear that the process of reception did not reach its “final” stage with the work of ARCIC I – the title “Final Report” did come much too early—nor is this process the responsibility of only one body within the churches concerned. The work of ARCIC has been succeeded and completed by that of ARCIC II. The second Commission has published five agreed statements: *Salvation and the Church* (1987), *The Church as Communion* (1991), *Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church* (1994), *The Gift of Authority: Authority in the Church III* (1999), and *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ* (2005). In publishing the statement on Mary, the Commission has completed all theological subjects set out by the Joint Preparatory Commission in 1968. In each of the five official publications mention is made of the status of the document in this or similar wording: “The document published here is the work of the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC II). It is simply a joint statement of the Commission. The authorities who appointed the Commission have allowed the statement to be published so that it may be discussed and improved by the suggestions received. It is not an authoritative declaration by the Roman Catholic Church or by the Anglican Communion, who will evaluate the document in order to take a position on it in due time.” That means that the authority of the agreed statements is limited – it is not an authoritative declaration of the Churches itself, but that their content is open to discussion, improvement, and to evaluation of the church authorities. The two Communion have not yet given a global official evaluation of the documents of ARCIC II.<sup>35</sup> However, the process of reception of the ARCIC documents is a responsibility of the churches at large and on different levels. The ARCIC statements have received due at-

---

<sup>35</sup> See however, Resolution 8,5 of the Lambeth Conference 1988, which warmly welcomes *Salvation and the Church* (1987) “as a timely and significant contribution to the understanding of the Churches’ doctrine of salvation and commends this Agreed Statement about the heart of Christian faith to the Provinces for study and reflection.” Resolution IV,23 (d) of the Lambeth Conference 1998 “encourages the referral of *Salvation and the Church* (1987), *The Church as Communion* (1991), *Life in Christ* (1994), and the anticipated completion of ARCIC’s work on authority in the Church to the provinces for study and response back to the proposed Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations and (through the Primates’ Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council) to the next Lambeth Conference.” The (Vatican) Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published its *Observations on Salvation and the Church* in 1987.

tention in circles of scholarly theologians and in national ARCs.<sup>36</sup> This growth of agreement in faith has also stimulated attempts to grow in lived relations, especially in those countries where national ARCs were established.

In addition, ARCIC II has published a document of a special nature: *Clarifications of Certain Aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry* (1994). It is a response of ARCIC to the request of the Catholic Church's Response for greater clarification of certain aspects of the Agreed Statement on Eucharist and Ministry. The text was published together with an assessment in a letter from Cardinal Cassidy addressed to the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC. The Cardinal says that ARCIC's clarifications have "indeed thrown new light on the questions," so that "the agreement reached on Eucharist and Ministry by ARCIC I is thus greatly strengthened and no further study would be required at this stage." In the Statement introducing the Clarifications the Co-Chairmen observe that "These clarifications and the Cardinal's letter constitute a very important element in the reception of ARCIC's agreements on Eucharist and the understanding of Ministry," even while acknowledging that "there remains a serious disagreement between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion about the ordination of women to the priesthood."<sup>37</sup> And they continue: "It is our hope that this positive step on the road of reception will assist both communions to recognise that what ARCIC has stated and now clarified does indeed represent agreement about our respective faith and practice."

One Agreed Statement of ARCIC II needs special attention, *Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church* (1994). The very existence of this document shows that, even if the theological dialogue carried out by ARCIC I and II has been principally concerned with doctrinal issues, it has also dealt with moral matters. It is the first international dialogue to have

---

<sup>36</sup> National Anglican—Roman Catholic dialogues (ARCs) have been established in Australia, Belgium, Canada, Great Britain, France, and the United States of America. See Adelbert Denaux & Lorelei Fuchs, "ARCIC Bibliography 1966–1996," in *From Malines to ARCIC. The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, ed. Adelbert Denaux & John A. Dick, (BETL, 130) (Leuven: University Press–Peeters, 1997), 193–307; and the Supplements to "A Bibliography of Interchurch and Interconfessional Theological Dialogues" in the *Semi-annual Bulletin* in the Centro pro Unione in Rome. See also *Common Witness to the Gospel. Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations 1983–1995*, ed. Jeffrey Gros, Rozanne Elder, Ellen K. Wondra (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1997).

<sup>37</sup> See on this issue also: Matthieu Wagemaker, *Two Trains Running: The Reception of the Understanding of Authority by ARCIC I Related to the Debates on the Ordination of Women* (European University Studies. Series 23. Theology, 676) (Bern, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin: Peter Lang, 1999).

directly attempted the subject of morals. It reflects the conviction “that authentic Christian unity is as much a matter of life as of faith. Those who share one faith in Christ will share one life in Christ” (Life in Christ, Preface). Although there is a widespread belief that Anglicans and Roman Catholics are more divided on questions of morals than on questions of doctrine, the Commission was persuaded that, despite existing disagreements on certain specific moral issues, both Communion “derive from Scriptures and Tradition the same controlling vision of the nature and destiny of humanity and share the same fundamental moral values” (Life in Christ, par. 1). At the end it even came with a special recommendation to strengthen the process of reception in this field. It proposed “that steps should be taken to establish further instruments of co-operation between our two Communion at all levels of church life (especially national and regional), to engage with the serious moral issues confronting humanity today” (Life in Christ, par. 103). One of the reasons for which the proposal was made had to do with the process of reception: “Working together on moral issues would be a practical way of expressing the communion we already enjoy, of moving towards full communion, and of understanding more clearly what it entails” (Life in Christ, par. 104).

Recent developments, however, have shown that the Commission had a rather too optimistic view on the whole process and have called into question the extent to which both communion in fact share a common moral vision. In 2003, a priest in an active homosexual relationship was consecrated a bishop in the diocese of New Hampshire, the consecration being endorsed by of Episcopal Church of the United States. Furthermore, a public rite of blessing for same-sex unions was adopted in the Canadian Anglican Diocese of New Westminster. The issues raised by these decisions were not only a challenge for the Anglican Communion itself, but also endangered its relationship with the Roman Catholic Church. On the recommendation of the Primates’ meeting of October 2003, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Rowan Williams, set up a commission, called the Lambeth Commission, which gave practical recommendations on how to deal with this issue.<sup>38</sup> After having set up the commission, Archbishop Williams invited the president of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Cardinal W. Kasper, to establish a sub-commission to assist the Anglican discernment process. The sub-commission would offer a reflection on the ecclesiological

---

<sup>38</sup> See the official website of the Anglican communion about the ‘Windsor Process’: <http://www.aco.org/commission/index.cfm>

implications of the situation in the Anglican Communion with respect to the work of ARCIC. The fact of the existence of the sub-commission is a significant example of the on-going reception process of the agreed ARCIC statements within the Anglican Communion. It is at the same time a sign of how much both communions have grown together seeing how the Anglican Communion did not want to solve its internal problems without first consulting its Roman Catholic sister Church. The IARCCUM sub-commission published its report in June, 2004: *Ecclesiological Reflections on the Current Situation in the Anglican Communion in the light of ARCIC*.<sup>39</sup> It argued that the decisions of the Episcopal Church USA and the Diocese of New Westminster call into question significant portions of ARCIC's agreed statements on morals, but especially on authority and ecclesiology, such as "the nature of ecclesial communion; the mutual interdependence of churches; the role of Episcopal and collegial authority in maintaining the unity of the communion; the process of discernment in the communion of the Church, and the decisive role of Scripture and Tradition therein" (par. 44). The report entails a serious warning against the shibboleth of (provincial) autonomy, which would impair the principle of interdependence as an essential dimension of ecclesial communion.<sup>40</sup>

The IARCCUM sub-commission report was but one of the many sub-commissions to the Lambeth Commission. However, it obviously had a considerable influence on The Windsor Report that was published by the Lambeth Commission in October, 2004. The Windsor Report clearly criticised the decisions taken by the ECUSA and the Diocese of New Westminster. It also made two important proposals to tighten the bonds of communion within

---

<sup>39</sup> See the text in [http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/iarccum/doc/e\\_iarccum\\_2004.html](http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/iarccum/doc/e_iarccum_2004.html). The Anglican members of the Ecclesiological Sub-Commission of IARCCUM were: The Rt Revd David Beetge (Anglican Co-Chair of IARCCUM), The Rt Revd John Baycroft (consultor of IARCCUM, member of ARCIC), Dr Mary Tanner (member of IARCCUM, former member of ARCIC), The Revd Canon Gregory Cameron (Anglican Co-Secretary of IARCCUM and ARCIC, *ex officio*). The Roman Catholic members of the Ecclesiological Sub-Commission of IARCCUM were: The Revd Peter Cross (member of IARCCUM and ARCIC); The Revd Dr Paul McPartlan (consultor of IARCCUM); The Revd Liam Walsh, OP (member of ARCIC); The Revd Canon Donald Bolen (Roman Catholic Co-Secretary of IARCCUM and ARCIC, *ex officio*).

<sup>40</sup> "If Anglican dioceses or provinces were to embrace the notion of a 'local option' for important decisions about the teaching of the Church in matters of faith and morals, and if bonds of communion were weakened in the direction of a federation of autonomous provinces rather than a relationship of mutual responsibility and interdependence, then our consensus on the ecclesiology of communion would be seriously undermined, and perhaps irreparably damaged. A federal arrangement cannot adequately express the profound link between the visible gathering of God's people and its life giving source, and is a pale shadow of a proper ecclesiology of communion" (par. 46).

Anglicanism: one was to strengthen the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the authority of the Anglican primates, another was the establishment of an “Anglican Covenant” to be adopted by Anglican provinces, making “explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between the churches of the Communion” (par. 118). At present, a Windsor Report reception process is going on. It is noteworthy that the Anglican Communion has also invited its ecumenical partners to take part in this process. The questions being offered to the ecumenical partners by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Secretary General of the Anglican Communion are: (i) What do you find helpful in the Windsor Report 2004? (ii) What questions does the report raise from the perspective of your church? (iii) If the recommendations of the Windsor Report were implemented, how would this affect your church's relationship with the Anglican Communion as an ecumenical partner? Since then, the Anglican Covenant Project has moved forward in different stages and has resulted in a final Document The Anglican Communion Covenant (Dec. 2009). This document was sent for formal consideration to the provinces of the Anglican Communion for adoption by each province through the appropriate processes.<sup>41</sup> The responses of the provinces to the proposal are not yet substantial enough to see whether the proposal will be generally accepted or not: by July 2012 only nine provinces had responded, one of which was negative!<sup>42</sup> Recently, even the Church of England has voted to reject the proposed text.

As a result of the difficulties that have arisen within the Anglican Communion, if the proposals of the Windsor Report would be accepted, it would be an encouraging step forward in the reception of ARCIC's communion ecclesiology in the life of the Anglican Communion. However, it is not sure whether this will happen, since the Anglican Communion Covenant, “has been widely criticised as too authoritarian and ‘un-Anglican’.”<sup>43</sup> Moreover, the reasons for internal dissent within the Anglican Communion are still there: in recent years other Episcopal ordinations of active homosexuals have taken place and the Church of England has moved towards ordaining women bishops. This seriously affects ecumenical relations with the Catholic Church.

---

<sup>41</sup> See <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm> (access 24–06–2013).

<sup>42</sup> See <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/responses/index.cfm> (access 24–06–2013).

<sup>43</sup> Mark Langham, “New Fruits of dialogue of Catholics with Anglicans and Methodists amid difficulties,” *L'Osservatore Romano* (English version) 24–06–2013.

Looking back on the work of ARCIC I and II until now, one can see that the Commission has intensively struggled with the issue of authority and has published three agreed statements about this subject. It seems that its intuition was right. Even when the current crisis within the Anglican Communion is of a moral nature, it is as much an ecclesiological crisis, the core question being: what kind of authority structure is needed to discern the will of God for the whole Church and to maintain the unity of the Body of Christ?

#### FROM ARCIC II TO IARCCUM

In a 2000 contribution to the volume in honour of Bishop Pierre Duprey, the former Secretary of the Council for Promoting Christian Unity, entitled *The Vision of Malta: A Way for the Future*, Dr Mary Tanner pointed to the contrast between the enormous achievement of the work of ARCIC I and ARCIC II in reaching a theological convergence on the one hand, and the almost complete lack of convergence in life on the other.<sup>44</sup> This observation does not mean, however, that the members of ARCIC I themselves have given up the comprehensive view of Malta. The conclusion of the Final Report clearly asserts that “this dialogue, however, has been directed not merely to the achievement of doctrinal agreement, which is central to our reconciliation, but to the far greater goal of organic unity. The convergence reflected in our Final Report would appear to call for the establishing of a new relationship between our Churches as a next stage in the journey towards Christian unity.” It was rather the official responses of the churches which focused on the theological agreements reached while overlooking the practical implications suggested by the Commission. As to ARCIC II, we have already mentioned the particular concern of Life in Christ to work together on moral issues as a practical way of expressing the communion both Churches already enjoy (par. 104). In a similar way, Gift of Authority suggests that “for the sake of koinonia and a united Christian witness to the world, Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops should find ways of cooperating and developing relationships of mutual accountability in their exercise of oversight” (par. 58). Several interesting possibilities are suggested to put it into practice (par. 59). The most challenging suggestion being that, because of the agreement reached on universal primacy, it should be considered as a gift

---

<sup>44</sup> See note 16.

to be shared, and “that such a primacy could be offered and received even before our churches are in full communion” (par. 60)!

Nevertheless, Mary Tanner was right in making a plea for a more significant step on the way to full organic unity between both Communion. She suggested that the two Churches draft a Common Declaration which “would provide an opportunity to receive some of the convergences reached in the dialogue, and to use them as a foundation for a new and committed relationship.” It would set out the considerable agreement in faith that has been worked out over the past decennia and how we understand today the goal of visible unity. Such a recognition could lead the two churches to make binding commitments about concrete practical steps consonant with the degree of agreement in faith that has been reached.<sup>45</sup>

It is probably not by accident that in the same year as M. Tanner’s contribution, a major event took place when Anglican and Roman Catholic senior bishops from 13 countries, convened by Cardinal Edward Cassidy and Archbishop George Carey, gathered at Mississauga (near Toronto), Canada, from 14–20 May 2000. In their Statement, *Communion in Mission*, while reviewing the results of ARCIC, they came to appreciate the very impressive degree of agreement in faith that already exists, which alerted them to the serious obligation to intensify the process of reception of those agreements at the local level. They have become conscious that both Communion have embraced not only a new era of friendship and co-operation, but a new stage of ‘evangelical koinonia’, that is a communion of joint commitment to our common mission in the world. They “believe that now is the appropriate time for the authorities of our two Communion to recognise and endorse this new stage through the signing of a Joint Declaration of Agreement. This Agreement would set out: our shared goal of visible unity; an acknowledgement of the consensus in faith that we have reached, and a fresh commitment to share together in common life and witness” (par. 10). This proposal would finally implement the beginning of the second stage envisaged by the Malta Report in 1968. The bishops also drafted an action plan to implement their intentions. The first recommendation of this action plan was that a high level working group be established, which would focus on the agreements of

---

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Tanner, *The vision of Malta* [n. 16], 165–168. She thinks of: commitments to regular joint meetings of bishops, Anglican bishops accompanying Roman Catholic bishops on Ad Limina visits to the Holy See, intensification of shared theological education, joint statements on matters of social and political concern, recognising the possibilities of interchurch families, serving local communities, exchanging pulpits, building joint schools, etc.

ARCIC to draw out how they compel both Communion towards joint witness and mission in the world. This new working group mainly consists of bishops.<sup>46</sup> Known as the “International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission” (IARCCUM), it has been working from 2001 on. One sub-group of the Commission was to prepare a draft of a common declaration. A second sub-group would prepare practical recommendations for the next steps in the on-going process of ecumenical reception. The third sub-group would focus on visible and practical outcomes of spiritual communion with proposals for pastoral and practical strategies to help the two communions to do together whatever is possible in the present stage of real but imperfect communion. The work of the commission has been interrupted by the difficulties in which the Anglican Communion has entered in 2003 and that were mentioned before. As was said, a sub-commission ad hoc has drafted Ecclesiological Reflections on the Current Situation in the Anglican Communion in the light of ARCIC (2004).

In 2007, IARCCUM has published its first Agreed Statement, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission. Building on 40 years of Anglican—Roman Catholic Dialogue*. The members of IARCCUM admit that in the present context of internal dispute within the Anglican Communion, which adds to existing differences between the two Communion, “it is not the appropriate time to enter the new formal stage of relationship envisaged by the bishops at Mississauga” (par. 7), and indeed, already by the Malta Report.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, they want to seek to do what is possible in the present context: “to bridge the gap between the elements of faith we hold in common and the tangible expression of that shared belief in our ecclesial lives” (par. 10). This intention explains the two parts of the agreed statement. Part One surveys “The Achievements of the Anglican—Roman Catholic Theological Dialogue.” On the basis of the common heritage and of the agreements

---

<sup>46</sup> The Anglican members of IARCCUM are: Bishop David Beetge (South Africa, Co-Chairman), Archbishop Peter Carnley (Australia), Bishop Edwin Gulick (USA), Archbishop Peter Kwong (Hong Kong), Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali (England, also member of ARCIC), Dr Mary Tanner (England), The Revd Canon Jonathan Gough (Archbishop of Canterbury’s Office), The Revd Canon David Hamid (Anglican Communion Office, Co-Secretary). The Roman Catholic members are: Archbishop John Bathurst (Australia, Co-Chairman), Archbishop Alexander Brunett (USA, also Co-Chairman of ARCIC), Bishop Anthony Farquhar (Ireland), Bishop Crispian Hollis (England), Bishop Lucius Ugorji (Nigeria), The Revd Dr Peter Cross (Australia), Sr Dr Donna Geernaert (Canada), The Revd Don Bolen (PCPCU, Co-Secretary).

<sup>47</sup> See Mary Tanner, “Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations. A New Step to be Taken, A New Stage to be Reached,” *Centro pro Unione semi-annual Bulletin* Nr. 65 (Spring 2004): 14–19.



reached by ARCIC, it describes the faith we hold in common in nine sections: (1) Belief in God as Trinity; (2) Church as Communion in Mission; (3) The Living Word of God; (4) Baptism; (5) Eucharist; (6) Ministry; (7) Authority in the Church; (8) Discipleship and Holiness; (9) The Blessed Virgin Mary. At the end of this section, “The Commission gratefully acknowledges that the faith we hold in common is given to us by God. In this statement we have attempted to harvest the fruits of forty years of dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics” (par. 93). At the same time, the Commission humbly admits that: “There have been failures on the way and opportunities missed. We recognise that the obstacles that prevent us from receiving together all that God offers damage the effectiveness of our mission to the world” (par. 94). Part Two is entitled “Towards Unity and Common Mission.” Four concrete practical steps to express the common faith in common action are proposed and expanded: (1) visible expressions of our shared faith: “Both the Roman Catholic Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion are liturgical Churches in which God is glorified in common public worship. We invite Anglicans and Roman Catholics to develop strategies to foster the visible expression of their shared faith”; (2) joint study of our faith: “Given the degree of agreement in faith outlined in this statement, we wish to promote joint study in order to deepen the faith we share.” (3) co-operation in ministry: “We encourage co-operation wherever possible in lay and ordained ministries.” (4) and shared witness in the world: “We encourage fostering a mission-orientated spirituality of engagement with the world and developing joint strategies of outreach so as to share our faith.” It seems to us that what had been envisaged as a Joint Declaration by the highest Church authorities about the common faith we share, has now become the first part of an Agreed Statement of IARCCUM. The document has a higher degree of authority than the agreed statements of ARCIC, which was meant to be a commission of (mainly) theologians. Nevertheless, it is an important part of the reception process, because a group of senior bishops of both communions “recognise” by doing so the work of ARCIC, they prepare the way for a recognition on a higher level. This is at least one step forward. Moreover, Part Two explicitly pays attention to the second dimension of the Malta vision: to join faith and life. “The extent of common faith described in this statement compels us to live and witness together more fully here and now. Agreement in faith must go beyond mere affirmation” (par. 96). This is a second step forward on our arduous way to full *koinonia*!

As a result of the internal developments within the Anglican Communion and its impact on the relations with the Roman-Catholic Church, IARCCUM has been inactive for some years. The first Anglican co-chair, Right Reverend David Beetge, died in 2008. His successor, the Right Reverend David Hamid, Suffragan Bishop in the Diocese in Europe, was appointed in June 2012. The actual Roman Catholic co-chair is the Most Reverend Donald Bolen, Bishop of Saskatoon in Canada. The two co-chairs have started to conduct a survey of Anglican-Roman Catholic relations throughout the world and to promote the work in progress of ARCIC III.

#### FROM ARCIC II TO ARCIC III

Despite the difficulties mentioned above, the heads of the two Churches have decided to initiate a third phase of the international dialogue. ARCIC III started its first session in Bose, Italy (2011) and continued its work in the plenary sessions of Hong Kong (2012) and Rio de Janeiro (2013). In the Mandate for ARCIC III, two main tasks were given: first, “we ask the Commission to promote the reception of its previous work by presenting the previous work of ARCIC as a corpus, with appropriate introduction”; and second: “ARCIC has worked with a characteristic method. To quote the Gift of Authority: “From the beginning of its work, ARCIC has considered questions of Church teaching or practice in the context of our real but imperfect communion in Christ and the visible unity to which we are called. The Commission has always sought to get behind opposed and entrenched positions to discover and develop our common inheritance.”<sup>48</sup> ARCIC III is asked to continue to work in this way on the basis of the Gospels and the ancient common Tradition. Based on the Common Declaration of Pope Benedict and Archbishop Williams, we affirm the two interrelated areas as critical for further work: the Church as Communion, local and universal, and how in communion the local and universal Church come to discern right ethical teaching. In both areas, the Commission is asked to build on what is already in the agreed statements of the first two phases of dialogue.”

The Mandate makes clear that ‘reception’ is at the heart of the work of ARCIC III. Firstly, the new members of ARCIC III have to receive the previous work of ARCIC I and II. For the few former members of the pre-

---

<sup>48</sup> ARCIC Agreed Statement *Gift of Authority* © 1999 paragraph 6

vious ARCIC dialogues, who still serve on ARCIC III,<sup>49</sup> it became clear that they needed to introduce the new members of ARCIC III<sup>50</sup> into the tradition, method and results of ARCIC I and II. This means that within ARCIC III itself there is a continuing process of reception of the previous work of ARCIC. Secondly, one major task given to ARCIC III is “to promote the reception of its previous work by presenting the previous work of ARCIC as a corpus, with appropriate introduction.” Actually, it is not entirely clear what is meant by “previous work of ARCIC.” Does this mean the work of ARCIC II, whose work as a whole has not yet been assessed by the mandating churches, or is it the work of ARCIC I and II? Since the work of ARCIC I has been presented as a corpus in the Final Report and evaluated by both the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church, it seems more obvious that a publication of the work of ARCIC II is meant. Hence, the three former members of ARCIC II have been commissioned to prepare a publication of a ‘Final Report of the work of ARCIC II.’ Under their supervision, a survey of the main reactions to the different documents of ARCIC II as well as an elucidation is being prepared for each of these documents. There is also an introduction that situates the documents in their historical

---

<sup>49</sup> Former members of ARCIC: Roman Catholic: Reverend Professor Adelbert Denaux, Dean Tilburg School of Catholic Theology; Anglicans: The Rt Revd Christopher Hill, Bishop of Guilford, England (as co-secretary of ARCIC I); The Revd Canon Nicholas Sagovsky, London; and The Revd Dr Charles Sherlock, Bendigo, Australia.

<sup>50</sup> New Members of ARCIC III. Co-Chairs: The Most Revd Bernard Longley, Archbishop of Birmingham, England; The Most Revd David Moxon, Bishop of Waikato and Archbishop of the Dioceses of New Zealand. Roman Catholics: The Revd Robert Christian OP, Angelicum University, Rome; The Most Revd Arthur Kennedy, auxiliary bishop, Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, USA; Professor Paul D. Murray, Durham University, England; Professor Janet E. Smith, Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit, Michigan, USA; The Revd Professor Vimal Tirimanna CSsR, Alphonsianum University, Rome; The Very Revd Dom Henry Wansbrough OSB, Ampleforth Abbey, England; Revd Sister Teresa Okure SHCJ, Catholic Institute of West Africa, Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Anglicans: Canon Dr Paula Gooder, Birmingham, England; The Revd Canon Professor Mark McIntosh, University of Durham, England; The Rt Revd Nkosinathi Ndwandwe, Bishop Suffragan of Natal, Southern Area, South Africa; The Rt Revd Linda Nicholls, Area Bishop for Trent-Durham, Diocese of Toronto, Canada; The Revd Canon Michael Nai-Chiu Poon, Trinity Theological College, Singapore; The Revd Peter Sedgwick, St Michael’s College, Llandaff, Wales; The Revd Canon Jonathan Goodall, Archbishop of Canterbury’s Representative. Consultants: The Very Revd Peter Galadza, Sheptytsky Institute, St Paul University, Ottawa, Canada; The Revd Odair Pedroso Mateus, Faith and Order Secretariat, World Council of Churches. The work of the Commission is supported by the Co-Secretaries, Canon Alyson Barnett-Cowan (Anglican Communion Office), Monsignor Mark Langham (Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity) and Mr Neil Vigers (Administrative Assistant, Anglican Communion Office).

context.. The purpose of this future publication is to present it to the mandating churches with the request to provide an official assessment of the work of ARCIC II, which is a necessary step towards a possible reception. Subsequently, a publication of the previous work of ARCIC I and II is also possible. The purpose of this second publication would be to further facilitate the process of the reception of the work of ARCIC in larger circles than only church leaders, for example, in theological faculties etc. Thirdly, the second primary task of the Commission is to offer a study of “the Church as Communion, local and universal, and how in communion the local and universal Church come to discern right ethical teaching.” This also has a bearing on the future reciprocal recognition and reception of both churches in the domains of ecclesiology (especially with respect to the tension between ‘provincialism’ and ‘universal primacy’) and morals (especially with respect to Christian anthropology, gender issues and sexuality). And finally, the Mandate also affirms that ARCIC III should receive the methodology of ARCIC I and II, that is, it should try “to get behind opposed and entrenched positions to discover and develop our common inheritance [and] to continue to work in this way on the basis of the Gospels and the ancient common Tradition.”

Although ARCIC III certainly wants to respect and to integrate the methodology adopted and proved to be successful in the previous phases, it also wants to deepen ARCIC’s methodology by integrating some valuable aspects of the method of “receptive ecumenism” developed at Durham University (Paul Murray). This method suggests that churches involved in the ecumenical dialogue should be ready to ‘confess’ what is going wrong in their own life and system of government and to try to discover what is valuable in other churches. The idea is to ‘receive’ aspects of doctrine, spirituality and church life from other churches in order to heal and improve the shortcomings within their own church. Nonetheless, ARCIC III still has to discover how the traditional methodology of ARCIC and the methodology of ‘receptive ecumenism’ can be fruitfully combined. However, it is clear that an up-dating of the ARCIC methodology in that sense would integrate the concept of ‘reception’ more fully into its work.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## DOCUMENTS OF ARCIC

- Clarifications of Certain Aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of the First Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Iridis Cassidy, President Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.* Rome, London: Catholic Truth Society/Church House Publishing, 1994 (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 87 [1994,4] 237–242).
- Life in Christ. Morals, Communion and the Church. An Agreed Statement by ARCIC II.* Rome, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1994 (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 85 [1994,1] 54–70).
- Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ (An Agreed Statement).* Harrisburg, PA/London: Morehouse, 2005.
- Salvation and the Church: An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II.* London: Catholic Truth Society/Church House Publishing, 1987.
- The Church as Communion: An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II.* London: Catholic Truth Society/Church House Publishing, 1991 (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 77 [1991,2] 87–97).
- The Gift of Authority: Authority in the Church III: An Agreed Statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission ARCIC, published for the Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.* London: Catholic Truth Society/Toronto: Anglican Book Centre/New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 1999 (= *PCPCU Information Service* Nr. 100 [1999/I] 17–29).
- The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988: The Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops.* London: ACC/Church House Publishing, 1988.

## OTHER SOURCES

- Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity*, edited by ed. Christopher Hill and Edward J. Yarnold. London: SPCK/CTS, 1994.
- Clifford Catherine E. “Reception of the Final Report,” *One in Christ* 32 (1996), 2: 106–117.
- Common Witness to the Gospel. Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations 1983–1995*, edited ed. Jeffrey Gros, Rozanne Elder, Ellen K. Wondra. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1997.
- Denaux, Adelbert, & Lorelei Fuchs. “ARCIC Bibliography 1966–1996”. In *From Malines to ARCIC. The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, (BETL, 130), edited by Adelbert Denaux & John A. Dick, 193–307. Leuven: University Press—Peeters, 1997.
- Documentary History of Faith and Order*, (F&O Paper, 159), edited by Günther Gassmann. Geneva: WCC, 1993.
- Gamberini, Paolo. “Maria e la ‘ri-recezione’ ecumenical: un accordo tra cattolici e anglicani,” *La Civiltà cattolica* 156, 3738 (2005): 113–127.
- Houtepen, Anton. „Reception.” In *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, edited by ed. Nicholas Lossky et al., 959–960. Geneva: WCC, <sup>2</sup>2002.
- Kelly, Gerard. *Recognition. Advancing Ecumenical Thinking* (American University Studies. Series VII. Theology and Religion, 186). New York a.o.: Peter Lang, 1996.

- Langham, Mark. "New Fruits of dialogue of Catholics with Anglicans and Methodists amid difficulties." *L'Osservatore Romano* (English version) 24–06–2013.
- McManus, Erwin. "The Re-reception of Papal Primacy by ARCIC II." *One in Christ* 37 (2002), 1: 16–30.
- Tanner, Mary. "Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations. A New Step to be Taken, A New Stage to be Reached." *Centro pro Unione semi-annual Bulletin* Nr. 65 (Spring 2004): 14–19.
- Tanner, Mary. "The Vision of Malta: A Way for the Future?" In *AGAPÈ. Études en l'honneur de Mgr Pierre Duprey M. Afr. Evêque Tit. de Thibar* (Analecta Chambesiana, 3; Institut d'études supérieures en théologie orthodoxe), edited by Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, 153–168. Chambésy–Genève: Centre orthodoxe du Patriarchat Œcuménique, 2000.
- Wagemaker, Matthieu. *Two Trains Running: The Reception of the Understanding of Authority by ARCIC I Related to the Debates on the Ordination of Women* (European University Studies. Series 23. Theology, 676). Bern, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin: Peter Lang, 1999.

## DIALOG ANGLIKAŃSKO-RZYMSKOKATOLICKI I JEGO RECEPCJA

### Streszczenie

Artykuł analizuje proces uznania i/albo recepcji uzgodnień dialogu anglikańsko-rzymskokatolickiego prowadzonego przez zaangażowane Kościoły. Przez dialog katolicko-anglikański rozumiemy oficjalny dialog prowadzony na szczeblu międzynarodowym, który został przez oba Kościoły powierzony Międzynarodowej Komisji Anglikańsko-Rzymskokatolickiej (Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC). Poszczególne etapy tego dialogu prowadzone były przez Komisje ARCIC I, ARCIC II i ARCIC III.

**Słowa kluczowe:** dialog, recepcja, uznanie, Kościół rzymskokatolicki, Wspólnota Anglikańska.