

CONFIDENTIAL

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

Meeting at Grottaferrata, 27th August - 5th September 1974

MINUTES

27th August

OPENING SESSION: 8.45 p.m.

After opening remarks, of a practical nature by Mgr. Purdy, Bishop McAdoo expressed the regret of the Commission at the illness of Professor Root and Fr. Ahern who were unable to attend. He also welcomed the new Anglican Secretary and wished to indicate the deep gratitude of the Commission for the work of the previous Secretary, the Revd. Colin Davey; the congratulations of the Commission were to be sent to him upon his institution to the parish of St. Paul's, South Harrow.

Bishop McAdoo then turned to the shape of the work for the present session. He asked if pattern suggested by the Steering Committee was an adequate one; three Sub-Commissions dealing with; (I) New Testament and Authority; (II) Ecclesiology and Koinonia; and (III) either, Primacy and Petrine Office, or, Infallibility and Indefectibility. He noted that three members of the Commission were prepared to act as Chairmen of the Sub-Commissions; Fr. Yarnold, Bishop Vogel and Dean Chadwick, respectively.

Bishop Butler asked if the suggested subjects really answered the question as to what we really meant by authority. Could the Commission come to agree upon a definition of authority?

Bishop Clark suggested that the meaning of authority would arise from an examination and understanding of the New Testament.

Bishop Butler replied that this would be simply an exercise in lexicography rather than theology.

Fr. Duprey argued that a strict methodology was required and it was this that had borne fruit at Canterbury. He saw a danger in dealing too quickly with "authoritative statements" rather than authority itself. He therefore questioned whether it would be wise, at this stage, to deal with Primacy and Petrine Office. He saw Ecclesiology and Koinonia as a more hopeful starting point in the discussion on authority. He repeated his original emphasis for a precise methodology.

Mgr. Purdy wondered, at this point, whether the Commission ought not to be concentrating more upon the questions raised by the headings suggested, rather than the headings themselves.

Bishop Clark thanked Fr. Duprey and Bishop Butler for their points.

Archbishop Arnott counselled caution in proceeding to abstract definition and endorsed the schema proposed by the Steering Committee.

Bishop Clark noted that the Commission was not, in any case, competent to investigate EXOUSIA lexicographically. He asked how the Commission was to 'get started'. "What do we mean by authority in our respective traditions?"

Fr. Duprey agreed that authority should not be treated in the abstract.

Fr. Ryan replied that christian authority was to be found within the 'Eucharistic Community'. He wished to ask what made the christian community a 'community of authority'. He saw three aspects to the answering of this question: (a) the authority of the New Testament; (b) the authority of the community and (c) the authority of the ordained ministry with particular reference to the bishop and the local church.

Bishop Vogel noted that some national ARCs already had a working definition of authority. He wanted to stress that the question of authority and jurisdiction need not necessarily be taken together.

Fr. Ryan posed the question: "by what authority are you what you are - as a community?"

Mgr. Purdy suggested that it was pertinent to consider how one used the New Testament.

Bishop Butler responded to this with parallels from criticism made of the Canterbury Statement as to when it was talking of historical fact and when of historical norm. He noted different perspectives of the New Testament. The New Testament could be simply considered as a body of historical documents or as 'inspired witness'.

Bishop Clark asked whether a starting point might be made by asking what authority the New Testament has in each tradition; a comparison of methodology.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that a working definition was found to be necessary at Canterbury when dealing with difficult subjects. This was the case even when it was clear that re-definition would occur as the session continued.

Fr. Tillard was anxious that authority be investigated through the notion of EPISCOPE. This would involve the discovery of that notion of authority which was intended in the EPISCOPE given by Christ to his church. It would involve the notion of the authority of the People of God.

The Revd. Julian Charley cautioned the Commission to avoid putting too much weight on the notion of EPISCOPE. He was also cautious about defining authority before an examination of the New Testament evidence. This would, he suggested, be prejudging the issue.

Bishop Butler noted that it was not simply the ordained ministry which exercised an authority within the Church. He also noted that there was a difference between an intrinsic authority and a delegated authority. The authority of a bishop, for example, was not intrinsic. He argued for precision and clarity of definition. Thus he pointed out further differences in the notion of authority: living and dead authority; the authority of constraint and the authority of voluntary consent.

Bishop Vogel noted that any investigation of authority should include KATASKEUADZO as well as EXOUSIA.

Fr. Tavard thought that if a definition of authority is arrived upon it will have eventually to be compared with that of the New Testament in any case. For his part he would start with the Old and New Testaments.

Bishop McAdoo was another who preferred to avoid a notion of authority in the abstract. He saw any christian authority proceeding from that of the Incarnate Word of God. He too saw a distinction between such authority and authority in terms of jurisdiction.

At this point Bishop Clark felt that methodology, having been well raised, should be adjourned to the next session.

28th August: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Clark, from the chair, introduced the second session by suggesting that Fr. Tillard's request for continuity with the Canterbury statement should be noted. He thought that a consideration of persons exercising authority within the Church would be valuable, whether this was descriptive or prescriptive. The question to be asked was: "What is the authority of the ordained minister?" This could be a way in to a consideration of authority and then, perhaps, attention could be paid to the topics of the sub-commissions.

Fr. Ryan agreed with this approach; it was existential and concrete. This was a similar pattern to that followed for the statement on Ministry and Ordination. He wondered, however, whether there was a difference of tradition concerning the Holy Spirit. The difficulty over the problem of authority was due to an underdeveloped theology of the Holy Spirit; this needed development. The Holy Spirit was not bound to the Sacrament of Order; the Church is the "Community of the Spirit". The Holy Spirit had been neglected in western theology; the Holy Spirit is the basic authority of the Christian community.

Bishop McAdoo wished to follow up the question of EPISCOPE. When asked where church authority comes from he had to assert the supreme authority of Christ. This was a kerugmatic authority. To substantiate this witness was the function of the Bible, the Creeds, reason and conscience. Authority derives from Christ; it exists to serve and proclaim him. He did not wish to assert that there was no jurisdictional aspect to authority, that the primary aspect was Christ; both the source and goal of authority.

Dr. Yarnold questioned whether the sub-commission topics were to exhaust the notion of authority, or if other aspects would be raised next year. He was particularly thinking of the Magisterium.

Fr. Duprey noted that Infallibility could be thought of in terms of a gift of discernment; what it is true to say and do. This was not purely notional and intellectual. This understanding had been developed since Vatican I.

Bishop Clark echoed the fact that Infallibility and Magisterium had been tied to a propositional conception of Revelation.

Mr. Charley was worried that in starting with EPISCOPE the Commission would be beginning with "human authority"; he emphasised that "divine authority" must be the starting point. He was also concerned about the content of sub-commission III.

Bishop Clark stated that he simply wanted an introduction to the task of the production of a statement. He emphasised that he did not wish to start in vacuo.

Fr. Duprey thought that the notion of the Spirit's gift to the Church of the ability to "act the act of the Kingdom" was helpful. This was the gift of the Risen Christ (Yves Congar).

Fr. Ryan agreed with Bishop McAdoo and Mr. Charley that the Commission must see authority as derived from Christ. He warned, however, against a "word ecclesiology" based on a kerugmatic model. This would put the word above the Church. The Commission had already taken koinonia as a model. He warned of the problem evident in the United States, where in dialogue with the Baptist and Christian Brethren, no further progress could be made than a summoned community under the word.

Bishop Vogel advocated the use of both models.

Bishop McAdoo favoured the models given in the Epistle to the Ephesians. He was specifically thinking of the image of the New Israel, the Body of Christ and the People of God.

Fr. Tillard wanted to agree with Fr. Ryan that koinonia was of great significance from Windsor onwards. It was the basis of the Commission's common theology.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher wished to make three points. First of all he supported the schema. Secondly he wished to stress that the topic was Church as well as Authority. Thirdly he simply wondered if sub-commission I ought to have the Old Testament as well as the New in its brief.

Bishop Butler hoped that the Commission would keep in mind a danger of starting with EPISCOPE. He warned that it could rapidly degenerate into apologetics for an hierarchical structure and institution. There was a more fundamental authority than hierarchy. This was not simply a question of the grace of the sacraments of baptism and confirmation. "We must not box the Holy Spirit down". He noted that EPISCOPE was a service and reminded the Commission of the papal title Servus Servorum Dei. He thought that hierarchical authority was an enabling authority to allow the fundamental authority of the Holy Spirit to be realised in the response of faith to the Word of God; it was a charism. He was anxious that the Commission should not be left with a constructed conceptual system which ignored the real authority of the Holy Spirit.

Dean Chadwick strongly endorsed the bishop's view but went on to point out the need of church going laity for authoritative guidance.

Bishop McAdoo reminded the commission that the Christian was dependent on faith rather than certainty.

Bishop Clark noted that though authority was being discussed no **one** had defined authority.

Mr Charley wanted the function of sub-commission I to be spelt out more in relation to the authority of the New Testament.

Bishop Eutler wished to say that one does not get a clear picture of EXOUSIA from the gospels. He noted the exousia given to the apostles over demons. There was an authority of constraint: without voluntary consent. He asked what kind of authority was under consideration; that of compulsion or a developing free response to God? (Marcel Kegant)

Mr Charley was not altogether convinced that the scriptures did not suggest some answer to the bishop's question. He feared that to define outside the context of the New Testament was to prejudge the issue. He wished to avoid a philosophical premise in seeking an answer to this problem.

Dean Chadwick, whilst noting that human response to the gospel was not constrained, wished to remind the commission that there was an imperative in its appeal. The demands of the gospel were categorical rather than hypothetical. Man is made in the image of God and he becomes less than fully human if he fails to respond to God's call.

Fr. Tavard was insistent that in talking about authority freedom too must have a place. Koinonia creates the freedom of the children of God.

Bishop Clark noted a concept of authority as the freedom to act within the community which the community accepts. (Robert Murray).

Bishop McAdoo suggested Christ as "the authority to become what you really are through the grace of the Holy Spirit".

Fr. Duprey drew the commission's attention to the doxology in the apocalypse where all authority is relative to the sole authority of God (Rev. 5:13)

Fr. Yarnold felt that sub-commission I had too much to deal with. It contained the questions of God, Christ, the Apostles, and the Holy Scriptures. He wondered if it could be split in two. He felt that sub-commission III material might, in any case, be rather advanced work at this stage.

Mr Charley wanted to say that in the New Testament authority was related to truth (in the Johannine sense of life in accordance with the truth). How truth is perceived and what it is in the eyes of God is the question he raises over traditional Roman Catholic attitudes. He sees false authority as requiring the acceptance of falsity as truth.

Bishop Clark asked then what was the genuine freedom which was the pre-supposition in any discussion of christian authority.

Bishop Vogel endorsed Mr Charley's point and went on to note that even in the natural order eventually there were "historical sanctions" against false authority. He went on to state that truth and love were the source of freedom.

Bishop McAdoo, opening a new area of discussion, defined the concept of Indefectibility as meaning "perpetuity in the truth". The promise that the church remains in the truth.

Fr. Ryan saw, as the key to the problems here, the notion of a personal graced response to Christ as the action of the Holy Spirit. Christ is seen, by the action of the Holy Spirit, in the Word, the sacraments, the ordained ministry and in the people of God. This intra-personal dialogue is concerned with truth, in its Johannine sense, and therefore with authority.

Dr. Halliburton saw in the schema for Sub-Commission I the basis of a pattern of authority derived through a consideration of Christology. Christ, as a full man, has an intrinsic authority which could form the basis of a christian notion of authority.

Fr. Ryan was cautious about Jesus of history. He did not want an ethical pattern model.

Dr. Halliburton repeated that Christ was the 'Man' par excellence and that he is both historical and contemporary.

Fr. Ryan held that this approach would be salipsistic and would lead to unresolvable historico-critical problems. He did not wish to assume the community but rather explain communal authority.

Bishop McAdoo returned that to look to Christ as the source and shape of authority would be to look to the living head of the community. Thus sub-commission I will lead on to sub-commission III.

Bishop Butler noted that Jesus incorporates the tradition of the People of God. He was not a 'marcionite Intervention'.

Fr. Tillard insisted that the question was why a ministerial authority is needed. The authority of the Risen Lord makes the question of what he is doing in his church now an imperative one. "How is the Risen Lord exercising authority by his Holy Spirit".

Dr. Yarnold indicated that this meant a return to the New Testament.

Fr. Tillard replied that this meant a return to problems of history, where certainty is to be found is in the realm of the community.

Bishop Butler said that some things could be borne in mind though not included in a statement.

Bishop Clark stated that Fr. Tillard's position had the merit of being existential.

Bishop McAdoo, with Dr. Yarnold, said that at some stage both Christ and the New Testament would have to be dealt with.

Bishop Vogel noted that to start with KOINONIA would be to follow the example of the Canterbury agreement; afterwards the Commission could go back to historical problems.

Bishop McAdoo agreed that this would relate to the first two statements; but with the caveat that the authority of Christ must be dealt with.

Bishop Clark reminded the Commission that at this stage they were not so much drafting statements as finding a way in to the various aspects of authority. He asked if sub-commission topics were acceptable in that light.

Dr. Yarnold still held that sub-commission I had too much material to deal with.

Bishop Moorman objected to Dr. Yarnold's suggestion that sub-commission III might take over some of the work of sub-commission I. He held strongly that as the Commission must come to grips with the problems of sub-commission III it was right that some preparatory work should be done at this stage.

Archbishop Arnott agreed with this.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher also concurred with this.

Bishop McAdoo related the work of sub-commissions I and III with the remark that if the church is to talk about Christ it must have a reliable witness in the New Testament and teaching office of the church.

Bishop Vogel noted that sub-commission II also found itself involved with the New Testament in koinonia and ecclesiology.

Bishop Butler stressed the authority of the Bible as having a claim over conscience; it was not simply an historically interesting document. The biblical documents crystalize the authority of the community. He stressed also the primary witness of the community to Christ.

Bishop McAdoo saw the primary witness to Christ as the New Testament.

Fr. Ryan saw here a difference of emphasis. In Bishop McAdoo he saw an apologetic of consistency. The record of the New Testament is that of the faith community. There were different starting points here but they were not antithetical.

Mr. Charley was not so certain. He saw a major distinction. He wanted to know what sub-commission II was doing.

Dean Chadwick insisted that the Commission must be seen to be addressing itself to the church now; not that of 1563. Owing to the vicissitudes of ecclesiastical history authority has had certain overtones of a static restrictive and retrograde kind. The Dean illustrated this attitude to authority in terms of a Safari Park; where the animals are kept in freedom, to a degree, but safely behind the fence. Was it now possible to get away from this to a concept of authority as keeping the church "together". An authority was needed which was spontaneous in a new community. The Dean noted that Julian Charley saw propositional assent required, in traditional Roman Catholicism of the past, to untrue realities. He thought that this was true also of non-roman christians. He wanted a change in the way the church should be talking about authority absolutely. Authority should be free of the notion of a "generous prison". Authority should not exhaust the christian life in doctrine. There was much here for sub-commission II to do!

Bishop Butler thought that hope was important. Authority related back to Christ and to the present. It also pointed forward.

The Revd. Julian Charley saw a way forward by an emphasis on the new freedom of the gospel with the avoidance of that lapse into rigidity which characterises even the most vital of African sects. An authority which could contain the freedom of the gospel would be a gain indeed.

Bishop Clark at this stage asked if it was the mind of the commission as to how the Risen Lord was exercising his authority today, both in the Church and in the community of men? Was such a question an overall umbrella?

Mr Charley thought that such a question pinpointed the problem of structures and freedom.

Fr. Yarnold still felt his subcommission had too much material.

Bishop Clark asked if there was a methodology that could be used to elucidate the scriptures.

Fr Ryan suggested three modes of Christ's presence. In the Word, in the Sacraments and through the magisterium. The latter was to be understood as the teaching office of the church, the sensus fidelium, the spirit filled community.

Fr Tavad felt that the New Testament had already been investigated.

Bishop Butler noted the criticism of the commission's use of the New Testament.

Mr Charley again put his question as to whether the Scriptures were the primary authority?

Dean Chadwick, noting the immense problems facing the commission, at this point, took Bishop Butler's point that the bible is the book of the community. He also added that the authority of the community has now been derived from the bible.

Bishop Clark concluded the session by requesting the sub-commissions to attempt to clarify their own brief and report back.

28th August: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop McAdoo asked for the Sub-Commissioners' thoughts on the presentation of the theme of authority.

Dr. Yarnold reported for Sub-Commission I. 1) The Sub-Commission wished to avoid the word authority for the moment. It preferred to start with the concept of truth. Truth, however, was not propositional. Truth was rather the relationship with God in Christ. Truth was living the life, orthopraxy, saving truth. Truth, it was held, was self-authenticating. 2) The relationship between truth and revelation was then investigated. General Revelation was considered. It was based on the fact that man is the image of God. 3) Special Revelation was considered in the two covenants as inspired by the Holy Spirit, and interpreted to God's people as a community, the Holy Spirit being the exegete. The Scriptures are to be considered normative in the community guided by the Spirit.

Fr. Tavard questioned whether this approach was not a philosophy of truth rather than a direct study of the New Testament.

Dr. Yarnold felt that Sub-Commission I had tried to see authority and revelation in a wider context than was suggested by Fr. Tavard. Its work was not just a preliminary study before using the Scriptures as "sources" for doctrine.

Fr. Tavard repeated his original point by asking if this material was in Scripture. He especially noted the dogmatic concept of General Revelation.

Bishop Vogel said that the distinction of "General" and "Special" revelation was not really apposite to the material of Sub-Commission I. The notion of revelation in Jesus Christ was rather what was wanted.

Mr. Charley agreed with this. He thought that it was more correct to say that it was revelation which was non-propositional rather than truth.

Bishop Butler pointed out that truth was not so much a matter of a relationship with God in Christ so much as God himself. He felt it better to say that the Special Revelation in the Old and New Covenants was witnessed in Scripture.

Fr. Ryan felt the treatment of truth and authority a little abstract, for its eventual audience. It was fine for a humanist gathering but hardly for ordinary church people.

Fr. Tillard questioned the meaning of the self-authenticating nature of truth.

Dr. Yarnold replied that this meant that a truth was accepted because of its inner nature rather than the status of its propounder.

Fr. Tillard asked what the Holy Spirit as the exegete of Scripture meant.

Dr. Yarnold explicated that this meant that the Holy Spirit enlightens those who study the Scriptures.

Bishop Clark asked if He did.

Bishop Butler said that He did.

Dr. Halliburton asked if by self-authenticating the Sub-Commission meant intrinsic.

Mr. Charley said this had not been discussed.

Dr. Yarnold asked if the Commission felt that the Sub-Commission has approached the subject along the right lines.

Fr. Tavard wanted direct access to the New Testament.

Mr. Charley said that the Sub-Commission had discussed the New Testament all the time and that this would come out in the full report.

Bishop Butler noted that there was no discussion of apostolic authority in the New Testament and felt that this ought to be included somewhere.

Dr. Gassmann said that there was a question as to whether the topic was the authority of or authority within the New Testament.

Dr. Yarnold asked whether the Sub-Commission's work was acceptable.

Bishop McAdoo asked for the critique of the Commission to be noted and asked for the report of Sub-Commission II.

Bishop Clark reported that Sub-Commission II had followed an existential approach to its brief. He noted that a closed picture of the Church, with authority alone, should give way to a model based on koinonia.

From this he outlined such a model:

1. The koinonia is constituted by the Holy Spirit.
2. The Spirit as the Risen Lord, being the author, is the authority in and of the Church.
3. Each Christian, as born of the Holy Spirit, participates in this authority.
4. This authority is for the authentic life and mission of the Church and of each Christian. The authority for this life is not simply noetic but is the means by which this life is lived.
5. The fidelity of the whole body to the truth is maintained and developed by a CONSPIRATIO of the SENSUS FIDELIUM and the EPISCOPE of the ordained ministry is sited within the community and for the community - a community of reconciliation, itself in process of reconciliation.

Fr. Ryan thought that in sections 4 and 5 the relationship of the community to the world should be seen, with an emphasis on evangelism and outreach, the community being seen as a community of reconciliation.

Bishop Vogel wanted to say that the Sub-Commission was trying to describe the relationship of persons in KOINONIA; it was not being exclusive.

Fr. Ryan saw the church as instrumental rather than the Holy Spirit in the building up of KOINONIA.

Bishop Moorman stated that the term church had been used; but he wanted to know what the church is and who are in the church.

Mr. Charley said he was puzzled by the phrase "participates in this authority".

Dr. Halliburton was of the opinion that the Holy Spirit was the AUCTOR, the author of each person of the Spirit, and that this was essential to this concept of authority.

Mr. Charley wanted to include a reference to Scripture; the notion of fidelity to apostolic teaching was important in this aspect.

Bishop Butler asked if one was to infer that where the Spirit inspired life in an individual Christian one found a person of authority in the church. He also asked that the Commission did not settle the issue of the totality of revelation within Scripture. The Anglican view was that all was included.

Bishop Vogel amplified this by saying that it would be more correct to say that the position of the Anglican formularies was that everything had to be consonant with scripture. The Scriptures contain all things necessary for salvation.

Dr. Yarnold thought that ministry ought to be brought in at the level of authority and not simply brought in at the end.

Bishop Clark held that an interaction was important here.

Fr. Tillard made two points:

1. Each Christian has an authority.
2. The special authority of the ministry was a MUNUS not POTESTAS.

Bishop Butler wanted to know if the episcopal MUNUS was a MUNUS DOCENDI.

Dr. Halliburton argued that the way to understand the problem was through the notion of an articulating authority. He could not see too much difference between this and the request of Bishop Butler.

Mr. Charley stated that it was not simply the EPISCOPOI who had authority.

Dr. Halliburton noted the treatment of EXOUSIA by Robert Murray; the Spirit being authoritative, but not in the sense of constraining, rather bringing freedom to live.

Bishop Clark said that authority was more than freedom to act.

Bishop Butler echoed this and again warned the Commission of theology from the lexicon.

Bishop Clark did however think that the notion of MUNUS gives a normative function to authority. Freedom had to have some limitations.

Bishop McAdoo remarked that the New Testament notion was that it was the truth which made one free.

Archbishop Arnott noted that the truth in question was in the Johannine sense rather than a body of doctrine.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission if they were reasonably happy with the approach of Sub-commission II.

Dr. Yarnold wondered if ecclesiology had been neglected.

Bishop Clark thought that some attention might be paid to Bishop Moorman's question about the Church.

Bishop Butler agreed that this question ought to be looked at. Authority kept the KOINONIA in being. This then raised the question of the nature of the Church and the nature of schism.

Bishop Moorman thought that too much consideration had been given to the "subsists in" of Lumen Gentium. He thought that a passage in ch.9 was very significant. "God has gathered together as one all those who in faith look upon Jesus as the author of salvation and the source of unity and peace, and has established them as the Church, that for each and all she may be the visible sacrament of this saving unity."

Dr. Halliburton returned to the question of authority and suggested that there were two not mutually inconsistent approaches. Authority could be viewed as a limit set on freedom for the good of all. It could also be seen as a manifestation of the Holy Spirit as the author of life.

Dr. Gassmann warned the Commission of the danger of mixing ecclesiology and authority. This would be to make an error of methodology.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher, however, agreed with Bishop Butler and Bishop Moorman.

Mr. Charley warned of the difficult issues which would have to be raised over the question of jurisdiction.

Bishop McAdoo thought that Subcommittee II might investigate Bishop Moorman's point and the notion of jurisdiction.

Dr. Fairweather was strongly of the opinion that these issues were not to be dealt with yet. Authority must be dealt with first.

Bishop Butler felt this might well be the case. If this was so then he thought that a fourth topic would be needed before the final report of the Commission. This would be on Ecclesiology. Many people were expecting the third statement to be about the Church. The Commission would have to be honest about this and give its reasons.

Fr. Ryan saw a systematic problem here. There had been three suggested topics: Church and Eucharist; Church and Ministry; and now Church and Authority. This when completed would provide a theological model of the Church, between institution and communion, approaching a theology of koinonia. This would have been reached by looking at concrete problems. Three examples of an ecclesiology of koinonia. The advantage of this would be the achievement of a systematic theology which would not otherwise be available to the Roman Catholic Church.

Fr. Tavard was of the opinion that once the Eucharist and Ministry had been described the Church had been described.

Bishop McAdoo reminded the Commission that at Venice the Church had been described in terms of Apostolic Faith, Ministry and Sacraments.

Bishop Clark stressed that the purpose of the Commission was to effect a reconciliation rather than argue who was the true Church.

Dr. Halliburton said that there were elements of ecclesiology in section two of Sub-commission II's report. This might be taken further by the Commission.

Bishop Vogel thought it would be difficult to talk in full term of ecclesiology using the model of koinonia. No one model would be sufficient to treat of ecclesiology.

Bishop Butler questioned whether the koinonia was constituted by the Holy Spirit. He asked whether an authentic eucharist, ministry and creed constituted koinonia. He felt that koinonia was founded upon the latter but was not identical to them. He saw koinonia in intra-personal relationships. He noted that two eucharists in the same place would be an offence against koinonia.

Fr. Duprey considered that there were different levels of participation in any reality. There were therefore different levels of koinonia. He did feel that the relationship, suggested by the sub-commissions, between the Holy Spirit and koinonia was

was too simple. He also felt that more clarification of the equivocal nature of authority was needed.

Fr. Ryan saw a distinction between subjective fellowship and ecclesiastical communion. The problem was of finding a norm for full ecclesiastical communion where the Spirit had established koinonia.

Dean Chadwick suggested that things were being made more difficult by the question "What is the Church". The second sub-commission had suggested that koinonia is created by the Spirit. Each believer participates in the total authority of this community; just as does the apostolic witness, the New Testament, and the ministry of the Church. What is needed is a description of this authority and a description of the life of the Spirit.

Bishop Clark agreed with this.

Bishop McAdoo then suggest the sub-commission examined this.

Fr. Yarnold enquired as to which group EPISCOPE should be included.
Bishops Clark & McAdoo said both.

Bishop Vogel wanted it made clear that he felt that jurisdiction was not in sub-commission II's brief.

Bishop McAdoo felt unease as to where it should come.

Mr Charley said that it must come up somewhere.

Bishop McAdoo at this point suggested that the third sub-commission present its report.

Prof. Fairweather noted that their sub-commission had a choice of subject matter. He then outlined some of the issues which had helped to formulate a decision as to which to deal with.

The themes of Primacy and Petrine Office appeared to be easier to make some positive statements upon. However the notion of Infallibility and Indefectibility would in the long run be more valuable.

Infallibility raised the question of Primacy. It also involved the full consideration of all the organs of authority. It raised the question as to whether authentic christianity was capable of identification; this was answered in the affirmative.

The exercises of authority within the church could be thus, by

- a) an appeal to scripture;
- b) a development of doctrine;
- c) an appeal to Councils;
- d) an appeal to infallible pronouncements of the Roman Pontiff;
- e) the Magisterium and Sensus Fidelium.

It was noted that: (a) was a complex enterprise; (b) was dependent on a resolving of the Boissy versus Newman debate; (c) involved the identification of an Ecumenical Council; (d) involved the same over infallible statements; (e) also involved the notion of infallibility and problems of authority.

Finally the applicability of terms like infallibility might be open to debate as applied to pronouncements. It was suggested that it might be argued that there was a category mistake here.

Dean Chadwick seriously asked whether these issues should be pursued further at this stage.

Bishop Clark enquired whether the notion of indefectibility had been raised.

Dr. Fairweather indicated that it had.

Fr. Yarnold insisted that this must be seen in the context of the whole church.

Bishop Butler wondered about indefectibility. As presented by Hans Küng he thought it impossible to have indefectibility without infallibility. It can never be known if the truth has been reached. Certainty can never be achieved in the present.

Archbishop Arnott did not think that there was an Anglican tradition of indefectibility. He asked if the Petrine passages had been investigated.

Fr. Duprey noted that as regards authority infallibility was not comprehensive. Pastoral authority was a different aspect again. He felt the notion of indefectibility to be valuable. He suggested that there had been no cases of infallible pronouncements in the strict sense of Vatican I.

Fr Ryan noted that the sub-commission had chosen infallibility for those reasons. It wished to consider the whole Church rather than simply the Roman See.

Dr Fairweather agreed that the intention had been to give a broader base for discussion.

Bishop Vogel wanted an examination of truth in relation to these problems.

Fr. Tavard noted that in the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue in the United States, Primacy and Infallibility had been separated. It was noted that there had been an examination of petrine function rather than office. He questioned whether pastoral authority could be exercised in "statements".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked whether a change of title would help the sub-commission. He offered: "The Exercise of Authority within the Church".

Bishop McAdoo asked how the whole commission felt about this.

Dean Chadwick asked if the commission were correct in now trying to take apart such loaded words. He considered primacy an easier way of approach than Petrine Office. He wanted to discover the relation between the Church, councils, patriarchs and even popes. *

Dr Halliburton asked if the second sub-commission could possibly deal with ecclesiology without some treatment of infallibility.

Bishop McAdoo noted that it remained to be seen !

Fr. Yarnold was surprised at Fr. Duprey's remarks that there had never been any infallible statements. He said there could be a putative infallible statement. He said that such authority would not depend upon the rest of the church.

Fr. Duprey answered that Vatican I had defined in the abstract but in fact there was a continuous interaction and consultation.

Bishop McAdoo adjourned the plenary sessions until Friday.

* Here the commission agreed to change the title of Sub-Commission III in accordance with Bishop Knapp-Fisher's suggestion.

30th August: 4.30 p.m.

Reactions to Canterbury Statement

Bishop Clark from the chair, invited members of the Commission to comment on reaction to the Canterbury Statement. Prior to this he asked if any members of the Commission, who had been commissioned to prepare papers, wished to present their work.

Fr. Tillard said that it was rather late to do this as his work was already part of the work of one of the Sub-Commissions. He suggested that Fr. Ryan might present his paper.

Fr. Ryan was prepared to do this at short notice if necessary.

Bishop Clark thanked him for this.

Archbishop Arnott requested information about the programme for the remainder of the week. Practical details were briefly discussed then by several members of the Commission.

Bishop Clark then noted the reports on reactions to the Canterbury Statement and in particular ARCIC 114/A and 114/B by the Revd. Colin Davey. He then asked Mgr. Purdy if he would comment upon his Report (ARCIC 114).

Mgr. Purdy apologised for a certain lack of order but he had prepared the paper in order of arrival of the various comments. Certain comments had come in since but they were not adversely significant. He thought it worth while to add that the Belgian hierarchy had commissioned a team of theologians to report on the Canterbury Statement. This they had done favourably. The Statement had been presented to the Secretariat and was well received. Not all at the Vatican appreciated such a document and it was a help to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity to have such useful work done. He thought that this added a dimension to Fr. Tillard's paper on "Sensus Fidelium".

Fr. Ryan expressed the deep gratitude of the B.C.E.I.A. of N.C.C.B.* to Mgr. Purdy for his report which much eased the United States hierarchy's reception of the Canterbury Statement, which would have otherwise been rather stern. What "saved the day", he reported, was the comments of Yves Congar. This much modified a harsh reaction. It had been hoped to have a copy of the Bishops' report but this had not quite been available in time.

Bishop Clark said that he had been "on the road" a good deal speaking to the Canterbury Statement. It had been a great help to see what sort of reaction the Statement had produced. Different audiences had sometimes reacted in different ways. There had sometimes been a feeling of betrayal on the part of those whose theology was not particularly up to date. This occasionally applied to parochial clergy who, through no fault of their own, had ceased to do much theology since starting parish work. There was not really much overtly critical comment.

Fr. Tavard said that he had had no hostile reaction in Youngstown, Cleveland and Baltimore.

Bishop Clark wondered if people had not gone home from a meeting and then found themselves to be less enthusiastic.

Fr. Tavard said he did not know about that!

Bishop Vogel commented that his own Committee on Ecumenical Relations thought that a commentary might help. Some had felt the rather terse style of the statement needed explanation. He thought there had been more enthusiasm over this particular statement than the one on the Eucharist. There had been some criticism of the statement that the New Testament nowhere uses the term "priest" of the ordained ministry. Reference was made to HIEROURGOUNTA of Romans 15:16.

Bishop McAdoo said that the Co-Chairmen raise the issue in their forthcoming book.

Bishop Vogel said that American ARC was very favourable.

Fr. Ryan noted that there was considerably more enthusiasm amongst younger priests for the Statement. This caused a problem as there was an increased demand for "eucharistic sharing". He had defended the present practice. Some younger priests had considered the document not radical enough. This had assisted its reception by the more conservative bishops!

Bishop Clark noted that reference was made to the Windsor Agreement when criticism was severe. There was much objection to the omission of the explicit statement that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. This was to be found in the comments of both the English and Irish Hierarchies. Bishop Clark had a pipe-dream that this might be one day possible, given the Commission's understanding of sacrifice.

Archbishop Arnott had spoken to many groups including two Anglican and two Roman Catholic seminaries. The Anglican bishops in Australia were enthusiastic; with one Evangelical exception. There was much support on the Roman Catholic side but not from the Hierarchy. In Sydney, at a significant meeting of theologians, only one professor voiced ^{any} objection. Anglican theologians were more impressed with the Canterbury than the Windsor Statement; this included Evangelicals. In the South Pacific area, Papua New Guinea, there was very strong support from all levels of the Church for both statements.

Bishop McAdoo stated that it was hard to make an accurate assessment. There were a number of enthusiastic groups in Canada and he had spoken on one occasion in Winnipeg with Fr. Tillard. There had been over 340 clergy present from both Churches and even one Cardinal.

Fr. Tillard commented that he had had many enthusiastic telephone calls. Cardinal Flahiff was very happy with the work. The Statement had had a very positive reception.

Professor Fairweather thought that in Canada the clergy were more enthusiastic over the Ministry Statement than the Eucharistic Statement, but that with the laity it was the other way round. Theologians had wondered what was "new"; they saw familiar teaching. There had been criticism for not going on to the question of 1896. He thought that the Commission had had more sense, though this was construed in some quarters as cowardice.

Bishop Clark wanted to know what the popular reaction signified. It could be that the reaction is over-enthusiastic; only the theologically educated could see the real problems.

Mgr. Purdy asked what value the reactions had; he suggested two significant points to be borne in mind:

- (a) On the whole only those dissatisfied with matter write to comment.
- (b) National differences were important in judging a reaction; this was witnessed by the diverse reactions in Canada on the one hand and England and Ireland on the other.

There were a variety of reasons for the latter including history and temperament and the mentality of a hierarchy. He thought that some reflective comment on informed criticism might be useful and lessons learnt from it. Was anybody prepared to do this, he asked. It would be very useful to the Secretariat.

Bishop Clark noted that even some friendly critics still raise questions.

Mgr. Purdy added that several distinguished scholars had commented on the Statement as members of the International Theological Commission. He cited the example of Professor Vagaggini who after reading favourable comments of other theologians re-wrote his own.

Fr. Duprey commented that a sub-commission of the International Theological Commission rather than the full Commission had examined the Statement but that all members send their reactions to documents.

Mr. Charley said that there had been some difficulties due to the method of presentation of the documents. He had spoken a good deal and there had been a considerable amount of interest; there was much sympathy but a need felt for guidance on the matter. He felt that those who were against the statement saw more opposition than he had. He noted that a "watchdog" mentality was likely to produce adverse reaction. Of evangelical groups in the Church of England he estimates that about two-thirds were in agreement with the statement, in general terms, and were sympathetic.

Bishop Moorman noted that the Convocations of Canterbury and York were due to debate the statement in October. He would be addressing the York Convocation as that was the one of which he was a member. He felt that the previous statement had been received more enthusiastically. It was a fact that debate often centred not on the statement itself but upon commentaries about the statement. There were general comments from the members of the Commission to this effect.

Fr. Tavad asked how many of the objections were theologically responsible. Other objections could be dismissed.

Bishop Moorman noted that some theological papers were very critical; and in particular the paper by Fr. D. Hamilton.

Mgr. Purdy said that this had not been sent from the Graymoor Ecumenical Institute but from Fr. Hamilton ^{himself} in a private capacity. This had been sent to the Cardinal who had reacted favourably.

Dean Chadwick had read the Hamilton paper, with some gratitude, but he was not persuaded. It was gratifying to note that he had to "cook the books" to get the answer that he wanted. He was grateful for a re-statement of the conservative position on matters of historical fact. The Commission had looked at these positions and had not tied itself to any one way of understanding them; it was anxious to persuade. He thought that this procedure was correct but that it laid itself open to "torpedoes" of this kind. The paper by Fr. Hamilton was of significance not so much because of its argument as its reflection of an attitude of confessional rivalry. There was, the Dean felt, a resistance to ecumenical documents. They could not be disagreed with and therefore could not speak to a rival confessional situation. It was the work of this Commission to break down this mutual distrust. It was necessary to take to pieces, one by one, the obstacles to this. This must carry the two Communities or the work of the Commission would be in vain.

Mgr. Purdy still insisted that the said paper should never have been presented out of context in the first place.

Bishop Butler said he did not follow this.

Mgr. Purdy replied that the paper had originally been one of several, not all critical; it would have been better seen with the others.

Dr. Gassmann said that as inter-confessional documents were a new species they needed a new hermeneutic. They were often read by people who had not gone through the same process of thought as those who had produced such statements.

He also said that people in all the churches were suffering from a crisis of identity at the present time and that there were those who thought that ecumenical statements would deepen this crisis by making the situation too fluid. This must somehow be understood and the persons led to find a new and wider identity.

It was added that it would be valuable to have a synthesis of the various reactions to the Windsor and Canterbury Statements. This would be essential to any revision.

Fr. Ryan informed the members of the Commission that he had himself invited Fr. Hamilton to speak to give a reasoned conservative position. He indicated that his thinking had changed since the conference at which his paper was presented. He does not hold the same position today; his newspaper column and radio station were now reported to be favourable.

Mr. Purdy said that he was only learning that now after the original critical paper had been sent.

Bishop Butler thought that profit could be derived from a synthesis and analysis of the critical comments received. He warned however that a "Gallup Poll" was not an effective method of conducting theology. He noted that there was a real loss of identity which was accentuated by the fact that ecumenical activities on the part of the Roman Catholic Church were of a very recent date. The "Sensus Fidelium" did not change overnight. On the Anglican side too contact with Roman Catholics was a comparative novelty. He stated that the real faith of a church was more than a consensus of doctrine. There was a slow shift in confidence and it was the task of the members of the Commission to educate others to look for identity in the "New Church" of the future rather than remain prisoners of the past.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher made three points: a) He was embarrassed and alarmed by the enthusiasm on both sides in South Africa. There was a lack of informed criticism. b) The Canterbury Statement had greatly increased the desire for "communio in sacris". There was some desire for unilateral action in South Africa. c) The existence of a local Commission had been instrumental in creating a considerable interest. This was appointed by both local hierarchies and had the duty of reporting back to both bodies. He thought that regional Commissions were very important.

Prof. Scarisbrick compared reactions to the two statements and thought that, after speaking to three groups about both, the reaction to Windsor had been more critical. Many landmarks had been missing for some. Canterbury did not threaten and thus underlined the deficiencies of the Windsor agreement.

Fr. Yarnold thought quite the reverse. He considered that the reactions to Canterbury had been considerably more hostile at most levels. There had been considerable sniping in the semi popular catholic press. Friends had regarded the statement as somewhat of an anti-climax; there was an expectation of some treatment of 1896 and the problem of inter-communion.

Bishop Moorman asked if it was intended that some reply be made.

Bishop Clark felt that this was a matter for the business meeting. He then asked if the members of the commission were happy about the method used to come to the agreed statements. It was significantly different from the U.S.A. Lutheran/ Roman Catholic methodology. He himself believed it was the right way.

Fr. Ryan felt that the Lutheran method was far from an ideal one. The method of consultation by publication of agreed statements in easily readable form was good. There was however the question of how much more was on the "tapes". There was a certain questioning of what the statements meant.

Bishop Vogel warned against the Lutheran approach. In his diocese of Missouri there were 50% of Lutherans and the consultations had had a negligible effect on the local church communities. This could not be said of the agreed statements.

Fr. Tavard was not sure as to what the commission's method actually was.

Dr Gassmann suggested that this was proof of the work of the Holy Spirit. He commented on the vast numbers of papers. Were these papers to be thought of as background or as the next step forward. He felt the commission needed a little more discipline and some guidance as to what ought to be read.

Bishop Clark noted that the Revd. Colin Davey had done this by ARCIC 94. He said that the papers sent had educated him and that this was good; this was what they were intended for.

Fr. Duprey said that owing to postal difficulties he had received 2 kg. of paper all at once.

Bishop Butler said that there was a difference between an intermediate and final meeting. The papers were extremely valuable as a launching pad. The schemas could not have been produced earlier.

Professor Fairweather did not find the procedure unfamiliar. He had been involved in ecumenical debate since the Lund conference. It was a matter of sitting down and writing out of one's head. He had a strong suspicion that this was no bad method. Commissioned and non-commissioned documents did not make all that much difference. It was impossible, in any case, to make all the appropriate cross references. It might be better to have material earlier and slightly less of it.

Bishop Clark stated that he thought the papers were received in good time.

Fr. Tillard thought that the interaction of Commission members, all from different backgrounds, theologies, and horizons, contributed to the process of creating a "consensus". This was clear at Windsor where differences soon contributed to a common spirit.

Fr. Ryan thought that this procedure was a creative method of theological discourse. This could be judged by the results. The methodology has been approved by its fruits. After ten years it will be possible to say what the method was. The method was unique and important. It was not muddling through.

Dr. Yarnold thought that some attention could be paid to presentation.

Bishop Clark after discussing the programme adjourned the session.

30th August: 5.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark invited Fr. Ryan to present his paper "Pastor Eternus". Fr. Ryan outlined the paper with special attention to the Speculative Excursus. (Cf. ARCIC 104). The Bishop then asked for discussion and questions.

Bishop Butler thought that the excursus might well take the discussion on very far indeed. He did wish to put the question as to whether the notion of "Compulsory Arbitration", discussed in the Excursus would mean acceptance of a decision.

Fr. Ryan answered that it meant arbitration of the same tradition.

Bishop Butler clarified his original question by asking if the arbiter's decision was final.

Fr. Ryan said that it did.

Bishop Butler then asked if the critical edition of the Formula of Hormisdas would be likely to show a necessity for communion with the Roman See.

Fr. Ryan thought that it would.

Bishop Butler finally enquired whether he thought that this would give an ultimate ~~note~~ ^{right} of initiative when things were going wrong.

Fr. Ryan thought that there might be a right but there was also a tradition of renunciation of a legitimate right.

Bishop Butler then gave the picture of the Church of Alexandria with, perhaps, an arian bishop as well as an arian presbyter! Would it be possible for the Holy See to renounce its rite of initiative to intervene.

Fr. Ryan thought that any of the faithful would have the right to intervene.

Fr. Tillard was unclear as to what the process of compulsory arbitration involved.

Fr. Ryan answered that it meant the settling of a dispute by the compulsory ~~bringing~~ of the parties concerned to an independent arbitrator.

Archbishop Arnott was not at all happy about this particular model. There was always the suspicion of unfair judges. He spoke from Australian experience.

Fr. Ryan said that in the U.S.A. it was not a court procedure.

Bishop Vogel said that both sides agreed to accept the decision of the arbitrator.

Fr. Ryan simply offered it as a model.

Fr. Duprey thought that it was a useful one in some aspects. Pope Damasus had certainly acted in such a way as had Leo. However there was also an interdependence among local churches.

Fr. Duprey (Contd.) There had been a good deal of new thinking in the Western Church in the direction of autonomy. The nomination of local bishops, in the case of the Roman See, was not due to a papal power but as Patriarch of the West. There were different levels of authority to be seen. The occupant of the Roman See was bishop of Rome, Primate of Italy, Patriarch of the West as well as Pope. Such a model was not incompatible with auto-cephalus churches. Every local church had the right to intervene when there is trouble within a church. There needs to be a re-discovery of the local interdependence of churches.

Fr. Tavard was concerned that the model was a legal one. The Primacy was a positive thing; a primacy of agape.

Fr. Ryan agreed that it was weak in this respect.

Fr. Duprey reminded the Commission of the teaching of Chalcedon that there shall be one bishop in one place; there must be a unity of the local hierarchy. He noted the position in the East where in one city there were no less than five catholic archbishops. Such a situation could not be tolerated. Perhaps a synodal unity of bishops was called for; it was in any case wrong to have parallel hierarchies.

Fr. Ryan agreed as an ideal but with a situation such as immigrant workers or a similar situation it was difficult to achieve this.

Bishop Butler noted that the Ukrainian Exarch had full episcopal rites in the English Episcopal Conference.

Dean Chadwick asked the Commission to forgive him for being a little impish for noting that the Formula of Hormisdas, quoted in 1870 uses the Matthew 16:17-19 text, but does not base the claims for the primacy upon that text.

Bishop Clark felt that this was an appropriate point to adjourn.

31st August: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop McAdoo was in the chair for consideration of the Sub-Commission Reports. He noted that there had been some overlapping. He asked for the report of Sub-Commission I (cf. ARCIC 124/I/1).

Dr. Yarnold said that as Sub-Commission I had in fact produced its report by split-drafting, Archbishop Arnott would introduce the first section.

Archbishop Arnott simply noted that the Sub-Commission had avoided the definition of authority; it was intended that this should emerge. It was hoped that abstraction could be avoided by this procedure.

Fr. Tillard questioned what the first sentence really meant.

Mr. Charley said that originally the word premise had been included.

Bishop Clark understood it to mean the presupposition of the reality of God.

Fr. Yarnold added "based upon".

Dr. Gassmann wondered if it would be possible to take discussion of sections together with the relevant parallel sections of Sub-Commission II.

Bishop McAdoo repeated that there was a certain overlap. He asked if Bishop Vogel would be prepared to present Sub-Commission II's report.

Bishop Clark expressed the strong opinion that they should be dealt with separately, only in this way would it be possible for the Commission to "worm its way into the subject."

Fr. Tillard wanted an explanation for going back to Moses on a treatment of authority in the church.

Mr. Charley answered this by saying that he saw the examination of authority as necessarily involving a treatment of the Old Testament as well as the New. Moses was a paradigm case of the way in which the authority of God was discovered. Abraham could also have been used but here the biblical material was not so explicit. The call and appointment of Moses was significant in its parallel with Christ.

Bishop McAdoo again asked the Commission if it wished to deal with the two Reports together.

Bishop Clark repeated that he thought separately.

Dr. Gassmann said he had only suggested that the relevant sections might be taken together.

Fr. Tillard argued for a logical progression.

Bishop Butler thought one by one but that the task at this stage was not one of re-drafting.

Bishop McAdoo discerned the wish of the Commission was that the reports should be dealt with separately.

Dean Chadwick asked for guidance. It was not clear what question the first Sub-Commission was really answering. Was the paradigm of Moses an edifying parenthesis.

Dr. Yarnold referred to the drafters.

Mr. Charley took it that the question was: "How is authority to be seen in the Scriptures?" So the course to be followed was that of showing the pattern of God's working in the scriptures. This is not de novo in the New Testament. He admitted that quantitatively the paper was disproportionate. The "crunch" came in the third section and this had been rather condensed.

Fr. Ryan thought that illustration was vital. He was however troubled by the treatment of authority at the beginning of the paper. He objected to the phrase "legitimate authority stems from the will of God!" He objected to the word "will" - it suggested the intellect too strongly. He felt that the model used was not adequate; it was the call of an individual. What was required was a model of God's call of the Covenant People. The notion of a people rather than a prophetic call would be more useful to the Commission's work.

Fr. Tillard asked if the Commission were now dealing with the paper paragraph by paragraph.

Bishop McAdoo asked if the Commission wished now to deal with the paper in general first or paragraph by paragraph.

Bishop Clark thought that there was a radical distinction between the definite claim to authority in Jesus and the recognition of authority in Moses.

Mr. Charley thought that there was a parallel here. God did give an authority to Moses; the Divine name was revealed to him. The authentic power of God was seen through him.

Bishop Butler, in returning to Bishop Clark's point insisted that just as Christ had authority given so did Moses. Christ came as a 'sent man'. He refers everything and his own authority to God. Jesus also has a derived authority.

Fr. Tavard was unhappy about the analogy. He much preferred the authority of the Covenant People of God. Personal authority cannot be directly used from the Old Testament. He was thinking of the authority of Moses in sending the plagues upon the Egyptians!

Fr. Tillard protested that it was difficult to see the authority of Jesus before the resurrection. The community confessed Jesus as its Saviour and Lord after the resurrection. It was the resurrection which showed this authority.

Mr. Charley thought that that was exactly what the paper had said.

Fr. Ryan repeated his point that the prophetic model was not the best of models. He thought perhaps the way the later prophets universalised the notion of covenant was a useful way in.

Bishop McAdoo was asked if the Commission thought that the general approach was the correct one.

Bishop Vogel was still unclear as to what the group actually thought they were doing.

Dr. Halliburton agreed with Fr. Ryan that the notion of covenant was a better model. However he wondered if the relation of Moses to the community and Jesus to the community was a help.

Dr. Gassmann stated that there were two different levels of authority.

Bishop Butler, who was not one of those responsible for the paper, thought that the purpose of the call and the authority of Moses was precisely the creation of the Covenant Community. He thought that if one was going to understand the church of the apostolic age it was necessary to see that when it wanted a conceptual framework for the understanding of the things God had done it naturally turned to the Old Testament. He thought that there was considerably more parallel between Moses and Christ in the New Testament than Christ and Abraham.

Dean Chadwick said that a monograph on the nature of authority in the Scriptures and ancient Church was not what was wanted. He considered, however, that it was impossible to say what had to be said without reference to those things. It was necessary to try and elicit from the Old and New Testaments, and the common inheritance of both Churches, the principles of the exercise of authority. Then it could be seen where the areas of disagreement lay.

Bishop McAdoo felt that that summed up the situation.

Mr. Charley noted that sections 3 and 4 showed the outworking of the theme. The other matter was there to show the type of authority in question. It could be drawn together and clarified.

Archbishop Arnott said that when, in context, the scripture references were read the whole was much more explicit.

Bishop Butler wanted a clarification, at some stage, of the distinction between prophetic and designated official ministry. He illustrated his point by saying that he would think very hard if he found himself in a disagreement with Congar. This was not because he was a Dominican or a priest! His authority was intrinsic. When he was a simple monk there could have been an Abbot of whom he had a very low personal opinion. Yet if he had required obedience he would still have had an authority as an Abbot. He wanted to know what one did with the Borgia Popes! The problem today was that there had been too many good popes! Perhaps it would be good if it were known that a pope had a mistress! The Commission found this an amusing proposition.

Bishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to turn to examine the sub-commission report paragraph by paragraph.

Bishop Clark asked what legitimate authority meant.

Mr. Charley thought that not all authority was of God.

Bishop Butler said that it meant genuine authority.

Fr. Tillard said that it must be qualified.

Dean Chadwick thought that he detected two propositions; the first that the purpose of the Church was to bring all men into a relationship with God and the second that that all genuine authority arises from its integral link with the saving purposes of God insofar as it serves this purpose.

Bishop Clark agreed that legitimate authority is so insofar as it subserves.

Mr. Charley wondered if this was not man centred.

Bishop Clark said that all genuine authority derives from God.

Fr. Tavard wanted a distinction of authority at some stage; a sacristan has an authority in the Church but what sort.

Bishop McAdoo then requested the Commission to pass on to the second paragraph.

Mr. Charley thought there ought to be something on the Old Testament even if Moses were to go.

Dr. Halliburton thought that this was not necessary and that the notion of Moses as liberator of the community would be valuable.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission to move on to paragraph three.

Fr. Tavad found it a little odd that in this section of the New Testament the textual quotations began with the Epistle to the Hebrews; perhaps the model was to be Melchizedek!

Mr. Charley felt it would be difficult to elaborate the call of the latter!

Fr. Ryan added that as well as the theme of covenant the centrality of Pentecost to the community was important to bring out. He questioned whether Jesus was appointed. It might be better to say that Jesus was constituted Lord.

Fr. Tillard repeated his original point that authority was to be seen as having its origin in the resurrection. Jesus is Lord in the Church by the Resurrection.

Mr. Charley said that it did not deny this.

Fr. Tillard said that it did not say it.

Bishop Butler made the point that Jesus had a real authority in his earthly life in his words, action and person.

Fr. Tillard commented that this could not be said because the community saw the authority of Jesus after the resurrection. The New Testament was written by the post-resurrection community. He added that there was a distinction of levels of authority in Jesus. In the life of Jesus there was a "Congar" authority; after the resurrection an "abbot" authority.

Dr. Gassmann agreed on the necessity of a distinction here.

Bishop McAdoo also agreed.

Dean Chadwick did not want there to be too sharp a distinction between the Jesus of faith and the Jesus of history.

Mr. Charley agreed with this, pointing out the confession of Jesus as the Christ by Peter.

Bishop Butler also said that there was a real continuity as well as discontinuity.

Dr. Halliburton noted that in the first sentence the subject was the New Testament; the "authority of Jesus" would avoid exegetical problems.

Bishop Vogel preferred the phrase "New Testament community".

Fr. Tavad wanted this section tightened up as there was a mixture of histologies.

Dean Chadwick preferred Fr. Ryan's "enables men". This suggested the calling into being of a community.

Bishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to look at paragraph 4.

Archbishop Arnott said that no member of the sub-commission was prepared to go to the stake over the last sentence. This was inserted to make a link with the work of other sub-commissions.

Fr. Tavard noted a distinction in the first sentence.

Mr. Charley thought that there was a distinction. Paul could talk about the individual and the Church as the Temple of the Spirit.

Bishop Clark noted that each individual Christian received charismata.

Fr. Tavard questioned whether the image of shepherd was appropriate today.

Archbishop Arnott thought that it was appropriate in Australia!

Bishop Butler did not think that the image of managers and work force would be any better.

Mr. Charley said that ministry was not simply service; it was service in obedience to the Father's will. He liked the paragraph and its intention.

Fr. Ryan found the image of shepherd a strong one; in its context it signified the Messianic King of Israel.

Bishop Butler asked if the image was the good or the great shepherd in I Peter 5.

Archbishop Arnott said that the notion of pastor came earlier in chapter 2.

Bishop Moorman wanted the inclusion of a reference to I Corinthians 12.

Bishop McAdoo then moved on to section 5. There was to be a general discussion first.

Bishop Clark questioned whether the implication was that the "assimilation of revelation" had taken place by the time the Scriptures were closed.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher indicated that there was a reception and assimilation before the Scriptures were put into writing.

Bishop Butler said that it was God's purpose which was achieved rather than revelation.

Bishop Clark said that this was a clarification.

Fr. Tavard said that God's purpose was achieved in the eschaton.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that God's revelation had not been fully received yet.

Dean Chadwick said that this section needed a certain amount of clarification.

Bishop McAdoo agreed. Was the document here concerned with establishing the criteria of authority in the Church; or the authority of the Church.

Fr. Duprey said that this was a good example of the equivocal nature of the word authority. There were many levels of authority: it would have to be decided which are being dealt with.

Fr. Tavad asked if the canon of scripture was closed.

Bishop Butler answered that it was closed "pro-tem".

Dean Chadwick thought that the word conclusively was rather definite; it was rather like the nails in a coffin lid.

Bishop Vogel found this a vague phrase.

Bishop Butler wondered if anything was lost by saying: "the establishment of the Canon".

Dr. Gassmann suggested "recognise".

Bishop McAdoo noted that the Commission was now dealing paragraph by paragraph "de facto".

Fr. Tillard questioned whether the scriptures were a product or a gift.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that there could have been no Scriptures without the Covenant Community; but that they were not a human product.

Mgr. Purdy thought that this was clear enough.

Bishop McAdoo suggested the Commission move to paragraph 6.

Fr. Tavad noted a transition from the Old Testament to the New.

Mr. Charley wondered if the whole paragraph were necessary.

Dean Chadwick felt it better that it went.

Bishop McAdoo agreed.

Bishop Butler defended the Old Testament stating that both Testaments were inspired and authoritative, but that they were not on the same level. He quoted Augustine "~~V~~etus patet in novo".

Bishop Moorman agreed; otherwise there would be no mention of the Old Testament.

Bishop McAdoo wanted to stress the covenant community.

Archbishop Arnott agreed.

Fr. Ryan thought that to re-work section two would be sufficient in this matter.

Fr. Yarnold asked that the sub-commission be allowed to think about the structure.

Bishop McAdoo then moved on to section seven.

Fr. Tavard noted that one could not be "inspired" in fidelity to Christ.

Fr. Ryan's problem was that the statement implied that the Old Testament was inspired in the same way as the Church.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that the Holy Spirit was present in different modes. There was further stress on the covenant community from several members of the commission.

Prof. Fairweather said that a reader would construe the Johannine promise of the Spirit leading the church into all truth as applying to the Old Testament.

Bishop Butler said that that was simply taking St John's gospel at a surface level. The Holy Spirit inspired the people of God in the Old Testament.

Prof. Fairweather still insisted that the readership would be misled.

Dr. Halliburton wished to see how sections 7 and 8 were connected. A sketch as to how authority in the Scriptures was appealed to would be of value.

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the implication that there was a parallel between the printed word and the Incarnate Word.

Bishop Butler saw certain parallels in the Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Fr. Tillard asked if this meant the written word.

Bishop McAdoo agreed with Bishop Butler. It was a question of Word with a capital 'W' and word with a small 'w'.

Mr Charley saw the actual authoritative record as the word of God.

Fr. Tavard warned against a rabbinic fundamentalism.

Bishop McAdoo saw the word as written and proclaimed

Fr. Ryan said that as "scripture" meant writings there was no problem. This was accepted.

Bishop McAdoo moved on to section 8. He reminded the commission that the last sentence was understood as a link.

Bishop Clark wanted authority to be mentioned in sentence three.

Dr. Gassmann felt that this was led on to.

Fr Tavad found difficulty in the ambiguity of the first sentence. He asked who was to judge faithfulness.

Bishop Butler quoted from Dei Verbum :chapter 2: 10
"The office of interpreting authentically the word of God, whether scriptural or traditional, has been entrusted exclusively to the living voice of the Church's magisterium, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ. This magisterium is not superior to the word of God, but ministers to the same word by teaching only what has been handed on to it, in so far as, by divine command and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, the magisterium devoutly hears, religiously keeps and faithfully explains the word, and from this one deposit of faith derives all those things which, it proposes to us for acceptance as divinely revealed."

Mr Charley Felt it better to say that the local church was influenced by its own tradition for good or bad. It was therefore necessary to judge one's own inheritance.

Dr. Gassmann thought that the idea of authority was to be seen in the proclamation and interpretation of the Word.

Fr Tillard wanted to know what was meant by the authority of scripture; the precise authority is not described.

Bishop McAadoo felt that the Vatican II teaching was acceptable; the scriptures were a norm and even a limiting factor.

Dean Chadwick had two stomach aches to share! In the first place the document did not recognise the scriptures as a source of historical information and should be used according to the normal canons of historical interpretation. In the second place the attitude to tradition was disparaging and unsophisticated. Scripture was the written tradition of the community and had been made the normative and constitutive element of the community. There was another sense of tradition; that of a particular tradition.

Fr Ryan said that Scripture was within Tradition. There was not enough said as to why the Scriptures were important; they were the inspired word of God. There were the prime fruits of the Spirit.

Fr. Tillard still put the question as to how the authority of the Scriptures was exercised. The word authority was he repeated, equivocal. There were at least three levels of authority; that of Congar, the Abbot and a rule.

Fr. Yarnold said that their subcommission had noted these points and would deal with them.

Bishop McAadoo thanked the subcommission and turned to the next report

31st August: 11.30 a.m.

Bishop Vogel introduced the Report of Sub-Commission II. He then outlined the sections of the Report (ARCIC 124/II/1). The first section outlined the meaning of koinonia. The second section described the manner in which authority was exercised. The third section indicated that faith was to be lived rather than as a propositional statement. The fourth section outlined the distinction between MUNUS and POTESTAS. The fifth section outlined the meaning of the CONSPIRATIO of the SENSUS FIDELIUM.

Bishop McAdoo invited general discussion.

Dr. Yarnold stated that koinonia was used as a self-evident term. He suggested the use of the term "christian koinonia".

Bishop Clark indicated that its use was the same as in the other agreed Statements.

Bishop Butler suggested that a footnote might protect the Commission from the philologists. He reminded the Commission of Alice in Wonderland; words can mean what you want them to mean. In the early church the term very soon came to mean the concrete embodiment of charity. It had been alleged that AGAPE was an equivalent term; the term communio is what was meant. In the final document this would have to be spelt out.

Fr. Ryan wished to see an explication of koinonia in terms of the worship of the transcendent God.

Dr. Gassmann contended that the reference to the Eucharist fulfilled this.

Bishop Butler noted a transition from the local Eucharistic Community to the Catholica. This double meaning of koinonia and its implications had not been brought out.

Bishop Vogel thought that collegiality had been dealt with in the Ministry Agreement.

Bishop McAdoo asked for detailed comments on paragraph 1.

Mr. Charley raised two points. His first point was the word "actualised" was not in fact true. He quoted the instance in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians of eating and drinking the Lord's body unworthily. His second point was a query as to what the word "interaction" meant in relation to gifts.

Bishop Vogel noted that the original text had read "realised" The text was meant to be understood as indicating God's action.

Dr. Gassmann stated that Julian Charley's point had run through the whole paper; that is to say the contrast between the ideal and historical empirical fact. An introductory sentence would make this clear.

Mr. Charley noted that "gifts" were not consequential to the love and service into which the Christian Community was called.

Fr. Tillard stated that the Sub-Commission had not intended the word "gifts" to be restricted to a narrow view. It had had a broader view of charismata.

Fr. Ryan enquired as to whether the Holy Spirit was not itself a gift.

Bishop Clark answered that it was.

Fr. Ryan thought that this section was too supernatural. He wanted a definition of the gifts of the Holy Spirit and indeed the whole realm of the humanum.

Bishop McAdoo asked if "a common sharing of the Spirit and His gifts", would meet that point.

Bishop Vogel commented that Fr. Ryan's point had been his. There was a need for an explanation of how koinonia related to persons.

Bishop Butler said that he would welcome a definition of the formal cause of the koinonia. He had been dissatisfied for some time with the notion of communio in Vatican II. The koinon grows out of the sharing of common gifts. It was the very climax of human experience; a system of intra-personal relationships. He also asked for the addition of the word "common" to the phrase "celebration of the Eucharist".

Bishop Vogel said that the paragraph was not descriptive.

Bishop Clark noted that "one" had been in the original version.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission to move to the next section.

Mr. Charley wanted the term "apostolic tradition" explained.

Bishop Clark explained that this was shorthand for the locus in which the Holy Spirit operates. This was spelt out in the Ministry Statement.

Bishop McAdoo noted that the three Statements would eventually go together.

Professor Scarisbrick questioned why, in the penultimate line, it appeared to be the Risen Lord who was the Giver of life; in contradistinction to the Nicene Creed.

Bishop Clark said that this was deliberate. What Christ gave to his community the Holy Spirit gives also.

Bishop McAdoo thought that this might be counter productive.

Dr. Yarnold suggested that the word author was inappropriate.

Fr. Tillard said that it was the Holy Spirit, who is the author of life, who is given.

Fr. Duprey commented that this was consonant with the Orthodox liturgical tradition.

Bishop McAdoo then invited discussion on section 3.

Fr. Duprey again raised the question of the equivocal nature of the word authority.

Fr. Tillard said that he understood that Sub-Commission I was to have made that distinction. There were three authorities; that from life, that from office and that from rule.

Bishop McAdoo considered that there was an essential link between authority and authenticity.

Mr. Charley was puzzled as to what a reader would understand by "everybody participates in this authority".

Bishop Vogel commented that it meant, "in the world".

Fr. Duprey said that each Christian possessed an intrinsic authority.

Bishop Butler added that when the man of the world met a Christian he was face to face with Christ.

Bishop McAdoo put an Irish gloss on this "the genuine article".

Mr. Charley questioned the work "witness"; to whom or what. This needed expanding.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Sub-Commission to look at this.

Dean Chadwick said that paragraph 3 gave him a golden feeling but he was not clear as to what was being said.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission to deal with section 4.

Father Duprey wanted the notion of "guiding" to be included in the MUNUS.

Bishop Clark was afraid of suggesting "guidelines".

Archbishop Arnott wanted the use of the word "Bishop" in the first paragraph.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed with this and added that he was worried about the word "Intervene". This had a too negative connotation.

Bishop McAdoo pleaded that the words "munus" and "potestas" might be avoided.

Dr. Gassmann said that some things could be transferred to a footnote, as was done with Transubstantiation, but that the terms ought to be preserved.

Bishop Clark suggested that the term intervention signified a major exercise of episcopate. Was there not a moment when intervention might be necessary?

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked then for a strengthening of its more positive aspect.

Fr. Ryan said that when a dispute arose a decision had to be made. Was it possible that this power might be expressed positively to promote the unity of the Church and give final discernment. He also thought that pastoral authority had a potestas.

Fr. Duprey stated that the term "potestas" was ambivalent. Potestas jurisdictionis was only one aspect. In the Orthodox Churches there was a potestas deriving from the sacraments; there was a need to be more precise.

Dean Chadwick commented that it was not so much a question of a quiescent charmer, not a "come on my boy", more a duty and a right of initiative to keep the unity of the Church.

Bishop Vogel said that the word "intervene" could be dropped.

Bishop Clark liked the word "duty" in this context.

Fr. Tillard stated that in Roman Catholic theology there was already a clear distinction between munus and potestas. Vatican II made clear that this was the case. The question was whether munus or potestas was first.

Mr. Charley asked for the deletion of the word "obedience".

Dr. Yarnold was against the use of the terms munus and potestas as it would appear as if what were being spoken about was an emergency situation only.

Dr. Halliburton, in replying to Archbishop Arnott's point, thought that in the first place obedience described an ideal situation, and in the second place it was wanted to state that what was said applied to the ordained ministry as a whole in its capacity of the discernment of doctrine.

Archbishop Arnott replied that he found the word "obedient" judgmental. If the word bishop was not used, then perhaps the term episcopate might be employed.

Fr. Ryan was against the use of technical terms. He indicated that old words "open a can of worms".

Bishop Butler argued that such a statement must be concrete. In the common tradition of the two Churches the terms bishop, priest and deacon could be used; otherwise the discussion will be thought to be up in the air.

Mr. Charley was still worried as to whether this statement was descriptive or prescriptive. This should be made clear.

Mgr. Purdy thought that Tom, Dick or Harry would be interested in a little more about section 4 and would be less happy about section 3. Authority was not used in anything like the same sense; he thought that the analogy strained language.

Bishop McAdoo replied that he saw it as authentic christian authority.

Bishop Moorman did not think that the word "authoritative" would read well. He asked the Sub-Commission to look at its phraseology.

Professor Scarisbrick wondered whether the term "focus of unity", as applied to a bishop, was a metaphor that could be sustained.

Bishop Clark suggested the term "organ".

Bishop McAdoo thought "an" organ.

Professor Scarisbrick said that that was a better description.

Bishop McAdoo at this point adjourned the meeting.

31st August: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop McAdoo opened the discussion on the last paragraph of Sub-Commission II's first draft (ARCIC 124/II/1).

Bishop Butler stated that not only discernment but also definition of that discernment was required to be dealt with at some stage.

Dr. Gassmann said that it was dealt with.

Bishop Butler said that it was not exclusively of bishops.

Archbishop Arnott disliked the word "interaction" as jargon.

Bishop Clark asked ^{if} there was another word.

Bishop McAdoo thought that the concept was right. Fr. Ryan was happy with the term. It did deal with the tradition of the Latin church's teaching office of the Bishop. There was, however, a time in the West when this did not exclusively appertain to the episcopate.

Bishop Butler felt that discernment was too mental. He wanted to cover the public expression of authority.

Fr. Ryan said that discernment was an act of corporate judgment in dialogue, a decision-making process, the word was used in its ascetical sense.

Bishop Butler said that it needed, in that case, an English gloss.

Dr. Yarnold was unclear as to where the second way started. As it was put in sections 1 and 2 the interaction was good but in the last section there was no definitive point of authority.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that there was a matter of principle and substance here. There were two stages, interaction and discernment, in which the whole Church was involved by mutual consultation. At some point however a decision must be made; that was the responsibility of the bishop.

Fr. Tillard agreed with this but wished to stress that the role of the laity was more than consultation; they too had discernment of the mind of Christ.

Mr. Duprey said that "the discernment of spirits" was not a matter of speculative truth; it was rather a judgment of the spirit and certainly not abstract.

Bishop Clark thought that Bishop Butler's point had not been answered.

Fr. Ryan pointed out the equivocal nature of authority once again. He reminded the Commission of a certain holy woman who brought the Pope back from Avignon to Rome. Here was a different kind of authority.

Fr. Tillard said that the Sub-Commission had tried to explain these two kinds of authority.

Bishop Clark asked the members of the Commission if the paper had managed to get across the idea of the conspiratio and sensus fidelium.

Bishop Butler saw the difference of emphasis in East and West in the notion of conciliar authority.

Mr. Charley asked if it were true. He cited Athanasius contra mundum.

Dean Chadwick said that Newman had thought that the sensus fidelium had saved the church when the whole episcopate was virtually Arian. He declined to comment on whether he thought Newman was right.

Dr. Halliburton said that all levels of Christian life were involved in the conspiratio; not only theology but also morals, piety and religious feeling.

Fr. Tillard added that theologians also reflect and criticise.

Bishop Moorman was afraid that evaluation would take place at the lowest level.

Dean Chadwick said that it was a two-way process; there was a duty of the whole body to support the ministry of the Church.

Dr. Gassmann commented that there was a continuous critical discernment at all levels and that this was done mutually. He wondered whether there was an end to this process.

Fr. Tillard said that it was an unending process.

Bishop Butler indicated that it could look as though those with a teaching mandate had only to take full account of their contemporaries. This would be a kind of ecclesiastical Gallup poll. Those with episcopate had also to look at tradition to judge and evaluate the contemporary mind; it was a sort of democracy but one which gave a vote to the dead, that is all the faithful down the ages.

Dean Chadwick thought that the process of mutual evaluation and control was a check upon idiosyncrasies in an individual or community.

Bishop McAdoo saw the Scriptures, Creeds and Councils as a check on contemporary teaching.

Dean Chadwick added the feet of the congregation too.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher questioned the word conspiratio.

Fr. Tillard said that the word was not necessary to the text.

Mr. Charley asked what "a search for fidelity" was in relation to the Gospel. He was also unhappy with the term "discipline". How could freedom and discipline go together?

Bishop McAdoo thought of the phrase from Romans "The law of Jesus Christ made you free".

Mr. Charley felt that the original phrase was too loose.

Fr. Tillard said that the original word had been "rule".

Bishop Vogel asked the Commission to accept the word "interaction".

Bishop McAdoo then handed over the chairmanship to Bishop Clark for discussion of Sub-Commission III's Report.

31st August: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark invited Professor Fairweather to introduce Sub-Commission III's draft (ARCIC 124/III/1).

Professor Fairweather commented that in the production of their draft one member had put his ideas down on paper, Fr. Ryan, and the line of thought had been continued. He said that there were three sections: the first was an existential introduction, the second was historical, the third an evaluation of Creeds and Councils.

Bishop Clark opened the discussion for general comment.

Dr. Yarnold asked what was still to come.

Dean Chadwick said that he did not know. The paper was as far as the Sub-Commission's thinking had gone. There was no paragraph on Ecumenical Councils, or the See of Rome.

Fr. Tavard asked if it was intentional that the local church had a neuter gender but the universal church a feminine one.

Professor Fairweather admitted the need, at some time, to deal with the *sensus fidelium*. The Sub-Commission had not emphasised the Bishop as speaking for his Church. The treatment of the origins of the Roman Primacy was a starting point.

Bishop Butler had the slight impression that the draft had come to concentrate on authority within the church as articulating faith. There was a wide area of authority outside matters of faith. He also wanted Fr. Duprey's point of the different levels of the exercise of the Roman Primacy, to be mentioned.

Dean Chadwick wondered if the notion of the growth of authority from the local to universal had not been sufficiently stressed. He mentioned the levels of authority to be found in the progression of Metropolitans, Primate, Patriarchs and the Apostolic Sees. The location of authority in the great Sees was, he pointed out, chronologically prior to the conciliar system. He wanted to know just how much more history ought to be put in the draft.

Fr. Tavard first wished to have a description of the Community of Faith and secondly a theological interpretation of authority.

Professor Fairweather conceded that this might be brought out.

Fr. Tavard wished to see a normative description of authority.

Bishop Vogel congratulated the Sub-Commission on easier reading matter than the other Sub-Commissions'. He did however want the problematic of authority to be described; an introduction might be given into this area.

Dr. Gassmann wanted to know whether the draft was descriptive history or an introduction as to how authority should be exercised.

Bishop McAdoo felt that the question of how should the Christian recognise that which was authentic, was fair.

Dean Chadwick said "I think so, sir!"

Fr. Tillard asked why the Commission could not describe the authority of the Pope; this must not be brushed under the carpet. The Commission must mention its partial agreement and disagreement.

Fr. Ryan welcomed the description of the evolution of the permanent institutions of doctrinal authority and the description of the exercise of those institutions. He wanted to see just how this all happened. The Commission should say as much as it was possible in common. Infallibility and indefectibility of the whole Church might be a context in which the primacy of the Roman See and the Pontifical magisterium might be seen.

Bishop McAdoo thought that it was very important to state the strength and depth of agreement.

Fr. Duprey wished to concentrate on the doctrinal aspects of authority. A change had taken place in Roman Catholic theology; the notion of revelation in Scripture and through tradition was more inclusive. It now owed more to real life; the mentality of the nineteenth century, with its static concept of faith, having given way to a dynamic concept. Magisterium and Infallibility were now being thought of in terms of "discernment". There was a desire to look at the life of the Church. Infallibility was a consequence of pastoral authority. The latter was a function of the whole Church. The problem was to find the real differences and concentrate upon them and to discover the sources of misunderstanding.

Bishop DuLor sympathised with Fr. Tillard and Fr. Duprey; he too held that the Commission must go on to the position of the Bishop of Rome. This was not the sole difficult however. There was another which had slipped between sections 2 and 3. This problem was that of the identification and real nature of the "communio". The communio in the first five centuries was literally unbreakable; he quoted St. Cyprian's dictum that the communio was undivided and indivisible. This was not mere empirical fact. The question was whether that notion of the unity of the Church was obsolete. The Commission must pay attention to that question. He cited the problem of knowing that the Arians were wrong; how was it known that the catholica was right vis a vis Nestorius. How did we know that the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus I and Chalcedon were orthodox but that Ephesus II was not. The problem of the primitive unbreakability of the communio must be taken seriously.

Bishop Butler said that he would be sorry to lose a historical approach. There was a distinction between description and prescription; but if the church was the community of the Holy Spirit then it will display in its history the characteristics of the MYSTERION. There was a parallel here with Jesus.

Mr Charley valued this historical account. History, he said, explains this "out-working". Yet what of the 16th century? There the situation was so complicated as to make the proposition meaningless.

Bishop Butler admitted that the history of the 16th century was a problem. He noted that Newman had not thought that history proved anything in detail; rather it gave broad outlines.

Mr Charley said that his problem was that he would see the finger of God in different places.

Bishop Butler stated that what was important was not where he or Julian Charley saw it but where the community saw it.

Fr. Tillard protested that the community was split.

Dr Halliburton echoed that the question was what happened when the community was broken.

Bishop Clark welcomed the draft; it was a background from which to go on to more difficult questions. How was the commission now to proceed he enquired.

Bishop Vogel invited the Dean of Christ Church to think out aloud.

Dean Chadwick gave an Anglican 'gut' reaction. He felt no problem over primacy; there was a difference over a primacy based upon Matthew 16.17-19. The latin West saw the primacy in one See. This was not so for the Greek Fathers. It was prudent of a pope in 519 to restore communion with the Christian East. This was not done, however, upon the foundation of the Petrine texts. He thought that the Lutheran documents were important. The question of the papacy as de iure divino or de iure humano was not a useful one.

On the question of infallibility the Dean suggested that the notion of "authentic Christianity" lay behind such a claim. There would have to be an evaluation of the emergence of Councils and Apostolic Sees. Yet for an Anglican, "Councils may err".

Dr Gassmann thought that the other groups also ought to look at these questions.

Bishop Vogel simply asked sub-commission III to produce a schema.

Bishop Butler indicated that the first two groups should still re-write their drafts, as these could be a foundation for further work.

Bishop Clark wondered if it were not possible to go a little further. He invited the commission to indicate in which direction it wished to go.

Mr Charley considered that sub-commission I's work was important.

Bishop Moorman felt that sub-commission III ought to be told whether they were re-drafting or producing something new.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested that the commission accept the document and ask for a further schera.

Archbishop Arnott and Fr. Ryan both agreed.

Dr Yarnold thought that sub-commission I would look at the second part of its draft again.

Fr. Tillard stressed that it was important that some more work was done on the nature of authority.

Mr Charley added that a treatment of authority in the Scriptures would be valuable.

Dr Gassmann wished to see some treatment of the whole problem of authority. The commission should not try to settle a status quo; rather it should try to help a serious problem.

Bishop Butler pointed out that that was not the job of the commission. That was rather to state a common faith about authority.

Dr. Gassmann did not intend to suggest that^a solution should be offered to the world's problems; rather an awareness of them.

Fr Duprey said that it was difficult to work without a background.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher held that a treatment of the context of authority in the modern world was matter for the co-chairmen's preface.

Dean Chadwick felt that the commission could hardly be expected to sort out all the problems of authority. He warned that much of the traditional language suggested the authoritarianism of the High Middle Ages. He could not avoid affirming that to follow Jesus in his community was to affirm an authority. The problem was that there was division by an agreement about the nature of authority; the two churches shared common pre-suppositions. Part of the problem was that they shared so much.

Fr Yarnold felt that there was little point in polishing the document but to go on to where it led on to.

Bishop Butler asked if this was the meaning of authority.

Bishop Clark answered in the affirmative.

Dr Halliburton was anxious to treat "authority" as the commission had treated "ministry". It was possible to look at how authority was worked out in the New Testament.

Bishop Butler felt that to treat authority in the New Testament was beyond them.

Fr Yarnold asked if it was the view of the commission that the sub-commissions should start afresh.

Bishop Clark indicated that an introductory definition on authority would be the right approach. At this stage he adjourned the meeting.

2nd September 1974 9.30.a.m.

Bishop McAdoe opened the meeting from the chair on the second draft of sub-commission II (ARCIC 124/II/2)

Mgr Purdy had wished it were more readable. He felt that the use of language was rather strained.

Mr Charley commented that the second draft had not the effective style of the former draft. He felt there was too much verbiage.

Bishop Butler doubted that the document would form part of a statement; the important issue was its content. He pointed out the dual nature of the koinonia. It was always locally rooted, and yet it was as universal as the proclamation of the Word of God.

Fr. Duprey did not feel that there was enough stress on the fact that it is because there is a communion with God that there is koinonia with others. He cited I John.

Bishop Butler said that, also in I John, there was a notion that unless there was human koinonia there could be no koinonia with God. If one left the koinonia one left God - but the converse was also true.

Bishop Clark stated that the commission had asked for a description of the koinonia.

Fr. Yarnold took up this point again and requested "Christian koinonia".

Bishop McAdoe reminded the commission of St. Paul's teaching that Christians pass from death to life because they loved the brethren.

Bishop Butler took up the mention of love by stating that in a relationship of wholeness the heart of the koinonia was the adoration of God. This was beyond conceptualisation. He mentioned the description of Fr. Cowburn; a cosmic love, of beauty and nature, and an ecstatic love because of what a person is. He would have liked to have seen a stronger stress on adoration.

Bishop McAdoo moved to the second paragraph.

Dr. Yarnold noted again the absence of a distinction between the universal and the local koinonia.

Mr. Charley was still unhappy with the words "participates in authority".

Bishop Vogel said that this meant that Christ lives through the people.

Mr. Charley remained unclear.

Bishop McAdoo thought that there must be a link between authority and authenticity. This was made in paragraph 3.

Mr. Charley felt that "authority" suggested "authority-over".

Fr. Tavard saw this as saying that Christians exercise an authority to speak in the name of God in the world.

Dean Chadwick felt that the latter did not come out; perhaps a change of order would be in order. He was also unhappy with a "witness at the basis".

Bishop Clark stated that the sub-commission had been trying to make the point that any other authority was subsequent.

Bishop McAdoo moved to section 4.

Archbishop Arnott felt that there was a discontinuity from the previous section. He still wanted to avoid the word "intervene".

Fr. Tavard said that it was difficult to talk of the power of the bishop without it.

Bishop Butler suggested that, "particular power to act", would make the point.

Bishop Clark felt that "intervene" was an appropriate description of how a bishop exercises his authority.

Mr. Charley said that the Pastoral Epistles made example important.

Bishop Clark said that there was the problem of the Borgia Popes.

Mr. Charley agreed that there was the problem.

Bishop Butler said that what was being talked about was mandated authority; the quality of a man was most important but did not enter into in qua mandated authority.

Fr. Tavard said that in the Pastorals part of the mandated authority was to be an example.

Bishop Butler withdrew his point.

Fr. Yarnold wished to see something about charismatic ministries; the prophet had not been dealt with.

Bishop Butler said that all good Christians were expressions of authority, that was authoritative living.

Dr. Halliburton warned against attempt to describe all Christian ministries.

Bishop McAdoo moved the discussion on to section 5.

Bishop Butler suggested that "continuous" might be better than than "on-going".

Professor Scarisbrick wished for some treatment of a third way of discernment; the Holy Spirit in persons outside the Church. The document before the Commission was a little ad intra.

Dr. Gassmann warned against talking about the work of the Spirit outside the Church.

Professor Scarisbrick felt that the Church owed much to those outside the Church.

Archbishop Arnott mentioned the parallel of Cyrus in the Old Testament.

Bishop McAdoo mentioned the Cambridge Platonists.

Bishop Butler pointed out that the interaction within the Commission was the mandate given to the sub-commission.

Mr. Charley was worried about an over-focus on koinonia.

Bishop Clark said that it was necessary to use one model at a time.

Bishop McAdoo felt that koinonia was a common denominator running through all the biblical models.

Mr. Charley felt that this was the strength of the biblical models; their wide variety.

Bishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to move to Sub-Commission I's draft 2 (ARCIC 124/I/2).

Dr. Yarnold noted that sections 1 to 4 was a general introduction, sections 5-8 had not been much changed from draft 1, and sections 9-11 was a reworking of the authority of scripture.

Bishop McAdoo opened the general discussion. There was comment on the need for headings.

Bishop Clark found this draft clearer.

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the dragging in of the world. It was important not to give the impression of dreaming scholars trying to change the world.

Dr. Gassmann said that there was a crisis of authority within the Churches and that this was not irrelevant to the crisis of authority in the world; this was true since Vatican II in the Roman Catholic Church.

Fr. Tillard said that it was not simply a matter of one church changing. He thought that there was a crisis of authority for Anglicans too.

Dean Chadwick said that some Anglicans thought so as well. He urged that the details of the draft be not overmuch criticised; it was to be used as a spring-board.

Bishop Butler, who had composed the introduction, felt that there would be a contrast between the Eucharist and Ministry statements on the one hand, and between a future statement on authority on the other. In the case of the former both churches had concrete realities which could be described. Authority however was an abstract. There would have to be a different style of approach. Equally the Eucharist and Ministry were esoteric; authority was a matter of concern for all in the Western world.

Dean Chadwick suggested that sections 1-4 be not discussed in detail as there would not be a general treatise on authority in the final document.

Dr. Gassmann thought that the sections ought to be examined, though substance was the important thing; the Commission was not drafting.

Dean Chadwick wished to avoid the word "authoritative". He also felt that one could have a dialogue with a document; all books on ethics were in dialogue with Aristotle's Ethics.

Bishop Butler felt that there was a real difference between exegesis and hermeneutics. If a document came from a totally different culture both were required. A living person can modify their views.

Fr. Tavard was unhappy as he held that the Bible as a document had no authority till one heard the Word of God through it. He was also unhappy about the suggestion of inspiration theories.

Mr. Charley noted that living persons could be ambiguous as well as documents.

Fr. Tillard disliked the mention of "intrinsic".

Dean Chadwick suggested "inherent".

Fr. Duprey asked if the word mandate signified "appointed for a function".

Dr. Gassmann questioned whether the word "incapable" meant a lack of capability or authority.

Bishop Butler answered this in terms of something given which was not there before.

Dean Chadwick was worried at the ambiguity in the word "document"; this could have a legal ring in Tertullian's sense of "instrumentum".

2nd September: 11.30

Bishop McAdoo invited discussion upon sections 6 - 11 of Sub-Commission I's Second Draft (ARCIC 124/I/2).

Dr. Halliburton commented that the impression was of a simple call of Moses; it should rather be that God calls his people through Moses.

Bishop Vogel felt that the idea of fellowship with others was left out of section 5.

Dr. Halliburton felt that the Sub-Commission had not made it sufficiently clear that God calls all people.

Fr. Tavard noted that in section 7 the reference in Hebrews was to faithfulness and not to appointment.

Fr. Tillard was still unhappy about the use of Moses as a model for Jesus.

Bishop Vogel agreed with this; there were several models for the messianic theme and to choose one would give a false picture.

Dr. Gagermann felt that the authority of Jesus was altogether different from that of Moses.

Mr. Stanley insisted that if the Scriptures were to be used then the Old Testament ought to be dealt with.

Fr. Tillard still wondered why Moses was chosen.

Bishop Butler was afraid that he detected a Marcionite strain in the Commission! There was a parallel with the Old Testament in God's selection and empowering of leaders of the community.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher was in favour of the link with the Covenant of Mt. Sinai.

Fr. Tavard asked that if Moses were to stay that the stress should be rather on his involvement in the Exodus and pastoral mystery than his appointment.

Dean Chadwick suggested Hebrews 1.1 would be a suitable way of including reference to the Old Testament.

Bishop Vogel felt that a mention of Moses rather than a paragraph would be appropriate.

Fr. Tillard wished to stress that during the earthly life of Jesus authority was attributed to the Father.

Bishop Butler suggested the amendment of "with an authority received from his Father".

Dean Chadwick asked for the removal of "an" to avoid misunderstanding. This was agreed.

Fr. Tavad stressed that the teaching of Jesus was authenticated by his authority and not the other way round. He warned the Commission against quoting the Bible without careful investigation.

Fr. Tillard again stressed that the lordship of Christ was directly derived from his resurrection.

Bishop Butler noted that there were two ways of talking about the resurrection in the New Testament; in one it was an act of Jesus, in another it was an act of God.

Professor Scarisbrick proposed "in a unique way" for line 7. This was accepted.

Bishop Vogel was worried about the suggestion that Pentecost was the birthday of the Church.

Bishop Butler proposed "full being" for line 10.

Fr. Tavad asked for the removal of "Israel of God" as there was no mention of Pentecost in the Galatians reference.

Bishop McAdoo proposed that the Commission move on to section 8.

Dr. Yarnold, in response to several requests, summarised the logic of sections 6 - 7.

Dr. Halliburton was unhappy with this logic. The theme of these sections was the relationship of God to a person in the Old and New Testaments; then of God to a community in the Old and New Testaments. He felt that the relationship of God to the community was primary.

Fr. Tavad saw a confusion of where the authoritative voice of Christ was seen in the Scriptures and where it was seen in the ministry of the Church.

Dr. Yarnold, in section 8, had two problems. The first problem was the question of how much emphasis was to be put upon "tradition has an authority". The second problem was that the interpretation of Scripture was not just a matter of exegesis but also of hermeneutics.

Fr. Tavad said that there was a sense in which all was not yet fulfilled; he wanted to see an eschatological emphasis.

Dean Chadwick, with Fr. Tillard, was unhappy with the last sentence of section 8, as it suggested the *ipsisima verba* of Christ; the word authentic condescended to pay the Lord a compliment.

Bishop Clark was unhappy at the suggestion that the apostolic tradition appeared to equal the manner in which the teaching of the apostolic community became recorded in the Scriptures. He wanted to say that the Apostolic Tradition continued to this day.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher stated that this was why the Sub-Commission had put in the word "early".

Dean Chadwick noted the equivocal use of the term and suggested the word "witness" as better.

Bishop Butler replied that he felt there was a theological difference here. The Apostolic Tradition lived on in the Church to the end of history.

Bishop McAdoo asked if there were not a distinction between the Apostolic Tradition before and after the formation of the Canon.

Fr. Tillard commented that the mind of Christ was seen in the first step of the Apostolic Tradition, that is the Canon, which had the value of a permanent norm. Thus there were two levels within the Apostolic Tradition.

Dr. Yarnold then asked if obedience were only required to the early tradition.

Dean Chadwick felt that there was an ambiguity here.

Bishop McAdoo moved on the section 10 whilst asking the Sub-Commission to look again at section 9. He asked if inspired record exhausted the term Scriptures.

The Commission moved on to section 11.

Dean Chadwick, in line 5, asked for a qualification of the acceptance of the conclusions of the magisterium.

Fr. Tillard was emphatic that some conclusions were not accepted.

Dean Chadwick was also worried about the reference to scholars. He had in mind Knox's picture of scholars running cap in hand for the latest edition of J.T.S. like investors for the evening paper.

Mr. Charley felt that the problem of the unequal value of the Scriptures had not been sufficiently dealt with.

Bishop Clark felt that "general Christian tradition" was a weak phrase.

Dr. Gassmann detected a static picture of the work of scholars; it was rather an interaction.

Fr. Duprey wished for the word "discernment" to be used.

Mr. Charley asked whether the Sub-Commission had done justice to the subject.

Bishop Butler noted that the Commission ought to tackle the old problem of revelation and its source, or sources, at some stage.

Mr. Charley felt that the Sub-Commission had been trying to say something positive rather than raise the problem in old terms.

Fr. Duprey noted that the issue was not closed by Vatican II.

Dr. Yarnold asked for more about tradition.

Dean Chadwick felt that there had been an important omission; this was the question of liturgy as a *lex credendi*. This was perhaps/more important influence that anything else.

Bishop McAdoo adjourned the session.

2nd September: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the Second Draft of Sub-Commission III. (ARCIC 124/III/2).

Dean Chadwick prefaced his introduction of the work of Sub-Commission III with the recommendation that there were two areas of study with insufficient material available for the Commission to be productive. The two areas were (a) a historical and theological study of jurisdiction and (b) the concept of a hierarchy of truths. He stressed that the five documents comprising the work of Sub-Commission III were essentially "fly-sheets". He introduced the five sections of the Sub-Commission's work:

1. A Treatment of Indefectibility and Infallibility; certain points were picked up from Venice.
2. This dealt with the unity and diversity of the Primacy.
3. This dealt with the Roman Primacy - the principal problem involved with the question of Authority.
4. This was contributed by the Bishops of Ripon and Ossory and asked what was the nature of assent for *Communicatio in Sacris*.
5. This last section comprised two questions by Fr. Duprey addressed to both Anglicans and Roman Catholics.

Dean Chadwick noted that Fr. Ryan had presented his own paper to the Sub-Commission raising the question as to whether Papal Infallibility was really a *misnomer*.

There were several questions here:

What papal discussions ranked as infallible.

Did papal infallibility mean more than confidence and loyalty?

Did not the Vatican I understanding of Papal Infallibility restrict both truth and faith to propositional terms?

What juridical authority had the Decree *Pastor Eternus*?

Was it to be accepted that Matthew 16 was the ground for the papal claims; were the Greek Fathers to be anathematised for not accepting this?

What was the status of the Marian claims?

Dr. Gassmann on the question of the indefectibility of a Church asked what kind of Church it was which did not fail?

Mr. Charley asked if certain Churches did not cease to be.

Dr. Halliburton wondered if Church here was equivalent to koinonia.

Fr. Tillard noted that after the reform both sides denied the reality of the Church in their opponents.

Bishop Clark felt that the term "authentic Christianity" was of value. The Church would remain in the truth.

Bishop Butler sensed a circular argument here. The paper claimed that the Church would survive and be an authentic witness to Christ. It avoided, however, specifying the subject denoted by the term "Church". The Commission must indicate what it meant by "Church".

Fr. Tavard noted that entire local Churches had been in error. There was a difference between the universal Church and the local Church. Even a local Church in error was still a Church. The holiness of the Church was not an ethical quality.

Bishop Clark asked how far the Church was maintained in the truth.

Bishop Butler whilst feeling that the paper was very valuable, still thought that the basic question had not been faced. How far can co-existence take place with different conceptions of the nature of the Church? Antiquity stated, that the Church was ~~own~~. Tycon, Bishop Butler thought, was unique in teaching that the Church was divisible. St. Augustine's attitude was interesting here; he was most anxious to heal the Donatist Schism. The Church of the present day relied on the Church of the second century for a consensus on the documents of the New Testament Canon; why then not too on the issue of Koinonia?

Professor Fairweather felt that the notion of the Church as a visible community would have to be faced sooner or later but that doctrinal authority could be discussed before it.

Bishop Butler explained that his question was not so much where the Church was to be found, but rather what sort of a thing was to be looked for. Provided the question was not evaded, it was not of great consequence when it was raised.

Bishop McAdoo reminded the Commission that at Venice Apostolic Faith, Sacraments, and Ministry constituted the Church. He wanted the notion of "subsistence" to be investigated. Vatican II had not taught that there was a plurality of Churches; was it the case that there was fragmented presence of the true Church?

Dr. Halliburton sympathised with this view. He pointed out the problem of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. In the Early Church there had been an unbroken koinonia, and yet there was a broken koinonia now, even with the recognition of full ecclesial reality.

Fr. Duprey noted that the teaching of Vatican II used the term "subsistit in". Thus the Orthodox Church was a true Church. The criterion of judgment found in the papal brief to Athenagoras was that of sacraments and ministry. This then was a possible way forward for the Commission.

Dr. Gassmann insisted that the true Church was to be found in all Christian communities; it was a "mixtum compositum". The Church does not fail and yet it has failed.

Bishop Clark noted that the koinonia had been broken over matters of faith. It was therefore necessary to put this right first.

Fr. Tavard said that there were two levels here. There was no ideal Church; even in a time of I John de facto, there was a divided Christianity and yet the Church was still the sign of salvation.

Dr. Yarnold wished to see the nature of religious faith outlined in the terms of Kung and Rahner i.e. the avoidance of equating faith with a conceptual proposition.

Dean Chadwick asked if the Commission felt that the Sub-Commission had dealt with the question on the right lines.

Fr. Tavard noted that it would be difficult to put the work of Sub-Commission III with the other papers.

Fr. Duprey thought that this was of no matter, as a final document on Authority was not yet in sight.

Bishop Butler wondered whether it was the attempt to exercise papal claims which was the cause of the problem;

it was seen as trying to interfere.

Archbishop Arnott agreed with this. Some Anglicans were willing to accept a primacy of the Roman See but insisted that Anglicanism rejected an immediate jurisdiction.

Professor Fairweather admitted that some Anglicans had spoken of a hypothetical primacy but with the classical Anglican Divines the 'de facto' existing primacy was rejected.

Dr. Gassmann wished to know whether the split had been caused by the rejection of papal claims or a breach in faith.

Fr. Tavard noted that there was a difference in the teaching about the Roman primacy between Vatican I and II.

Bishop Butler preferred the thought of an absterion from affirming the Roman primacy rather than its rejection.

Professor Scarisbrick was unhappy at the suggestion of the existence of the Church of England before the breach with Rome. The breach constituted a Church of England. The Church of England had always admitted the legitimacy of the Roman Church. The independence of the Church of England was a peculiar affirmation of the English Reformation.

Bishop Moorman stated that the term "Ecclesia Anglicanae" was certainly pre-Reformation and that it was certainly regarded as in some sense a "local church".

Professor Scarisbrick whilst admitting the term said that this was not in separation from Rome.

Bishop Butler noted that the Roman See was widely regarded as both a focal point and organ of unity in the Early Church.

Archbishop Arnott thought that Cyprian was relevant here.

Dean Chadwick agreed with Bishop Butler that there was wide recognition of the Roman See as the focal point of unity. He cited Tertullian, Ambrose and certain of the Greek Fathers. In spite of this wide recognition there were places where Rome was not regarded, for example North Africa and Palestine.

Fr. Tavard asked if Canon 28 of Chalcedon was not a political one.

Mr. Charley asked if the "is" on the ninth line of the second page of the section on the Roman primacy referred to past or present or was a dogmatic statement.

Professor Fairweather indicated that it was descriptive of the Early Church.

Dean Chadwick said that the 16th century Reformation was the affirmation of the Lordship of Christ over his Church. This, however, did not mean the rejection of all external authority.

Mr. Charley felt that a change in the notion of primacy would be difficult. It would be primacy only in a watered-down form. Even so many Anglicans could not slip into this notion of primacy.

Mr. Purdy felt that what the Commission was trying to say was that it was not committed to rejecting a primacy.

Professor Fairweather noted that, on the positive side, the Commission was not committed to a purely historical or political primacy either.

Bishop Butler felt encouraged by the "talks about talks" in which all the major Churches in Gt. Britain were involved at the present time at the invitation of the United Reformed Church. Was it necessary, he asked, when thinking about the visible unity of the Church to conceive a monolithic juridical structure. A complete fusion was not necessary. The notion of a sister church helps here. He wanted to stress that inter-communication was not enough. There was some need for an overarching link. He cited the example of the Roman Catholic body in England; this was comprised of several distinct rites. There was the Ukrainian rite as well as the Latin rite and these were not juridically fused. There was one Church and an acknowledgement of a primacy.

Professor Fairweather noted that the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue in the United States had stated just this need for a focal point. This was paralleled by the W.C.C. Faith and Order Conference at Accra where the need for a centre of unity for local Churches was strongly felt.

Bishop McAdoo felt strongly that unity by stages was the best way forward. The first stage might be inter-communication without a specific acknowledgement of the primacy; as was suggested in the Lutheran Statements.

Bishop Clark asked whether the Pope was as it were a question of order or faith and whether the function of a Pope was of the esse of the Church.

Bishop McAdoo said that just as there was limited communion with the Orthodox, without a specific acknowledgement of the papal claims, so why not with Anglicans.

Fr. Tillard stated that there was too much emphasis on Primacy. This was important but not the main point. He thought that the problem of Peter could only be seen properly in the context of the Eucharist and Ministry. He felt that the main problem was the validity of the Anglican Ministry.

Bishop Clark stated that the brief of the Commission was to look at Authority.

Fr. Tillard stated that there were two levels at which the problem of Authority could be investigated; that of theology and of practice.

Mr. Charley felt that the problem of Authority could not be exhausted in terms of Ministry and Eucharist.

Fr. Tillard still felt that this was the area of most importance.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher in answer to Bishop Clark's questions said that he could not answer the first point, as to whether the problem of the Pope was a matter of faith or order, but as to the second he felt that the papacy was not of the absolute "esse" of the Church.

Fr. Duprey noted that the Roman Catholic Church had "almost Full Communion" with the Orthodox. An agreement on Faith and Ministry raised the question of Authority.

Bishop Butler had a vision of a future Communion, a united Church of the future. As for the present in spite of the plea for recognition of Orders and Inter-Communion the vast mass of the faithful were not yet thinking along these lines. He mused upon the fact that if Archbishop X had been in another cradle he might have been at Canterbury and vice versa. The matter of unity was not just a question of intellectual judgment.

Fr. Duprey noted that the spirit required was that of a John Chrysostom who went to Arian Church in an effort to understand the spirituality of his opponents.

Professor Fairweather wished to encourage the idea of unity in stages. An immediate problem was the method to be approached in dealing with the twin anathemas of Pastor Eternus. The first anathematising those who reject a Petrine Primacy upon a Matthaean basis; the second upon those who reject an 'immediate' papal jurisdiction.

Fr. Tavard noted that he was anathematised!

Dr. Yarnold endorsed the Dean's request for further study on Pastor Eternus. He wanted to know what the dogmatic value of Iure Divino was. In 1870 there was a clear-cut rejection of a Primacy of Honour rather than Jurisdiction but what did a Primacy of Service mean for today? Between Iure Divino and Iure Humano was the term Divina Providencia, a useful concept for the action of the Holy Spirit within the Church.

Dr. Gassmann was unhappy at the methodology used here. Was the Commission attempting to get a minimising interpretation from the Roman Catholic point of view and a maximising interpretation from the Anglican one? He pleaded for an attempt to go beyond the status quo of 1870 or Vatican II. He cited the example of the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue in the United States.

Professor Fairweather noted a Eucharistic "exchange" between Dutch Old Catholics and Roman Catholics in Rotterdam. In answer to Dr. Gassmann he replied that minimising and maximising interpretations were not intended to be political. The question was, was there a movement in Roman Catholic theology and ought there to be a movement in Anglican theology.

Fr. Tavard noted that the background material to the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue would be published in the autumn.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to look at the Note by the Bishops of Ripon and Ossory.

Bishop McAdoo stated that here were the standard Anglican objections.

Bishop Butler noted a Lambeth note in "As it is commonly understood today". He wanted a precise exegesis of Vatican I. He noted also the recent emphasis in Roman Catholic theology which made clear that a doctrinal formula was contingent; the reality behind the formula was that which was permanent. The Vatican I approach was essentially juridical. Language and thought forms had much changed; doctrinal statements were true in their own context.

Dean Chadwick said there was a parallel here in the exegesis of a doctrinal statement such as that which had come from the Council of Chalcedon.

Mgr. Purdy hoped, very sincerely, that the Church would not have to wait until all understood Pastor Eternus in the same way. He felt that the maximising and minimising question was an important one; it might well be that such an approach could speed up mutual understanding.

Bishop McAdoo asked if the 'Hierarchy of Truths' was relevant here.

Professor Fairweather felt that little thought had been given to this in the Anglican Church. De facto any Anglican thought would sound 'minimising' in the terms of Pastor Eternus.

Mr. Charley felt that a gesture was required from the Papacy; without this the bulk of Anglicans would be against Inter-Communion.

Professor Scarisbrick also held that there would be many fears on the Roman side as well.

Dean Chadwick disagreed with Mr. Charley.

Bishop Butler, avoiding the term 'bulk', thought that there would be large elements on both sides holding back. There was a pastoral and episcopal problem here. On the other side there were those who wished to say, "come what may we are going to communicate".

Fr. Tillard insisted that this must be reciprocal and to this Bishop Butler agreed.

Bishop Clark suggested that debate was adjourned till the evening. This was agreed.

Dean Chadwick adding a postscript in answering an affirmative to Fr. Duprey's two questions.

2nd September: 8.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark invited opinion on the two questions asked by Fr. Duprey (ARCIC 124/III/2).

Archbishop Arnott noted that the Anglican Churches had an autonomy.

Dr. Yarnold stressed that doctrinal criticisms were not a question of consensus.

Bishop Butler was happy with the Statement. He saw two questions to be answered. Was there in the Church at large at present a consensus of opinion on the Primacy? Would there be in the Church of the future such a consensus?

Mr. Charley found the phrase "freely accepted as binding" difficult to understand.

Mgr. Purdy suggested the phrase "ought there to be".

Bishop Moorman returned to the question of what the Church was. He suggested the phrase "could there be in a united Church".

Professor Scarisbrick echoed this point; he asked if one expected to find an authority in a future Church.

Dean Chadwick said that an Anglican would wish to submit himself to the Universal Church. At present the Anglican Church had a highly diverse authority. He also noted that Anglicans are schooled to accept a judgment with reasoning.

Dr. Gassmann also preferred the word "ought".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher felt that this must mean a future Church but wondered if this were too abstract.

Dean Chadwick felt that the Venice Papers had already stated this.

Bishop Butler, in an autobiographical moment, told the Commission that he had been brought up to believe that the Church had been visibly one till 1054, after which it split into two parts. At the Reformation a further branch grew out, there then being branches of the true Church, Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Anglican. While the Church was one its decisions were binding in faith. This might be so in the future. In the interim period, however, there could be no true decision of the Church because no Church was truly ecumenical.

Bishop McAdoo stated that within modern Anglicanism a thing was binding because it was true.

Bishop Butler felt that ^{on} a question of faith a thing could be known to be true because it was ecumenical.

Dr. Halliburton asked if agreement of Rome was necessary to make a Council ecumenical.

Bishop Butler replied that the Bishop of Rome could ratify a Council.

Mr. Charley felt that there was some question begging here. How could a Council be really ecumenical? There were always splinter groups. Nothing was said about the criteria of an ecumenical council.

Fr. Tillard stated that authority came from the heads of the Churches.

Mr. Charley returning to his point questioned who constituted an ecumenical council.

Bishop Butler thought that there was a moral unanimity which could be described as ecumenical. He asked if a problem might not arise for the Church of the future in which a decision would have to be made and accepted as faith. If such an

authority was required, if the Church was not simply to repeat formulas of the past, or quote the Scriptures verbatim, then what part was the Papacy to play within such a Christian authority?

Dr. Halliburton stated that the Sensus Fidelium had its roots in Scripture, Tradition and the Ministry; it would operate within these spheres. Whether there was a presidency or not remained to be seen. He felt it would be required.

Bishop Clark said that the debate came back to the question of the nature of the function of the Bishop of Rome. He asked whether or not an acceptance of a presiding function for the Bishop of Rome was of the esse of the faith. With this question he adjourned the meeting.

4th September: 11.30 a.m.

Bishop Clark opened the meeting with some comments of a practical nature concerning the travel arrangements. There was also a brief discussion on the Press Release, but the main debate on this was adjourned until the afternoon.

The Bishop then asked if the Commission now had a plan for the next year's work. He also asked whether a "Poringland-type" interim meeting ought to be arranged.

Under the first heading he asked if the assumption that previous the Commission could work in the same way on Authority as on the Statments was correct. He wanted to know if certain papers on particular subjects were required for the Oxford Commission meeting. Would this lead to a different shape from the two previous Commission meetings; perhaps more like Gazzada?

Bishop Moorman asked what subjects the Bishop had in mind.

Bishop Clark wondered if a paper on the Hierarchy of Truths might be of value; with special reference to the question of whether agreement on Primacy and Infallibility were necessary as a matter of faith.

Dr. Gassmann asked if it would not be wise to decide on methodology first. There were two fields here, the question of authority in general and then the question of the papal office.

Dean Chadwick informed the Commission that Sub-Commission III had met informally and tried to look at the shape of things for the future, and where the Commission had got to so far. He said there was good evidence for certain main lines of convergence on Authority and also the authority in and of Scripture. He noted that there were still some lines of divergence also. He reported that Fr. Duprey had urged that

there was not enough material about the individual bishop and his local church. Conciliar authority was based upon the authority of the bishop; any treatment of the Bishop of Rome must start from the individual bishop. The traditional Anglican view also encourages such an approach. Pastor Eternus could also be interpreted in this way, at least in certain sections. Therefore it was necessary to start with individual bishops at the bottom of the pyramid.

Fr. Duprey objected to the term pyramid!

Dean Chadwick continued by noting that Anglicans saw a distinction between Primacy and Papacy. There were other questions in this connection. Was the Papal Primacy, with or without infallibility, of the esse of the Church? Was the Roman Catholic language of Primacy really talk about Apostolic Succession?

Fr. Duprey wanted to see Primacy and Infallibility together.

Bishop McAdoo again raised the question of perfect and imperfect communion. Why were the Orthodox Churches not in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church? Was there a different faith or was it the same faith in a different mode of expression?

Bishop Moorman wanted the Commission to do more to help people see first of all the difficulties of the ecumenical endeavour and then the means by which these difficulties might be overcome.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that a compact for unity with the Free Churches would cause serious problems.

Bishop Clark still asked for guidance as to the shape of the next year's work.

Dr. Yarnold asked for a treatment of the authority of collective bishops.

Fr. Tavard was most anxious that the work achieved at this meeting should not be forgotten. Could the work of the three documents be put together; it might then be seen what gaps remained. Did this point to a "Poringland"?

Bishop McAdoo did not want a conflation of the work of Sub-Commissions I, II and III. He felt what was required was some work on the issues raised by the Sub-Commissions, for example some notes on various aspects of ecclesiology would be invaluable. The themes he was thinking of were Sister Churches, Perfect and Imperfect Communion and Agreement on Faith.

Fr. Tavard suggested what was necessary was a debate on papers presented to the Commission at the beginning of a meeting, particularly a paper on the New Testament and its authority and the exercise of that authority.

Dean Chadwick questioned the Roman Catholic attempt to elucidate Hierarchy of Truths, Infallibility, etc. These topics were under discussion within the Roman Catholic Church, he cited Karl Rahner, and there was now a very fluid situation. It was possible to have agreement with Anglicans about certain issues but would this then just be another interpretation?

Bishop Butler attempted to alleviate the Dean's worries. He felt that at the present time there was a survival, at many levels, of pre-1962 thinking. This especially in Bishops trained in the theology common before Vatican II. In effect Vatican II opened up new ways of thinking and this thinking is now done in public. Anglicans have enjoyed a latitude in public thinking for a considerable time but there is still a central focus. This has not yet occurred in Roman Catholic thinking. The Bishop was quite certain however that it was going to settle and that both surviving tridentine theology and ridiculous speculation would be seen to be on a limb. The work of the Commission would be right in the centre of this mean.

Bishop Clark tried to discern a consensus of the Commission and outlined four areas for study. 1. Authority in the New Testament. 2. Infallibility and Primacy, with a distance between the two. 3. Perfect and Imperfect Communion, "Communio realis sed non plena". 4. The Authority of the Bishop, qua individual and as a college.

Fr. Tavard explained that this would be difficult, especially the work on Councils, it might take ten years!

Dr. Halliburton also wanted jurisdiction to be treated both historically and theologically.

Bishop Clark himself added the Hierarchy of Truths.

Bishop Vogel commented that the latter was not a concept one could make deductions from. It was a de facto thing.

Bishop Butler also felt that a full treatment would take too long. He was strongly of the opinion that if the Commission reflected upon that which had been agreed upon already, progress could be made. He felt there were hints at the direction which the Commission might take. There had been a fair agreement on Scripture; it was both inspired and

normative. The Church itself was guided by the Holy Spirit to enlarge its Canon (i.e. the Old Testament) by adding the Scriptures of the New Covenant. The Church recognised divine inspiration when it saw it. What value had this recognition? For Christians the authority discerned in the Church's acceptance of the New Testament Canon was normative. How then can the Church fail to recognise its own normative authority? He noted that if you reduce the authority of scripture to zero the authority of the Church is also zero. If the Scriptures had authority, then so had the Church.

Bishop Clark noted that the reflection on work already completed was of great importance. He asked where the Commission went from there.

Bishop Vogel agreed that something had already been achieved and also called for reflection. He saw three papers required. 1. Authority in the New Testament. 2. Primacy and Infallibility. 3. Perfect and Imperfect Communion.

Fr. Tavad asked of Anglicans whether Primacy or Infallibility was the real problem.

Bishop Vogel answered Infallibility.

Mr. Charley said both.

Professor Fairweather stated that Infallibility was the more painful. What Anglicans needed to do was to work out the Anglican tradition on these subjects.

Dean Chadwick noted that 16th century Anglicans were extremely worried by the exercise of authority, for example, the scandal of the traffic of indulgences.

Bishop Moorman noted that some Anglicans might find a primacy difficult but that all Anglicans would find Infallibility difficult. With this both Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Archbishop Arnott agreed.

Dr. Yarnold asked if an infallible Church was easier than an infallible Pope.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher answered that there was less difficulty over an infallible Church.

Bishop Clark asked for the concept of Infallibility to be taken to pieces.

Mr. Charley asked if the Commission could go round and behind the old problems. Could the same faith be stated in a different way? He found Infallibility and Primacy both bad words

Archbishop Arnott wondered if the analogy of the English Crown might be valuable. It was still assumed that the Crown was absolute. Nevertheless a constitutional monarchy was the real nature of the case. He asked if the notion of Primacy and Collegiality could be reconciled.

Mr. Charley felt this was a useful analogy.

Bishop Clark reminded the Commission that the sense of Infallibility taught explicitly by Pastor Eternus was "that Infallibility which Christ gave his Church".

Dr. Yarnold felt that a new paper on terminology might be valuable.

Professor Fairweather said that Anglicans found the Infallibility of the Church an easier concept than that of the Pope. With the latter it came to mean a definite doctrine and the notion of infallible teaching.

Bishop McAdoo noted that perpetuity in the truth was more congenial to Anglican thinking.

Bishop Clark asked then if the three papers under question were the right ones to commission bearing in mind also Bishop Butler's point that work of great value had already been achieved.

Bishop Vogel wanted something on Indefectibility.

Bishop Clark noted that the work of the Commission would be contributing to the positive thought of the Church.

Bishop Moorman wished to see more on the place of the Bishop.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher echoed this and asked that the place of the Bishop of Rome should not be treated in isolation.

Dean Chadwick was not clear on the notion of jurisdiction. Was this the jurisdiction of "Ordinary" authority? Pastor Eternus spoke of an Ordinary jurisdiction appertaining to the Pope over the universal Church.

Bishop Butler noted that the general direction of Vatican II was away from juridical language.

Bishop Clark felt at this stage he had a schema to present to the Commission. In the first place there must be an assessment of where the Commission now stood which would lead into position papers. There would be four of these:

1. Authority ⁱⁿ and the New Testament
2. Primacy and Infallibility
3. Perfect and Imperfect Communion
4. Jurisdiction

Bishop Butler thought that the reasons for difficulty over Infallibility and Primacy were different. The difficulty over Infallibility was that of the concept itself. "No proposition is ever verifiable" - Karl Poper. In other words the problem lay in the realm of philosophy. On the question of Primacy the problem was that of the New Testament texts, of Church History and the possibility of abuse.

At this point the Commission adjourned for tea, after which the Commission looked at the draft of the Press Communiqué. After some detailed discussion of the Communiqué, during which the eventual aim of unity was stressed an amended text was accepted.

Bishop Clark then resumed discussion on the future work of the Commission. He made four points: 1. Short papers should be commissioned but these need not necessarily be too academic, nor need they touch every problem. 2. There might have to be a different shape for the coming year's work. Papers already commissioned would have to be integrated. 3. The final statement might come out in stages. 4. To keep momentum it might be necessary to have two "Poringlands", one exploratory, the other definitive to producing a schema. The former of these would be to answer Bishop Butler's point and to reflect upon the work achieved at Grottaferrata.

Bishop Moorman requested a circulation of papers a little earlier.

Bishop Clark said they would be done as early as possible.

Bishop Butler asked that a Poringland be not held before June so that position papers could be studied.

Bishop Clark said that position papers should be at Lambeth for Easter.

Bishop Butler asked if the Commission envisaged a paper synthesising Sub-Commissions I and II; the second Poringland taking account of this work.

Mgr. Purdy wondered whether there was a danger in the body of the Commission getting out of touch with the prospect of two Interim Meetings.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed and proposed that the Steering Committee should do the first.

Bishop Clark noted this and said the first meeting could be a "private" meeting.

Bishop Butler wondered if regional bodies might produce the preparatory work. Yet this would not serve the original purpose of Poringland I: to reflect upon what had already been achieved. What was now proposed was a two-pronged attack; regional ARC preparatory groups and an informal reflexive group based upon the Steering Committee.

Bishop Clark suggested the Poringland-type meeting might be from 9th or from 16th June. This should be on a four-four basis. Anybody in England at that time would be free and welcome to come to the meeting. As well as this National ARCs could be involved in the production of preparatory papers.

Dr. Gassmann was worried as to whether the future work would be on Authority in general or more specifically concrete.

Bishop McAdoo said that this was what the Poringland meeting would be for.

Bishop Clark noted that the whole work of the Grottaferrata meeting would be for reflection.

Bishop Moorman felt that a Statement in stages was a good thing; it was more than a Press Release, it would be an Agreed Statement Part I.

Bishop Butler agreed with this but said that all the subjects appeared to interact. It might not be possible to give one part without another for fear of distortion.

Fr. Duprey wondered if the two stages might be first the Bishops then the Pope.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that South African ARC could do "Authority and the New Testament".

Fr. Duprey questioned whether Professor Alberigio might be prepared to do some work on jurisdiction for the Commission.

Bishop Butler agreed with this as did Dean Chadwick and other members of the Commission.

Bishop Clark wondered if Bishop Butler might do some work on Infallibility. The latter suggested that Dean Chadwick might be a better person for the subject. The Bishop then asked about the notion of "communio realis sed non plena".

Fr. Duprey noted that at the end of the year there was a colloquium on the Koinonia with the Orthodox.

Fr. Tillard felt that Bishops, Primacy and Koinonia all overlapped.

Bishop Butler noted that not all agreed as to what these terms meant.

Fr. Tillard offered to do a paper on Koinonia showing the context of the primacy.

Fr. Yarnold felt that a similar treatment of Infallibility would be invaluable and Bishop Butler agreed with this.

Dean Chadwick said he would see what could be done.

Bishop Clark noted that the Oxford Group would back him up.

Dean Chadwick asked what shape his treatment should take. Was it to be based upon the local Bishop? What then of the Metropolitan and Patriarch? From the sixth century Rome was Papa for the West but before the sixth century even North Africa did not look in quite the same way. The Primates of Carthage and Alexandria were ~~its~~ ~~Papas~~ rather than Rome. The local Bishop was most important for any treatment of conciliar authority, but was not a great help for the treatment of a Metropolitan or Patriarch.

Fr. Duprey felt that the canonical level of the local Bishop was the area to concentrate upon.

Bishop Butler pleaded that the Pope be split up! The Church at all levels needed a focal point and an organ of unity; that is the local Bishop. Primates and Patriarchs were simply examples of this search for unity. This was the way to look at the Papacy. Both Primacy and Infallibility took on a different hue in this context.

Fr. Tillard said that this was just what he wanted to do.

Bishop Clark now wished to finalise the programme. He asked for papers to be prepared by Easter. They were to be on the following subjects.

1. Authority and the New Testament
2. The Context of Infallibility
3. The Context of the Primacy
4. The Theology of Jurisdiction

Bishop Clark also said that individual members were invited to submit their reflections on what had already been achieved.

Bishop Butler noted a potential gap as to whether Koinonia was a visible unity.

Fr. Tillard felt there was also a gap on the Anglican side as to what the problems were.

Bishop Vogel noted that for some people the Papal problem was an emotive one.

Fr. Tillard said that there were still objections at a deeper level. He asked where the sickness of the Papacy lay noting that it was difficult to see what the Anglican theory about it was.

Mr. Charley said that as the Roman Catholic system of theology was dovetailed this was a highly diffuse problem.

Dean Chadwick said he did not follow Fr. Tillard's point.

Fr. Tillard asked whether the papacy were based on Scripture, whether it was providential, and whether it was of the "esse" of the Church.

Bishop Butler felt that the problem was difficult for Anglicans because it was a subject absent from its structures for four hundred years. There was a parallel here with devotion to Our Lady; but while there was some tradition of Our Lady in Anglicanism, there was none at all of papacy. The papacy was a strange thing!

Professor Fairweather said that there was very little in the way of formal Anglican statements on Authority other than by way of "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted the non-theological factor. There was an inheritance of suspicion rejecting any authority, an antinomianism. Every Anglican was obedient to his own conscience, and the papacy was the epitome of reaction against this.

Bishop Clark asked if the Dean of Christ Church would examine Infallibility in the light of these factors. He wanted to know what was behind the idea.

Professor Scarisbrick felt that the real difficulty was that the clearest conviction of Roman Catholics was the visible unity of the Church. The contribution of Anglicanism was a Christendom without visible unity. The real reason for a problem over the papacy was the positive conviction of the necessity for unity which Anglicanism per se rejected.

Bishop McAdoo felt that the major concern of Anglicanism was the truth of faith.

Professor Scarisbrick noted that the branch theory of ecclesiology was the contribution of Anglicanism.

Bishop McAdoo replied that the search for truth made this unfortunately necessary.

Bishop Vogel noted that the branch theory meant that unity was seen in the sacraments and ministry; that was the way in which the Church expressed its unity.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that the idea of a divided Church was better than the branch theory.

Bishop McAdoo spoke of a fragmented presence of the body of Christ.

Bishop Clark closed the meeting.