

ARCIC 1977SUMMARY MINUTES

30th August: 8.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the future of the Commission and revision of its three Agreed Statements. Two issues arose immediately: the Agenda for future dialogue (Archbishop McAdoo), and further issues arising from the meeting between Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury (Bishop Howe)¹. It was asked whether Venice could be properly clarified at the meeting and a request was made only for two sub-commissions (Fr. Duprey). Some felt that serious issues had not been dealt with and that the whole Commission needed to discuss them before breaking up into sub-commissions (Revd. Julian Charley, Fr. Jean Tillard). Christian perfection and the spiritual life were then proposed (Fr. Herbert Ryan). Work on the connection between the three documents was called for (Bishop Vogel).

On the question of new personnel (raised briefly during the Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Pope Paul VI) it was thought that two new people on each side might be appropriate (Dean Chadwick). New issues would require new personnel, but replies to criticism would necessitate the same team (Professor Root).

It was suggested that fundamental questions needed to be answered (such as grace, justification, and salvation), but that an affirmative approach was required (Fr. Tillard and Fr. Ryan). Several members of the Commission called for the isolation of the main points. An echo of the conscience of the churches was required (Fr. Tillard). Both the criticisms of official bodies and the concern of ordinary Christians were thought to be important. Several members thought that three groups would be required to do this. There was a warning against going back into the 16th and 17th centuries and trying to do the work of generations of theologians (Dean Chadwick and Bishop Butler). Several members felt that what was required was some interpretation of the three Agreed Statements and a statement of their purpose.

Finally the wide divergences of opinion in both Communions was commented upon.

¹ Present for the first two days.

31st August 1977: 9.30 a.m.

Archbishop McAdoo in the chair.

Archbishop McAdoo outlined the shape of a possible final document. There would be a statement of object; unity by stages through theological convergence. There would be a statement concerning degrees of agreement and degrees of communion. There would then be the three statements and something on their co-inherence. There would follow criticism and a response to underline theological problems.

It was hoped that if a fourth agreed statement was not produced at Chichester that there should be an adequate press release (Fr. Tavard).

Some members felt that another look at the Malta Report would be helpful. Ways of practical co-operation were also called for e.g. a joint calendar and permissive sharing of the Office (Bishop Knapp-Fisher).

Bishop Clark noted Bishop Moorman's request for an examination of the nature of the Church. Others called for investigation as to the level of consensus required for sacramental communion. Reference to the Bonn Agreement was also made. There was also a call for an explanation of "agreement in faith" (Bishop Butler). Following this there was the question of "degrees of communion" and Roman Catholic ecclesiology in relation to the reunion of corporate bodies (Dean Chadwick).

A real ecclesiology of corporate reunion was affirmed (Fr. Ryan). The difference between diversity within and between churches was noted (Mgr. Purdy). A state of mutilated communion was seen (Bishop Clark). Reference to official formularies was urged (Bishop Butler). A juxtaposition of a theology of *koinonia* and the problem of ecclesiology was noted in the PPVI/ABC Common Declaration (Rev. Christopher Hill). The Agreed Statement on the Purpose of the Church (USA/ARC) was referred to. (Fr. Ryan).

A member of the Commission wondered about the limits of diversity in both Churches (Prof. Root).

A fear was expressed at "kitten play" (chasing tails). The reception of the documents ought to be considered (Fr. Tillard). Several members again referred to the Malta Report.

The need for non-western voices was affirmed (Bishop Howe).

The necessity for a positive treatment of underlying problems was stressed (Bishop Vogel). There was also a plea that the Commission should not change its fundamental method (Fr. Duprey). Four groups were suggested, three on the documents and one on a preface stating the aim and goal of the dialogue (Bishop Knapp-Fisher). There was a request for work to be done on the criticism before a preface was drafted (Fr. Duprey and Fr. Tavard).

Archbishop McAdoo repeated his draft outline, but Bishop Clark asked for examination of the criticism before detailed consideration of the final document.

The problem of ecclesiology was reiterated, especially the question of the necessity of communion with Rome as a touchstone of catholicity. (Dean Chadwick). The sacramental nature of the Church was thought to be the fundamental problem (Fr. Duprey).

A plea for a consideration of the differences between the rules of life of the two Churches was then made (Fr. Ryan).

Bishop Clark asked the subcommissions to pin-point the problems and relate them to the objectives of the Commission. Archbishop McAdoo asked for three subcommissions rather than four. There was a question as to the sacrosanct nature of the present text of the Agreed Statements. It was urged that they should be reissued as they were but with footnotes (Bishop Butler). Finally, Archbishop McAdoo asked for the Commission to divide into subcommissions and report back to plenary after their completion of their initial considerations on the criticism of the three statements.

September 2nd : 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Clark in the chair.

Bishop Clark looked forward to the publication of the three statements in one book with preface, commentary and possible appendices. He noted that the Canterbury and Venice sub-commissions had taken a detailed approach. Windsor had tried to understand the underlying objections. It was agreed to start with the Windsor subcommission's work.

It was again hoped that if there was no intermediate document a full press release should be produced (Prof. Root).

There was some request for the inclusion of the Malta Report in the final statement (Bishop Knapp-Fisher), but others preferred excerpts or inclusion in an appendix (Bishops Clark and Butler).

Concern was expressed over the exegesis of anamnesis (Fr. Ahern and Bishop Butler). It was thought that this was a textual matter rather than material for a footnote. (Dean Chadwick). As well as scholarly opinion there was the more popular problem that memorial was not recognised in ordinary Roman Catholic circles. (Fr. Tavard).

The use of the term sacrifice as applied to the eucharist was defended and a plea made for unhibited language in worship. (Dean Chadwick). But ARCIC's success had been in getting behind controversial terms (Rev. Julian Charles). It was wondered whether anamnesis was too load bearing. It was liturgical shorthand which was not yet understood. St. John Chrysostom's equation of anamnesis with sacrifice was referred to. (Canon Halliburton).

The treatment of sacrifice was praised but the need to refer to traditional language was affirmed (Fr. Ryan). The allowance of diversity of language was asked for (Dr. Gassmann). There was further discussion on the need to use the word sacrifice, but it was noted that for some Roman Catholics this was no longer the case. (Rev. Julian Charley, Bishop Butler and Fr. Tillard).

It was noted that often theological matters were not so much concerned as Christian identity (Bishop Vogel). Trent had not called the Mass a sacrifice. A recent work by Byron had used the term in two senses: (a) a literal liturgical sense, and (b) an analogical sense. (Fr. Yarnold)

The origin of the application of sacrifice to the Mass was recalled in the IX century Sacramentaries with an anti Semi-Pelagian thrust. (Fr. Ryan). Byzantine parallels were also recalled and the reality of the eschaton here and now (Fr. Duprey).

Professor Fairweather recalled Hooker: Polity V 78. "The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech, usually call the ministry of the Gospel priesthood in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely, the communion of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice." Waterland was then quoted on this passage, Works VIII 168. "Mr. Hooker feared not to say that sacrifice is now no part of the church ministry and that we have properly now no sacrifice. I presume he meant by proper sacrifice, propitiatory, according to the sense of the Trent Council or of the new definitions. In such a sense as that he might justly say that sacrifice is no part of the Church ministry or that the Christian Church has no sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such new language be the meaning ever so right: the Fathers never used it."

Archbishop McAdoo quoted John Bramhall "The Holy Eucharist is a commemoration, a representation, an application of the all sufficient propitiatory sacrifice of the Cross We acknowledge an eucharistical sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative sacrifice or a memorial of a sacrifice of the Cross; a representative sacrifice or a representation of the passion of Christ before the eyes of his Heavenly Father; an impetrative sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of his passion by way of real prayer; and lastly an applicative sacrifice or an application of his merits unto our souls."

Two emendations were requested to the Windsor draft; 1) "Therefore it is legitimate" and "in the sacramental and liturgical sense." (Bishop Butler).

Some discussion followed on the problems of communication and accuracy.

A request was made for a consideration of why anti-sacrificial language was also held to be important (Dean Chadwick).

Paragraph 4 was expounded as an attempt to answer the problems concerning "become". (Fr. Tillard). The question of a parallel statement on the cup was raised after the reference to the Bread. This would refer to the covenantal symbolism of the New Testament. The eschatological reference was noted as also the parallel to the Windsor Statement's paragraph 11.

The problem of sacramental presence being interpreted as a physical presence rather than a new mode of presence was noted. (Fr. Ryan).

The helpfulness of the use of the word "become" in the Scottish Prayer Book was referred to. (Fr. Ryan). The phrase "become for us" was also found to be helpful from the Roman Mass. (Archbishop McAdoo). The importance of a personal presence was noted by several members with reference to paragraph 8 of the Agreed Statement.

The Commission then moved on to the Canterbury Statement after expressing general approval of the Windsor Sub-Commission's approach. Mgr. Purdy introduced its various paragraphs.

Discussion opened on the phrase "traditions of our common inheritance". It was generally agreed that this should not be taken as referring simply to a common pre-Reformation tradition which came to an end in the sixteenth century.

The differing use of the word "proclaim" as between Windsor and Canterbury was queried. (Fr. Ahern)

There was some discussion on whether detailed questions should be answered or the more fundamental problem of Scripture, tradition and church order. Was the threefold structure of the ministry sufficiently based on tradition? (Fr. Tillard).

The method of the Commission was questioned. Some problems were raised by all three Statements and would have to be dealt with in a Preface, e.g. ecclesiology, (Dr. Gassmann) It was generally agreed that ecclesiological questions were fundamental.

There followed a further discussion on the question of the necessity of the ministry. Neither church felt able to dispense with it. (Fr. Tillard and Bishop Butler). A distinction between the essential ministry and a particular structure was called for. (Dr. Gassmann) The Australian Episcopal ARC had called for clarification on this matter. (Revd. C.Hill)

On paragraph 6 of the Canterbury Statement a jump to ministerial office was noted. (Revd. J. Charley)

There was some discussion on the diaconate, its necessity and very varied forms. (Fr. Yarnold and the Revd. J. Charley).

Introducing para. 13 of the sub-commission's paper Mgr. Purdy expressed some reservations about the reference to the Ampleforth Journal. It was generally agreed that this would have to be dealt with in greater detail. It was noted that the fundamental problems raised by the Agreed Statements were all related.

2nd September: 4.30 p.m. Bishop Clark in the chair.

Bishop Butler introduced the Venice sub-Commission's paragraphs.

There was some discussion of the use of the word "analogy" in number 2. Not all were happy at the use of the word.

In No. 4. there was a question as to what were the central

truths of salvation (Bishop Vogel).

On No. 5 the need to weave together the three Agreed Statements was stressed. It was felt that an apology was not required, though it was noted that an apology could be a vindication (Dr. Gassmann and Dean Chadwick). It was thought to be premature to discuss the final form of the document. It was hoped the document would retain ARCIC's custom of brevity. There were problems over the idea of unity by stages in the realm of canon law. (Fr. Duprey).

In No.6. there was discussion as to whether the "when" of the original Statement meant if or because. It was interpreted as temporal.

In 7 it was felt that the mention of patriarchates and the Pentarchy would only complicate matters, in spite of the comment by Kallistos Ware. (Fr. Duprey).

In 8 Archbishop McAdoo hoped that the Dean's paper would also stress conciliarity.

Bishop Clark then asked from the chair where the sub-commission was going from there.

There was some discussion on Professor Lampe's criticism. It was felt it had not been too careful, but for political reasons it might be helpful to try and answer some of his points.

A plea was made for two editions of the final Statement, one with the three Agreed Statements and one without (the Revd. Julian Charley).

A request was made for a thematic treatment from all the sub-commissions (Bishop Vogel). But the problem of a lack of official comment on Venice was raised. (Professor Root).

A request was made that the Final Report should be sent to groups who had offered criticism, official or otherwise, together with a specific letter answering points (Fr. Duprey).

A question was asked as to whether the clarification being attempted was for theologians or intelligent ordinary christians (Revd. Julian Charley) and a distinction was drawn between commentary and interpretation (Dr. Gassmann). A plea was made for the dissemination of ARCIC's work (Fr. Ahern).

Positive approbation of the Statements/^{from authorities} was hoped for (Bishop Butler).

A call was made to return to the consideration of the immediate work (Professor Root). An intermediate document was required dealing with problems arising from the three Agreed Statements and the main issues arising from those problems (Fr. Tillard). But there was a strong plea for an answer to specific criticism (Fr. Ryan). It was noted that there was a deal of unfinished business remaining from Venice. This should be dealt with (Revd. J. Charley).

The relatively low level of criticism on Canterbury and

Venice was noted (Professor Scarisbrick).

The distinction drawn by Fr. Dumont (inductive/deductive method) was felt to be important and the polarization at Vatican II between those who followed a scholarstic approach and those who followed the historical method was paralleled (Bishop Butler).

The importance of the problem of ecumenical councils was noted. Anglican criticism had centred on paragraph 19 of Venice, and would need to be answered. (The Revd.C.Hill). There was some discussion on future work and it was agreed that the remaining problems from Venice should be tackled. Canadian corroboration of the difficulty of Venice 19 was offered and a plea for work on para. 24. (Professor Fairweather) The importance of the ius divinum issue was stressed. (Fr.Yarnold) It was felt more could be done on paragraph 24 of Venice and that more could be agreed (Dean Chadwick). There had been Irish difficulties over Venice 19 also (Archbishop McAdoo). Attention was drawn to the fact that some people considered that Venice 24 cancelled Venice 1-23 (Bishop Butler).

It was accepted that a composite document should be drawn up but that technical matters might receive substantial footnotes (Bishop Knapp-Fisher). Two tasks were outlined for the sub-commission: the putting together of the existing material and new work on Venice 24. (Revd.J.Charley)

From the chair Bishop Clark asked for work in sub-commissions and expressed the view that the shape of a document would emerge as work proceeded.

5th September, 1977 : 9.30 a.m.

Archbishop McAdoo in the chair.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on paragraph 4 following of ARCIC 173/Windsor/2.

The two references to the heavenly Christ were queried (Fr. Ahern). The sacramental presence of the glorified Christ and the glorified Christ in heaven were distinguished. (Bishop Vogel).

In the second paragraph of section 4 the unclarity of the reference to the fellowship "of the Lord's Supper" was noted. Nor should the sacramental order appear to be a superimposition on the natural order (Fr. Tavad).

The last paragraph of section 4 was thought to be in accord with St. Thomas, though "the lives of men" was felt to be moralistic (Fr. Duprey).

Archbishop McAdoo then called for discussion paragraph by paragraph.

In 4.1 "too" should be removed (Prof. Scarisbrick).

It was suggested that the document should read "the footnote on the word transubstantiation" (Dean Chadwick).

Use of the liturgical phrase "become for us" was urged (Archbishop McAdoo).

In 4.2 "at the Lord's Supper" was suggested in answer to Fr. Tavad. (Rev. J. Charley). "Its fellowship" was also offered (Bishop Butler).

"a special way" was queried (Dr. Halliburton). There followed some discussion and "in a still further mode" was suggested. (Dean Chadwick). "Special gift of himself" was also suggested (Fr. Ahern and Bishop Moorman). The danger of the eucharistic presence appearing to be something added was pointed out (Fr. Tavad).

In 4.3 there was unease at the phrase "the elements of the new creation" (Bishop Butler). The idea of a new creation seemed to differ from the wider sense used by St. Paul. It was also new to the thought of ARCIC (Fr. Ahern). The removal of the definite article was proposed (Fr. Ryan), and reference to Windsor 11 was made (Prof. Fairweather). Windsor 11 was preferred (Bishop Butler). "comes about through the transforming action of the Holy Spirit" was suggested (Fr. Duprey). The real difficulty was the word "them". The bread and wine were no longer what they were before (Bishop Butler). There was a similar problem in the opening sentence of 4.1. The need for a subject for conversion was stressed (Fr. Duprey).

"appropriate" was thought to be a vague word (Bishop Moorman) and "making his own" was offered. (Dean Chadwick). "in order that they may become" was suggested (Prof. Scarisbrick). "that they may be" was preferred (Rev. J. Charley).

Some felt it better not to use the word "become" as this question was in fact under discussion, others wanted it as it was to be demythologised in the following paragraph. Preference was expressed for "become for us". (Fr. Ryan and Archbishop McAdoo). "so that they become for us" was suggested also. (Bishop Butler).

An awkwardness in "comes about" was expressed and in "the coming of Christ". (Prof. Root and Dean Chadwick).

In 4.4, serious ambiguity was detected in the opening negations as the subject of the negations appear^{ed} to change (Fr. Ryan). The subcommission did not mean to confuse the sacramental presence of Christ and the means of its becoming. "material change results" was suggested as a clarification (Rev. J. Charley). There was a confusion between the historic and existential order. (Fr. Ryan). It was "in the same manner" that was confusing. (Fr. Tavard). There was a suggestion that the article before "becoming" should be removed (Bishop Knapp-Fisher). The second objection was not clear (Fr. Duprey). "become Christ's Body and Blood" was offered with the addition of "bread and wine" (Rev. J. Charley and Dean Chadwick).

It was queried whether there was an attempt here to tackle the problem of the locality of Christ, but it was pointed out that this would be tackled with reference to permanence and reservation (Bishop Butler and Fr. Yarnold).

"the laws of this world" was felt to be vague. (Fr. Tavard) and "physico/chemico change" was suggested (Lutheran/RC Conversations U.S.A) (Archbishop McAdoo).

Mgr. Purdy suggested the following with reference to the first sentence: "It is not ^{implied} that that presence is of the same mode as his presence in his earthly life or his presence now before the Father. He is not present according to the laws of this world, but in a way which belongs to the sacramental order of the new creation."

A serious difficulty was raised over the suggestion that the sacramentum of the eucharist was bread and wine. This was evoked by the word "used" in the last sentence (Bishop Butler). Fr. Tillard referred to I Cor. 11:26 and the Liturgy: "Gather all who share this bread and wine into the one body of Christ" and "when we eat this bread and drink this cup". The phrase used in the earlier draft "the bread which was bread for this life is now Christ the Bread of Life" was suggested (Fr. Yarnold). The question of the cup was again raised (Fr. Tavard). The deleted sentence might be attached to the following paragraph on sacramental order (Dr. Gassmann).

Bishop Butler was happy at the substitution, but also hoped there ^{would} be some reference to sacramental signs.

In 4.5 hope of exegesis of "visible and tangible" was expressed (Fr. Ryan). "In the sacramental order the world of faith becomes present in visible and tangible signs" was offered (Bishop Butler). "is present" was preferred (Rev. J. Charley). A new sentence was suggested "this enables ..." (Bishop Knapp-Fisher).

"the realities of faith are present" was suggested as explaining "the world of faith" (Rev. J. Charley and Prof. Root).

It was asserted that divine grace enables the Christian to be redeemed rather than the sacramental order (Bishop Butler and the Rev. J. Charley). Reference to the Holy Spirit was required.

"the whole Christ" might imply that only parts of Christ were present in other ways. (Rev. J. Charley and Bishop Vogel). This was meant to avoid the suggestion that the whole human person only met the Body and Blood. It corresponded to Trent (Fr. Yarnold and Fr. Ryan). The subcommission was trying to speak of the incarnational manner Christ meets us: there was not the same kind of assistance in other ways (Rev. J. Charley). The word "whole" was not used in the same way in both parts (Fr. Ryan). Bishop Butler suggested "in the eucharist the whole Christ in his sacramental Body and Blood comes to meet the whole human person". The eucharist was not simply a cerebral operation (Rev. J. Charley). Whole person could mean a saint (Fr. Ryan and Prof. Root). Human person implied totality (Bishop Knapp-Fisher).

Dean Chadwick called for the clarification of the whole passage. "Moreover, the community" was offered (Bishop Butler). "Christ himself in his sacramental Body and Blood" was offered (Fr. Tillard). There was some discussion on which whole was causing the problem. It was agreed that some re-drafting was necessary.

Bishop Clark asked if effectively was the correct word in the penultimate sentence.

Bishop Butler felt that in the last sentence the ultimate change effected was the new creation. Three changes were seen: (1) the relation between God and man, (2) the relation between men, and (3) the heart of man. (Dr. Gassmann).

There was a call for reference to Christ coming to us. The three aspects of memorial, celebration, and anticipation were referred to (Bishop Butler and Fr. Duprey). The dynamism of the eucharist would be dealt with in the section on reservation (Fr. Tillard).

In paragraph 5 it was felt that Christian tradition maintained the oneness of the two movements referred to (Fr. Tavard). The deletion of "in the mystery of the eucharist" was proposed (Rev. J. Charley). The addition of "not one but two" was proposed (Bishop Knapp-Fisher). Also suggested was "within an indissoluble unity two complementary movements ..." (Dean Chadwick).

Reference to the whole Christ was made by quotation from O Sacrum Convivium (Fr. Ahern), but receptionism was being dealt with in this paragraph (Fr. Tillard).

It was asked whether justice had been done to the questions put from both sides (Fr. Yarnold). To meet the question of the location of the presence, the following was offered: "that of Christ giving his Body and Blood and that of the communicants feeding on the same in their hearts by faith" (Rev. J. Charley).

There was some discussion as to whether the opinion of the Commission should be expressed in a positive or negative way. The subcommission was saying that the emphases were right providing they were not exclusive.

It was suggested that "traditions" should be omitted and also the following "some" (Bishop Knapp-Fisher, Dean Chadwick). It was asserted that they were traditions. "Some theological traditions" was accepted. It was felt that the phrase "our past difficulties" suggested that one view was wholly identified with one church and vice versa. "In the past acute differences/difficulties have arisen" was accepted.

It was objected that all sacraments were sacraments of the new covenant (except perhaps marriage) (Fr. Tavad). "That sacrament" was accepted.

Bishop Vogel asked if the question of a moment of consecration should be dealt with. It was thought by some that it should not. It was a question that councils had left open, a philosophical question as to whether action was discreet rather than continuous (Fr. Ryan) ARCIC could not answer it (Professor Scarisbrick). It was asked whether Windsor 10 meant that by the end of the anaphora an objective presence occurred. "In" would be preferred to "through" (Bishop Butler) It was thought that in answer to this question it was truer to say yes than no (Dean Chadwick) Could Christ's sacramental presence be adored? What should be done to the consecrated elements if the Eucharist was interrupted? (Bishop Butler.) It was said that when consecration was over it was over (Bishop Vogel). In canon law from the offertory onwards in such circumstances the elements should be destroyed by fire or put into water (Fr. Ryan). Similar evidence was adduced from the Dominican missal. (Fr. Tillard). In the Book of Common Prayer once consecration had taken place the elements had to be consumed (Revd. C.Hill) The question of the permanence of the presence was to be dealt with next (Fr. Yarnold). It was asked whether an objective presence could occur at communion on the analogy of the signing of a will and its effect. (Bishop Butler) On the other hand this could not take place without the eucharistic prayer (Archbishop McAdoo). A moment of adoration could not be pinpointed between the eucharistic prayer and communion (Fr. Tavad). Orthodox evidence was offered in that the elements were given outward reverence at the Great Entrance in the Byzantine Liturgy. (Fr. Duprey)

5th September: 4.30 p.m. Archbishop McAdoo in the chair

Bishop Knapp-Fisher introduced ARCIC 173/Canterbury 5 and noted that some footnotes had been retained in 173/Canterbury 6.

In paragraph 2 "the Commission given to the apostles" was not considered to be sufficiently specific (Bishop Vogel). It was said to be an illusion to authorisation. (Fr Duprey) "In historical continuity" was offered, but this was still felt to be not strong enough (Bishop Butler and Bishop Vogel)

Not only a ministry of oversight was to be seen. The use of the word "sacrament" was anachronistic (Fr. Tillard.

There was concern over the lack of the word "ordination". (Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Butler)

Episcopate was an essential element (Bishop Clark).

The paragraph was not felt to answer the question of the Commission's attitude to the threefold ministry. Was it normative or not? What was the value of the parallel between the evolution of the canon and the threefold ministry in the Canterbury Statement (Revd.J. Charley). It was thought that the analogy was simply a temporal one (Fr. Duprey). The authority which decided the content of the canon also accepted the threefold ministry (Fr. Ryan). Both churches regarded it as essential for themselves but refrained from saying whether or not it was possible to have a church without it. (Fr.Yarnold) Would the acceptance of the threefold ministry as normative prejudice other unity discussions? (Revd.J.Charley) It was not felt that the job of the Commission was to decide the conditions of unity with other churches. (Bishop Butler) The need for a sign of authorization was seen to be emerging rather than the threefold ministry (Groupe des Dombes) (Dr. Halliburton). The problem for other dialogues was episcopacy (Dr. Gassmann). If the necessity of the threefold ministry had been stated in Canterbury, it could not have been signed by Fr. Ryan. "The pattern of episcopacy as the centre of what we now call the threefold ministry" was offered by Fr. Tillard.

In paragraph 4 it was asked whether it could be stated that one reason for the validity of sacerdotal language was because the Eucharist might be called a sacrifice (Fr.Yarnold).

"Nothing in common" was felt to be far too strong even though it was realised that what was being indicated was that only the prime analogate was in common (Fr. Ryan). There were two distinct realities which had in common only their dependence on the priesthood of Christ. (Professor Root and Bishop Knapp-Fisher) This was still held to be too strong (Fr. Ryan) "The term priesthood is applied" was felt to be a wrong start and "Christians use the term priest in three ways" was suggested (Revd.Julian Charley). There was no New Testament link between the priesthood of Christ and the priesthood of the people of God.

On paragraph 5 Professor Root asked whether it was necessary.

Note was made of the ordination of women consultation to be held in the spring (Revd.C.Hill). 3(c) was felt to be important by Bishop Vogel. The whole subject was felt to be important in view of the following paragraph on Anglican Orders. 3(c) was held to be unfair to the Vatican Declaration Concerning the Ordination of Women (Fr. Ryan).

A statement of the problem of the ordination of women and of the problems to be resolved in attaining the reconciliation of churches was required. If the matter was at the level of discipline, there was no serious problem and a parallel with clerical celibacy could be drawn (Dean Chadwick).

It was noted that at the 1975 session of the General Synod of the Church of Canada both the Canterbury Statement

and the ordination of women had been accepted. Those Anglican churches which ordained women did not reject the Canterbury Statement (Professor Fairweather). Dean Chadwick suggested that general synods should be introduced into the paragraph.

The ordination of women was felt to be a great tragedy. Although ordination was locally administered it put a person into the universal ministry. This was called in question when one part of the church acted unilaterally. There was a parallel in Cyprian and Stephen over rebaptism (Bishop Butler).

Any ARCIC contribution ought not to be superficial (Fr. Ahern.)

Bishop Butler's point was echoed by Professor Root and Dr. Halliburton with reference to the recent Anglican/Old Catholic Communique ("One in Christ", Summer 1977).

There was a disagreement between Fr. Ryan and Bishop Vogel as to the degree of support for the Canterbury Statement given by Episcopalians in favour of the ordination of women.

Archbishop McAdoo wished to close the debate. Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked if the sub-commission should proceed with the subject. The crucial question was held to be whether or not Canterbury made a difference to the ordination of women. (Dean Chadwick). The important question was whether churches ordaining women were developing a different concept of ministry from that in the Canterbury Agreement. This ARCIC might answer (Fr. Duprey).

On paragraph 6, the subject of Anglican Orders was felt to be premature (Dean Chadwick). It was explained that this was not intended to be part of the final document (Mgr. Purdy).

It was affirmed that ARCIC must say something (Revd. J.Charley) The proposed solution was not a happy one.

"The Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church will examine possibilities "was suggested with the omission of the following sentence (Fr. Ryan).

One problem was that Anglicans had never for a moment doubted Roman Catholic orders (Dean Chadwick). This was why the word 'acceptance' had been used. (Mgr. Purdy).

Professor Fairweather noted that the Lambeth 1920 method had not been the first choice. Bishop Eric Kemp (who had assisted the sub-commission) had outlined three ways in which the ministries might be reconciled: (a) conditional ordination, (b) some sacramental act (c) the dismantling of apostolicae curae. The intermediate way had been settled on.

Bishop Butler favoured the erosion of apostolicae curae, but the psychological reaction of ordinary Catholics was a problem. No option meant Anglican re-ordination (Professor Fairweather). The distinction between re-ordination and conditional ordination was recalled. (Bishop Butler) The difficulty of Rome never admitting a mistake was stated (Revd. J.Charley).

Archbishop McAdoo asked the Commission then to turn to the work of the Venice subcommission (ARCIC 173/Venice/11).

Bishop Butler introduced the document and then it was considered paragraph by paragraph.

In (1) a,b, and c there was insufficient distinction between theology and faith (Fr. Duprey). There was some discussion between the Dean and Fr. Yarnold over the nature of the criticism answered. It was decided that some of the matter in the paragraph would be better as part of a preface to the three documents. (Mgr. Purdy). It was then asked whether the Montefiore/Lampe view on the non-authority of the Church had been answered (Fr. Yarnold).

God as the ultimate Object was queried (Fr. Tavad).

It was wondered whether the style was too defensive of the text of Venice. Did it get into the minds of the critics? (Rev. J. Charley).

In paragraph 2 the flash of insight referred to could be misinterpreted as the final step mentioned at the end of the paragraph (Rev. J. Charley). Similarly, the word "revelation" was objected to (Fr. Duprey).

Prof. Root pleaded for restraint in detailed criticism until paragraph 24 of Venice had been elaborated. It was agreed that more must be done on jus divinum. (Fr. Yarnold).

It was thought that the subcommission was attempting an answer to the problem of method posed by Fr. Dumont. (Bishop Clark). The contrast between responsibility and power might be answered (Fr. Duprey). Mention was made of the paper on the Dumont criticisms produced by the Catholic members of Canadian ARC and circulated to the Canadian RC episcopate. It was decided that ARCIC should have a copy of this document (Rev. C. Hill).

In paragraph 4 the intrinsic/extrinsic distinction was not found to be helpful (Fr. Duprey). A distinction between personal authority and the authority of sacramental office was drawn (Bishop Vogel), but the confusion of the phrase "authority of office" as meaning ordinary authority in the canonical sense was also pointed out (Fr. Duprey).

There was some discussion on an alleged weakness of the phrase "the authority of God's love in Christ". Bishop Clark and Bishop Butler disagreed. Love was felt to be the attribute of a person, there was discussion as to whether love could be authoritative.

The phrase "and unity" was requested (Bishop Knapp-Fisher).

In paragraph 6 the question was raised as to whether regional primacy belonged to the pattern of unity, but universal primacy belonged to unity itself (Fr. Yarnold).

The Pope appeared to be subordinate to no-one (Fr. Tavad).

It was asked whether a regional primate was infallible (Fr. Yarnold). Comment was made that they might speak infallibly (Dean Chadwick). A bishop could speak authentically, a patriarch could speak authentically, and the universal primate could speak authentically. The difference was that a universal primate taught authentically universally (Bishop Butler). It was demurred that the Marian dogmas remained a problem (Archbishop McAdoo). It was thought that Venice 20 said as much as Bishop Butler had suggested (Fr. Ahern). In response to Archbishop McAdoo it was noted that whatever was said about the Pope must be covered by his headship of the College of Bishops and that alone. Infallibility had to be seen to derive from his episcopal character (Bishop Butler).

In paragraph 7 there was unhappiness that it had begun with the problem of new dogmas but had ended with the meaning of words (Fr. Tillard).

It was thought that it would need rewriting (Dean Chadwick).

5th September: 8.15 p.m.

Bishop Clark in the chair. (ARCIC 173 Venice/11, 7 continued).

The reference to Venice 15 appeared to suggest that the objection was not that pronouncements were wrong but that there was simply a problem concerning human language. A distinction was called for between the form of words and the fundamental truth of a definition. Trent on original sin was cited as an example (Fr. Yarnold). There was agreement that there was not only a problem of language (Fr. Tillard). It was affirmed that the most profound meaning of truth could be very badly explained (Fr. Tillard).

It was stated that liberal objectors would not be satisfied with ARCIC's approach (Professor Root).

The difficulty of drawing a distinction between theology and faith, though made by both churches, was noted (Dean Chadwick). It was stated that the depositum fidei was given for christian life; it required a plurality of theologies. This was the problem of tradition. (Fr. Tillard). This could only be said amongst friends (Dean Chadwick).

It was affirmed that the Church could arrive at permanent teaching, or rather it could exclude certain directions (Bishop Clark and Bishop Vogel).

The need for the recognition of the reformability of infallible statements was pleaded, e.g. the Marian dogmas. (Fr. Tillard).

The objection some Anglicans had made to the Venice Statement was really that certainty was not given to man. This was not in fact a Christian objection (Bishop Butler). Not all Anglican unease concerning ecumenical councils was of the liberal type. (Revd. C.Hill). It was asserted that there were Chillingworths in both camps. New dogmas were a real fear, and also maximalist Catholic interpretations of infallibility. (Fr. Ryan).

It was noted that one critic of the Venice Statement had seen paragraph 19 and immediately interpreted it in a maximalist sense. Paragraph 19 meant exactly what it said. The critic would have infinite pain in finding a doctrine of infallibility he could accept. (Dean Chadwick).

A plea for a direct reply to the problem of Article XXI was made (Fr. Yarnold). It was asserted that Lampe was saying that all councils always erred (Archbishop McAdoo). An Anglican exegesis of the text was called for (Bishop Clark). Gibson's commentary was referred to and it was noted that the term general councils was itself ambiguous. (Professor Fairweather). It was opined that Bellarmine would have agreed with Article XXI (Dean Chadwick).

The papal letter on the anniversary of the Second Council of Lyon distinguishing between general councils of the western church and ecumenical councils was thought to be significant (Fr. Duprey).

Discussion of the matter before more work was done on paragraph 24 was thought to be premature (Professor Root and Bishop Butler)

On paragraph 8 it was noted that the sub-commission had been thinking about the remaining problems left over from Venice. The sub-commission recommended the Commission to request a joint paper on Venice 24(a) from Dean Chadwick and Fr. Yarnold (Professor Root). Mention of a possible treatment of Peter in the New Testament by Professor Hanson was also made.

It was controverted that part of the problem of the papacy was that the Roman Catholic Church had not applied to it all that was said of Peter in the New Testament. (Fr. Tavard).

The need to commission work on Venice 24(b), (c) and (d) was affirmed (Professor Fairweather).

It was noted that though documents were internal to the Commission at the present stage they could be shown to responsible people. A crisper style was felt to be ultimately needed gripping the basic objections (Bishop Clark).

7th September: 4.30 p.m. Bishop Clark in the chair

Bishop Clark noted that the final documents from the sub-commissions were internal to the Commission.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher introduced ARCIC 173/Canterbury 7. There had been an extended treatment of the ordination of women and certain footnotes had been incorporated in the text from the earlier draft.

Bishop Butler introduced ARCIC 173/Venice 11 and 12. No 12 was a schema for future work.

Bishop Clark introduced ARCIC 173/Windsor 2 paragraph 6. It was felt that the concluding two paragraphs within No. 6 were a little strong (Fr. Ryan, Dean Chadwick and Fr. Duprey). It was thought that "total" rejection was not appropriate (Bishop Butler). It was noted that this was not simply a straight Anglican/Roman Catholic division.

It was thought that once there had been agreement on reservation little more need be said. Adoration became disproportionate (Fr. Ryan).

Adoration was felt to be a very improper test concerning the real presence. It was noted that those who held both views were in full communion with each other within both churches. (Dean Chadwick). But it was also said that Anglicans were in full communion with those who held Arian views. (Revd. J. Charley)

Disagreement was recognised but not in doctrine (Bishop Butler). It was thought there was a difference of doctrine (Fr. Yarnold).

Bishop Clark asked the Commission to consider the draft Press Release produced by the Canterbury sub-commission. Minor changes were suggested including reference to the Commission responding to criticism. It was agreed that members could use the Press Release in whatever way seemed appropriate providing they did not go beyond it. The two Co-Chairmen were given authority to accept a revised draft.

Bishop Clark introduced the Canterbury sub-commission's schema on future work. It was agreed that it was not possible to say exactly how long it would take to produce a Final Report.

It was agreed that members could share papers from the 1977 meeting of ARCIC with responsible persons and could make a verbal report to national ARCs. There should be no publication of ARCIC documents. Discussion centred on the possibility of moving into the remaining problems of the Venice Statement. The possibility of finishing the Windsor sub-commission material was also mooted. Professor Root outlined the suggestions on future work made by the Venice sub-commission, but there was

some feeling that it would be better to give the preparation of papers to members of the Commission rather than to those outside. The possibility of involving National ARCs was mentioned. After some discussion on the four remaining topics from Venice (and particular reference to the Marian dogmas in the context of their definability) it was decided that material on Venice 24 should be commissioned as follows:

- (a) Fr. Tavard with Bishop Vogel
- (b) Fr. Yarnold and Dean Chadwick
- (c) Fr. Ryan and Archbishop McAdoo
- (d) Fr. Tillard and Professor Fairweather

The papers should be sent to Lambeth during May for a sub-commission meeting of eight members in June (provisionally 5th - 9th).

The place of the next meeting would be Italy, possibly Venice. There was some problem over the dates of the 1978 meeting due to a Faith and Order Commission meeting in India. It was decided that the dates should be revised to 30th August (arrival) - 8th September (departure). Fr. Tillard had some problems with the 1980 date.

It was finally decided that there should be a letter of thanks from the Co-Chairmen thanking Pierre Dumont for his comments on Venice.