

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

TENTH MEETING: SALISBURY, 12TH - 20TH JANUARY 1979

MINUTES

OPENING SESSION: 12th January

From the chair Archbishop McAdoe hoped the meeting would be able to complete the Eucharist and Ministry drafts for publication. He had personally found them very helpful in explaining the work of ARCIC.

Archbishop Annott agreed.

Fr. Tward asked what status they would have.

Fr. Duprey thought that the work of ARCIC was for reaction by the churches, not simply for those interested in the matter. He thought the Commission had planned a general introduction on the sacramental nature of the Church.

Fr. Ryan said that in the US the Catholic Bishops' Conference would be greatly helped by the drafts. There were two exercises, one a reply to criticism, two an explication of the ecclesiology of ARCIC. He noted that the Australian and New Zealand Episcopal Conferences had approved the Windsor Statement.

Bishop Butler warned of the confusion of further comments from the Commission and instanced the Churches Unity Commission's interpretations of the Ten Propositions. He hoped for one volume with an introduction, the texts of the Statements being sacrosanct.

Fr. Yarnold also saw two tasks, an introduction and clarification of Windsor and Canterbury and then material on Authority. The latter might take three years and it was therefore important to show that steps were being taken.

Bishop Vogel hoped that the General Convention 1979 would be able to have at least the Windsor Draft. The Detroit Conference had indicated that there was a strong desire for closer Anglican/Roman Catholic unity in the United States and it had recommended that the Convention accept Windsor as its own faith.

Revd. Julian Charley thought that the drafts could be seen as a working out of the principles of the Statements. On the other hand the Venice Statement was admittedly incomplete.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher wondered whether a fuller press statement would meet the point.

Revd. C. Hill noted the precedent of publishing in learned journals in the Venice Papers.

Bishop Clark looked for a final Statement which would demand something of the churches.

Fr. Ryan thought the texts should stand and that the Commission should try to help those who had responded. He suggested a Co-Chairmen's letter containing the Eucharist and Ministry drafts.

Revd. J. Charley thought the response should be in the name of the whole Commission.

Fr. Duprey did not see how the Commission could act on its own. It had to report to its authorities.

Fr. Tillard distinguished two levels, one a final document to the Vatican and Canterbury, two a response to the reactions of people in the two churches. The latter exercise was catechetical and did not need the same permission.

Bishop Butler hoped there would be some way to show progress.

Fr. Tavard did not find the Venice Papers a relevant precedent, as they were not accepted by the whole Commission.

Bishop Clark hoped that haste would not put the Commission at risk in view of the immediate flexible situation in Rome.

Bishop Butler did not think this was a reason for delay.

Fr. Ryan thought the Commission had a right to reply to its critics, and repeated his suggestion of a Co-Chairmen's letter as a means of distinguishing the status of the work.

Fr. Duprey again asked to whom the response was being sent.

Revd. C. Hill said that the Commission could ask the Secretariat and the ACC to send its response to Synods and Conferences. In this way the document would be made public without publication.

From the chair Archbishop McAdoo suggested that the matter be left there for the moment and that the Windsor draft be examined in detail the following morning.

MORNING SESSION: 13th January

Bishop Clark took the chair and opened discussion on "Draft Response to the Eucharist Statement: Mill Hill" (ARCIC 192).

Revd. J. Charley made two points on its content. In paragraph 1 perhaps the real idea was that of a mystical immolation in heaven rather than a repeated immolation. He also wanted it to be made clear that the document was an answer to those who felt ARCIC had been inconsistent to speak of Christ's presence both in and through the Eucharist.

Fr. Tavard thought it would be wise to make some reference to the Eucharist and liberation theology.

Archbishop Arnott felt that substantial agreement could be expanded.

Revd. C. Hill asked for further elucidation of sacramental language.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether intercommunion should be mentioned.

Bishop Vogel thought this depended on all three Statements.

Archbishop McAdoo thought it might be wise to reserve a fuller treatment of sacramental reality till the final document.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought the title ought to be "A Response to criticisms and discussion of the Eucharist Statement".

Revd. J. Charley felt the way the draft pointed out differences within a common faith very healthy.

Fr. Ryan regretted that many American Catholics did not understand the dual movement. It was important to emphasise that this was part of classical Roman Catholic theology. He also agreed that liberation theology should be touched on.

Fr. Duprey noted that the two movements were indeed classical. He also felt that sacramentality could be expanded. He was not sure that liberation theology was relevant, as it did not divide the two churches.

Bishop Butler thought that liberation theology might be referred to in a final document.

Fr. Yarnold suggested inclusion in a Co-Chairmen's covering letter on the present draft.

Fr. Tillard insisted that ARCIC was not writing a treatise.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher saw the need for an introductory paragraph to the draft in which incidental reference could be made to liberation theology.

There followed some discussion on the exact title, "commentary", and "response" being offered.

Fr. Tillard suggested "explication". All agreed when Mr. Charley offered "elucidation".

Revd. C. Hill suggested that the new introductory paragraph should pick up the concluding paragraph of Windsor 12.

Bishop Clark thought the introductory paragraph should also refer to the intercommunion question.

Fr. Tillard said it would need to show that intercommunion was not just dependent on Eucharistic faith.

Fr. Duprey said that it would need to be shown that the Commission was speaking at the level of faith.

After this Bishop Clark introduced a paragraph by paragraph discussion of the draft.

In the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 1 Mr. Charley returned to the question of a heavenly sacrifice. He was anxious that the Commission should be seen to have answered the problem of a theology which almost made the ascension the equivalent to the atonement. He suggested a new sentence should be inserted after the first sentence.

Fr. Tillard said this was the theology of Schillebeeckx.

Fr. Tavard noted that the draft spoke of a common christian faith at its conclusion, but of theology at the end of 1 sub-paragraph 1. The same sentence was also tautologous.

Bishop Butler noted that the sentence was prematurely answering questions. He asked for "wæther" to replace "that" on line 6 of the same paragraph.

Archbishop McAdoo did not like "devotion to it" in the second sub-para of I. This also occurred in para 7.

Bishop Butler suggested "discussion" for "treatment" in line 8.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested "acknowledged" for "protected" on the same line.

Father Tavad suggested "Christ's eucharistic presence" in lines 6 and 7.

The Rev. C. Hill asked for "unintentional" in line 5 of paragraph 2 instead of "indeliberate".

Father Yarnold therefore asked for "intentional" to complement it.

Bishop Clark then asked Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Father Yarnold to draft an introductory paragraph.

In paragraph 3 Bishop Butler noted that Justin was not biblical.

Archbishop McAdoo thought that anamnesis should be put into the quotations in 3 sub-para. 1.

In the same para Archbishop Arnott asked for an expansion of the reference to the Greek tradition.

Father Tavad asked for "When Trent explains the relation between the sacrifice of the Cross and the eucharist" Father Tillard thought a quotation from the General Instruction of the Missal would be helpful.

It was also noted that the reference to the Council of Trent should read "Session XXII"

Rev. C. Hill felt that 3 sub-para 2 would be an appropriate place for some expansion of the term sacramental.

Bishop Butler preferred "the Eucharist is a sacrifice in the sacramental sense" in the last sentence of this sub-para.

Father Tavad queried the use of the New Testament allusion in this sub-para.

The Rev. J. Charley suggested "in the New Testament sacrificial language refers primarily to....."

Father Yarnold asked for "sacramental anamnesis" in line 10 of the sub-para.

Bishop Butler thought the Fathers also used sacrificial language. He therefore preferred "the tradition of the Church as evidenced, for example, in the liturgies used the same word....." He also preferred "historical" rather than "Eucharistic".

Father Tavad said that it was the Eucharist not the celebration which was sacramental in line 10.

Father Tillard was not happy at the suggested phrase "sacrificial language". Sacrificial language in the New Testament frequently referred to the Old Testament.

Bishop Butler offered "regularly refers to these historic events".

Father Ryan preferred to invert the order "Christ's saving work for us is scribed in terms of sacrificial language"

Bishop Butler raised a serious difficulty in para 3, sub-para 4. He felt a lack of an explicit reference to the Church offering Christ.

Father Ryan said the Church's offering becomes reasonable "in Christ".

Rev. J. Charley accepted such an addition.

Bishop Butler suggested "offering and presenting himself".

Bishop Vogel offered "presenting itself and being offered in Christ"

Bishop Clark drew attention to Windsor para 5.

Father Tillard offered "it is, in communion with the offering of Christ, the body of Christ,"

Father Tavard thought the problem was the "it" in this phrase. What did it refer to?

Bishop Butler wanted to see reference to an action.

Father Ryan felt the paragraph was in the wrong order. It was meant to be an explication of Windsor 5 but this only came in at the end.

Bishop Vogel thought that this paragraph and the preceding one ought to be put together.

In the preceding paragraph 3, sub-para 3, Bishop Butler suggested "the action of his people" in line 3.

The Rev. J. Charley was very unhappy at language which spoke of offering Christ, but he thought that the word "offer" was being used in different ways.

Bishop Butler saw the whole purpose of creation as offering itself back to God in adoration in and by Christ.

Father Ryan reminded the Commission of the earlier paragraphs of Justin (64 and 65) Justin had asked what religions gave true access to God. The great gift of Christ was the possibility of achieving a rational sacrifice, a sacrifice of mind and heart.

Father Yarnold noted that in discussion with evangelicals he had at first been critical of a pedantry of tenses, but once a gift was made nobody ~~can~~ else can make it. It was not enough to say "we offer Christ", there must also be an offering of life.

Bishop Vogel suggested the addition "in Christ" after "redeemed" in line 2 of the last sub-para.

Father Tavard proposed "the community of believers....redeemed, offers and presents itself as the body of Christ, a reasonable.....".

But Bishop Butler felt this still did not meet his point.

Father Tillard thought that to speak of offering Christ would change the emphasis of the sub-paragraph.

Father Ryan repeated that the Commission must explicate "enter into the movement of his self-offering".

Archbishop McAdoo said that there must be a clear distinction between Christ's historic offering and the sacramental and liturgical offering.

The Rev. J. Charley said there was one historical and atoning offering. But there was also Christ's continual self-surrender without which the atonement was impossible.

The Church could not enter the atoning offering but it could enter Christ's self-surrender. The dual movement of the eucharist was relevant here. Christ offers himself to us so that we can offer ourselves to God.

Archbishop Arnott wondered whether reference to Windsor 3, 6, 7 and 8 might be made together with a common liturgical tradition "in him, with him, and through him".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought the first sentence of the final sub-para might be omitted without loss if the following sentence were strengthened by the addition of "his members" and obedience of Christ".

The Rev.C.Hill thought it a pity to omit the sentence if agreement were near.

Father Ryan called for an explication of what the Church could and could not enter into.

Father Duprey spoke of the psychological reactions to language, numbers of Catholics and Anglicans misunderstood what was meant by "to offer Christ". The Church was associated with Christ's self-offering. Hebrews 10.10.

Father Yarnold noted that some Roman Catholics would want some treatment of the propitiatory language of eucharistic sacrifice found in Trent.

AFTERNOON SESSION: 13th January

Bishop Clark was in the chair.

Fr.Yarnold wondered whether there ought to be some discussion of Article XXII.

Archbishop Arnott and Professor Root noted that in both their churches the Articles were assented to in their historical context.

Archbishop McAdoo saw it as a condemnation of the medieval chantry system.

Professor Root did not think the Commission was in the business of condemning its fathers.

Revd.J.Charley said this raised the bigger question of the authority of past Statements.

Bishop Clark then moved the discussion on to paragraph 4 of the draft.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher made the general point that quotation from the Windsor Statement might helpfully relate the Commission's response to the original document.

Revd.C.Hill hoped this would not encourage readers to distort the original Statement.

Fr.Tillard noted there were six places where "become" was used.

Archbishop McAdoo offered the suggestion of references as an alternative.

Fr. Duprey hoped there might be some treatment of presence per modum substantiae.

Fr.Tavard said that "materialistic" (4 sub-para. 1) suggested Marxist!

Bishop Butler was concerned that the "be" in the first sentence of 4 sub-para. 1 might be understood in terms of consubstantiation.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested that direct quotation from paragraph 10 of Windsor would obviate this.

Revd. C. Hill thought that the last sentence of 4 sub-paragraph 1 was trying to say two things. It spoke of both the location and the nature of the presence.

Archbishop McAdoo and Fr. Ryan hoped that the paragraph might include some liturgical reference to the eucharistic prayer/Series in the Scottish Prayer Book.

Archbishop Arnott did not like "appropriating" in 4 sub-para.

Bishop Butler offered "so they may become" in the same sub-para.

Fr. Tavard felt that 4 sub-para. 2 need^{ed} tightening. There seemed to be a contrast between the fellowship of the Lord's Supper and the heart of the believer.

Fr. Yarnold was not sure that the paragraph really hung together.

Fr. Ryan suggested that the two principles should be clearly distinguished from the later elucidation. He suggested that (a) and (b) might be inserted within paragraph 5.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested that 4 sub-para. 4 should begin "'becoming' then".

Bishop Butler added "Nor does the liturgical use".

Bishop Clark corrected "His presence is limited".

Bishop Butler felt uneasy at "elements" in 4, 4.

Bishop Vogel offered "creatures" or "things".

Fr. Ryan suggested the simple deletion of "the elements of".

Archbishop McAdoo suggested "the natural creation to convey" but Bishop Butler again smelt consubstantiation.

Fr. Ryan offered "realities".

Fr. Tillard noted that if there was no longer bread and wine there was no longer a presence and Fr. Yarnold insisted that the physical elements are sacramental signs but he agreed that "convey" could mean "suggest".

Revd. J. Charley said the second part of the sentence balanced the first part.

Fr. Duprey recollected that the instrumental causality of the sacraments was seen in a particular mode in the Eucharist. He again asked for a treatment of per modum substantiae.

Fr. Ryan thought this might come better in 4 sub-para. 5.

Bishop Vogel said this could be simply stated without technical language.

Bishop Butler urged that a distinction between the Eucharist and the other sacraments should be drawn. This was taking literally the words of the New Testament.

Fr. Tillard, Mr. Charley and Archbishop McAdoo felt this oversimplified the issue.

Fr. Ryan proposed the juxtaposition of principle (b) to 4 sub-para. 5.

Fr. Tillard offered "before the Eucharistic Prayer to the question what is that, the believer answers it is bread. After the Eucharistic Prayer to the same question he answers, it is truly Christ the bread of life."

Bishop Vogel agreed with Fr. Ryan that principle (b) could well come before sub-para. 5.

Fr. Yarnold thought that paragraph references would do instead.

Fr. Ryan wanted the references to be to the Windsor Statement.

Fr. Tavard asked for the first sentence to be put into the plural to avoid sexism.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether the "in" and "through" problem had been solved.

Professor Root insisted that they were not inconsistent.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed "the ultimate change that is sought in the purpose of God".

Bishop Butler thought "image of Christ" weak.

Fr. Tillard suggested "likeness".

Bishop Butler suggested "This transformation requires that....." in paragraph 5.

Fr. Yarnold asked which transformation.

Bishop Clarke indicated that it was the transformation into the likeness of Christ.

Fr. Tavard asked for the deletion of "have to"

Bishop Knapp-Fisher requested the deletion of "that of" and its substitution by a colon.

Fr. Tavard objected to the reference to a duality of movement as it separated.

Fr. Ryan asked for "consecrated elements"

Fr. Tillard wanted "but some traditions".

Dr. Gassmann was unclear as to what "association" meant in this context.

Rev. J. Charley wanted "reception by faith in the believers' heart".

Professor Root wanted "real" removed from "Presence" but Father Tillard wanted to keep it.

Bishop Butler suggested an upper case "Presence"

Rev. J. Charley wanted an addition to Fr. Tillard's amendment "The Body of Christ, the Bread of Life".

EVENING SESSION. 13th January

Bishop Clark was in the Chair.

Fr. Tavard felt the reference to the sacrament of the New Covenant in para 5 applied to all sacraments.

Fr. Tillard wanted "through faith".

Dr. Gassmann queried whether the para. meant more than the holding of two overemphases together.

Bishop Clark moved discussion to para 6.

Archbishop Arnott did not like "dispersal of the congregation" in 6 sub para 1

Archbishop McAdoo asked for "two movements".

Professor Root spoke of the considerable work of the C of E Doctrinal Commission had done on the subject of reservation, under the Chairmanship of Bishop Ian Ramsey of Durham.

Fr. Tavard wondered what "early" meant.

Rev C. Hill asked for a reference to Justin.

Rev. J. Charley suggested "is known to date back to the 2nd Century".

Bishop Butler asked for revision of the parenthesis.

Fr. Tillard asked for a reference to the communion of prisoners.

Professor Root thought that "in some parts of the Church" savoured of the Branch Theory.

Archbishop Arnott suggested "In some places in the Church".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought the first part of the final sentence in 6 sub-para 1 too strong. It should be removed.

Bishop Butler asked whether it ruled out Benediction.

Rev. Charley wanted the rejection of abuses.

Fr. Yarnold saw two ways of dissociation; reservation solely for adoration and that also for communion.

Fr. Ryan noted that a real abuse had been rejected in the abolition of mass in the presence of the sacrament exposed.

Fr. Tillard agreed and said that the host was not to be exposed unless it was consecrated for communion; and referred to De Cultu Eucharistico.

Professor Root hoped the point could be made without resort to polemics.

Bishop Clark suggested the beginning of 6 sub para 2 might be "we need to clarify further".

Rev.J.Charley thought the 3rd sentence suggested the Christian life began again at every eucharist.

Bishop Butler therefore offered "to lead us to an ever more perfect union with the Father".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested "It is to lead us to the Father that we are incorporated into Christ".

Rev.C.Fill explained that the fourth sentence indicated that adoration of Christ in the Eucharist was not an end in itself.

There followed some discussion on whether adoration was part or the essence of the Eucharist.

Fr.Tillard maintaining the former and Bishop Butler the latter.

Professor Root objected to the polemical note of the final sentence of 6 sub-para 3.

MORNING SESSION. 14th January.

Archbishop McAdoo was in the chair.

He opened discussion on para 7 after receiving agreement on the sub-commissions (A to revise paras 1-3; B to revise 4-7). He preferred "adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament" in 7 sub-para 1.

Fr.Gassmann thought more than disagreement over practices was involved in 7 sub-para 2.

Bishop Butler proposed "disagreement of theological judgements relating to practice.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher preferred "atoo static and localised " in 7 sub-para 1.

Bishop Arnott found the final sentence of all rather weak.

Fr.Yarnold asked for theological disagreement to be mentioned in 7 sub-para 2.

Rev.J.Charley was not sure it was a disagreement of theology.

Bishop Butler did not think it an appropriate place for a distinction between theology and faith.

Rev.Gassmann did not think differences within a Church proved thing.

Fr.Yarnold wanted to drop the sentence "supporters....." but the Rev.J.Charley opposed this as it indicated the good faith of others.

Fr.Tavard found "essential features" weak.

Bishop Butler felt the question of reservation illustrated rather than clarified substantial agreement.

Fr. Yarnold took Church to mean communion in the second sentence.

Archbishop McAdoo summed up in calling for a rewriting of the sub-para. He then moved discussion to the new introductory material produced by Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Knapp-Fisher. (ARCIC 199/Windsor/1)

Bishop Butler proposed "commissioned toexamine differences in our respective eucharistic beliefs" in 1

Bishop Clark thought the 2nd sentence in 1 too strong. This led to further discussion on the question of the publication of the elucidations.

Rev. J. Charley felt it was good to say the Commission was not simply going on fiddling with niceties.

Fr. Duprey did not think it would be helpful to say the Commission would not alter the Statements. He urged caution.

Bishop Butler... also warned about going on and on.

Fr. Duprey asked what the Commission could send to its Authorities as its final report.

Fr. Ryan and Bishop Vogel said the sentence could be deleted.

Fr. Tavad insisted that conscience as well as controversy should be noted in 2.

Professor Root proposed "extreme language" to "extreme positions" in 2 but Fr. Tillard thought that practice moulded theology.

Archbishop McAdoo wondered whether 2 was required.

Bishop Clark noted it repeated Windsor 1.

Archbishop Arnott asked for some reference to intercommunion and Anglican Orders.

The Rev. J. Charley thought that 3 would be more appropriate at the end of the document.

MORNING SESSION: 15th January

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine Windsor 1971: An Elucidation" (ARCIC 199/Windsor/2 and ARCIC 199/Windsor/3).

There was general approval of the argument.

Dr. Gassmann requested a clearer paragraph structure and Archbishop McAdoo suggested paragraph headings.

The Revd. J. Charley wondered whether the reference to the Mass as a sacrifice would raise unnecessary hackles. (Para. 2).

Fr. Duprey agreed that old vocabulary was not necessary.

Bishop Butler proposed the removal of that part of the sentence.

Bishop Vogel proposed the deletion of the reference to "in and through".

Bishop Clark noted the overlap on eschatology.

Fr. Tavard felt the two references to substantial agreement were confusing.

Bishop Butler pointed out that the first reference (para. 1) was semantic. The second reference (para. 8) concerned content.

Fr. Ryan proposed "represents not only the opinion", but

Professor Root felt this destroyed the meaning.

Bishop Butler proposed "It means that the document represents not only a judgement of all its members (i.e. it is an "agreement") but their unanimous agreement..... (i.e. it is a "substantial agreement").

Fr. Tillard then asked for the final sentence of para. 1 to begin with "consequently".

Fr. Yarnold asked if the "now" was still needed.

Bishop Clark offered "can today".

Revd. J. Charley felt "should they be found to exist" weak.

Fr. Yarnold proposed "which in the polemics of the past have divided our two communions".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher preferred "controversies".

In paragraph 2 the Revd. J. Charley questioned whether anybody thought of the sacrifice as only in heaven.

Fr. Ryan said this was found in the United States.

Bishop Butler did not wish to say there was no truth in the theory of a heavenly sacrifice.

Fr. Tillard offered "others have suspected that the word refers not only to the historical events of salvation, but also...."

Bishop Vogel and Fr. Tavad then said the question must be answered.

Dr. Gassmann wanted an introductory sentence to paragraph 2. noting that the Commission had received many comments but had selected the most important.

Professor Root did not like the word "cover".

Revd. J. Charley offered "conceal the theory of a repeated immolation".

Professor Root and Bishop Butler noted the ambiguity of the word "use" in paragraph 4 (referred to because of the discussion on anamnesis in paragraph 2).

Revd. C. Hill thought that the objection to anamnesis was to the manner of its use and the Commission had not really answered this.

Bishop Clark called the discussion back to paragraph 3.

Professor Root did not like "to conceal basic controversial issues".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Fr. Ryan proposed "which evades unresolved differences."

Archbishop McAdoo clarified the last sentence of the paragraph by proposing "without having in fact reached genuine consensus".

Professor Root proposed the deletion of the middle sentence.

Bishop Clark then moved the discussion to paragraph 4.

Fr. Tillard clarified the second sentence by proposing "It chose the word used in New Testament accounts.....".

Professor Root found "from this time onwards" vague.

Bishop Vogel thought that Justin might be given a date.

Dr. Halliburton preferred a reference to the Dialogue with Trypho.

Fr. Yarnold corrected the reference: 1 Cor. 11²⁴ and 25.

Fr. Tillard felt a lack of reference to the liturgies in this paragraph.

Bishop Clark asked Fr. Tillard and Dr. Halliburton to draft material.

Fr. Yarnold felt the last sentence of 4 sub-para. 1 should acknowledge different interpretations.

Revd. C. Hill asked for a stress on the effectiveness of the sacraments in the present.

Fr. Ryan agreed that the Commission should indicate that it did not go as far as Odo Cassels.

Bishop Butler proposed that the final sentence should in fact begin a new paragraph.

Revd. J. Charley insisted that the argument of Windsor was not simply based on an interpretation of anamnesis. He proposed a redrafting "The Commission believes that the traditional understanding of the reality of the sacrament, in which the once for all event of salvation becomes effective in the present through the action of the Holy Spirit, is best expressed by the word anamnesis".

Bishop Butler thought it might not be the best. He also preferred "of sacramental reality".

Fr. Duprey noted that Faith and Order accepted a realistic interpretation.

Bishop Clark asked Fr. Tillard and the Revd. Julian Charley to draft a following sentence.

Fr. Tillard and Dr. Halliburton proposed their joint expansion, to be inserted after "the term is commonly used in patristic and liturgical traditions": "From this time onwards the term is used at the heart of the eucharistic prayer of both East and West, not only in the Institution narrative, but also in the prayer that follows and elsewhere. cf Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the Roman Canon and the Church of England Revised Services".

Revd. C. Hill felt 1662 might be a more useful Anglican example.

Fr. Duprey wondered about the particular choice of the Eastern example.

Dr. Halliburton then asked for an Anglican reference in parallel with that of Trent in the following sentence.
suggested.

Archbishop Arnott/the Prayer Book catechism could be used.

AFTERNOON SESSION: 15th January

From the Chair Bishop Clark requested Father Tillard and the Rev. J.Charley to present their new material: "We accept this use of the word which seems to do full justice to the semitic background. Furthermore, it permits us to hold together both a strong conviction of sacramental realism and a rejection of mere symbolism. However, the selection of this word does not mean for the Commission that our common eucharistic faith may not be expressed in other terms".

Bishop Butler contended that a strong realism must automatically rule out mere symbolism.

After some discussion Father Ryan suggested "permits us to affirm a strong conviction of sacramental realism and to reject mere symbolism".

Bishop Clark then moved discussion on to 4 sub para 2 and after acceptance without amendment on to 4 sub para 3.

Bishop Vogel asked for the deletion of the phrase "and presenting it before the Father". And also pointed out the inconsistency involved in the full quotation from Windsor 5 which spoke of "on behalf of the whole Church" when in the same sentence "on behalf of all mankind" was found.

Father Ryan asked what "presenting it" referred to.

Bishop Butler thought it referred to the sacrifice of Christ.

Father Tillard wondered how he could say this.

Bishop Clark proposed the deletion of the final quotation and its substitution by a reference to Windsor.

Archbishops Arnott and McAdoo proposed a new sentence.

Rev.J.Charley thought the Mill Hill draft considerably clearer.

Father Ryan thought "it" could refer to the sacramental gift.

Father Tillard proposed the deletion of the phrase and its substitution by "and enter into the movement of his self-offering".

Father Duprey thought the same reality was being referred to by both sides but saw the difficulty in finding the right expression.

The Rev.J.Charley still found the draft highly confusing. Objectively there was that which Christ has done and there was a human responsive self-offering.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed another modification "giving thanks for the gift of Christ's sacrifice presented before the Father".

Bishop Butler did not think this met his point.

Father Yarnold wondered whether the phrase "entreat the benefits of his passion" would meet the point. He offered another re-draft "the Church in celebrating the eucharist, giving thanks for the gift of Christ's sacrifice and entreating the benefits of his passion, identifies itself with the will of Christ who has offered himself to the Father on behalf of all mankind.

The Church by this response participates in these benefits and enters into the movement of his self-offering".

Bishop Butler was still unable to accept this and felt he would not be able to sign the document.

Archbishop McAdoo quoted Jeremy Taylor:

And this also his ministers do on earth. They offer up the same sacrifice to God, the Sacrifice of the cross by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to his holy institution....As Christ is a priest in heaven for ever and yet does not sacrifice himself afresh nor yet without a Sacrifice could he be a priest, but by a daily ministration and intercession represents his sacrifice to God and offers himself as sacrificed, so he does upon earth by the ministry of his servants. He is offered to God; that is, he is by prayers and the sacrament represented or offered up to God as sacrificed, which in effect is a celebration of his death, and the applying of it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable by a ministry like his in heaven. It follows, then, that the celebration of this Sacrifice be in its proportion an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. (The Great Exemplar (1649), Pt III XV, discourse xiv).

Father Tillard proposed another solution "in the liturgical action of the Church Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people in a sacramental way with this offering".

The Rev. J. Charley was unclear as to what sense "unites" was to be given.

Father Ryan insisted that sacramental applied to both offering and sacrifice.

Bishop Butler asked of the significance of Hebrews.

The Rev. J. Charley stated that Christ did not offer himself in heaven in Hebrews.

Bishop Butler was afraid that Mr. Charley's objection went against the whole nature of sacramental reality.

Dr. Halliburton admitted that offering could be understood too realistically.

Mr. Charley insisted that the New Testament said nothing of Christians being united to Christ's offering.

Father Ryan repeated that the offering was sacramental.

The Rev. J. Charley said that Christ's obedience and submission to the Father was an absolute prerequisite of the atonement but did not make atonement. A distinction could be drawn between the Incarnation and the atonement; the two should not be confused.

Bishop Vogel felt entreating could mean the same as presenting.

Father Tillard tried to mediate again. He suggested "in the liturgical action the Church enters into the movement of this self-offering; Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people in a sacramental way with his unique sacrifice".

The Rev. J. Charley found this more helpful but preferred it to be put the other way round "in the liturgical action, Christ by the Holy Spirit unites his people in a sacramental way with his unique sacrifice; and so the Church enters into the movement of his self-offering".

Bishop Butler could accept the Tillard version but not the Charley version.

Bishop Clark asked whether the Commission would accept the Tillard version, delete the phrase "and presenting it before the Father" and the final quotation from Windsor.

The Rev. J. Charley was unhappy at this but suggested the Commission moved on.

In paragraph 5 Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested "involves a physical change in them" in the first sub-para.

Bishop Butler suggested "rather, we are indicating...." in sub-para 3.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher offered "The ultimate change intended by God...." in sub para 4.

Bishop Clark moved on to paragraph 6 and after grammatical improvement to para 7.

Archbishop Arnott and Father Tavard still found "dispersal" a problem.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested "after the congregation has dispersed".

Rev. J. Charley was not clear as to what "this" referred to at the end of 7 sub para 1. It would be better to speak specifically of veneration.

Bishop Butler preferred "If veneration is wholly dissociated....."

Bishop Knapp-Fisher felt there was more than a distortion of eucharistic practice in the dissociation referred to at the conclusion of para 7.

Bishop Butler therefore proposed "a distortion in eucharistic practice".

Archbishop Arnott hoped the reference to Eucharistiae Sacramentum would be footnoted.

The Rev. J. Charley thought the penultimate sentence in para 7 was a non-sequitur.

Father Ryan agreed and proposed "even though it does not include immediate sacramental reception".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher stated from a personal point of view that such devotion to Christ in the reserved sacrament need not be dissociated from Communion.

Father Yarnold was puzzled by the reference to "ultimate purpose" at the end of para 7 as this was confusing in view of the reference to the leading to the Father found earlier in the para.

The Rev. J. Charley and Bishop Butler proposed "this primary purpose".

In para 8 Father Tavard suggested "too static and localised a presence".

Father Yarnold asked for "within both our communions" in the last sentence.

Father Ryan proposed "the relation of the eucharist to contemporary questions of human liberation and social justice".

Archbishop McAdoo asked for general comments on the Draft Response to the Ministry Statement: London Colney" (ARCIG/195/6).

Father Tavard noted that the order of Canterbury had been reversed. The draft dealt with sacramentality first.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted the Damascus House draft (ARCIC/193) had spoken of an over-hierarchical criticism.

The Rev.C.Hill thought that it had been hoped at London Colney that this would be dealt with in a response on the Venice Statement.

Bishop Vogel found the Canterbury treatment of Apostolic Succession the most difficult to present.

Bishop Clark said that he was often questioned concerning Anglican Orders.

Archbishop Arnott expressed the Archbishop of Canterbury's concern in this matter.

Bishop Butler thought the Commission should be cautious lest the authorities thought it was bringing in extraneous matters.

Bishop Vogel was happy with the London Colney material on Anglican Orders and the ordination of women.

Dr.Halliburton thought the ordination of women really raised questions of authority.

Father Tillard insisted that the ordination of women was extremely complicated. He did not wish to see the Commission affirming something which would inevitably be divisive.

Father Ryan thought London Colney was consistent with the discussions at Canterbury. He insisted that the problem was a real one for Roman Catholics in the U.S.

Father Duprey agreed that something had to be said.

Father Yarnold asked if the general shape met with approval.

Bishop Vogel and Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought it would need expansion at some points.

Archbishop McAdoo invited discussion by paragraphs.

Bishop Clark thought there would need to be a similar introduction to the Windsor elucidation.

Father Tavard thought 1(c) ought to be first.

Bishop Vogel suggested (a), (c), (b), (d).

Dr.Halliburton wondered whether it was a treatment of the whole people of God or of the ordained ministry.

Bishop Butler thought that minister was in some ways a profounder term. He wondered if it could qualify both the ordained priesthood and the priesthood of the whole people of God

The Rev.J.Charley distinguished two issues: 1. the absence of a development of the laity; 2. the relation between the priesthood and the laity.

Father Ryan saw problems in an expansion on the role of the baptised because some Anglican provinces gave a larger role to the laity. How was this related to episcopate.

Bishop Butler agreed this was matter for an introduction to the final document.

Archbishop McAdoo asked whether there was consensus for the order of para 1.

Bishop Butler suggested (a), (c), (b), (d) and Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed.

Professor Root insisted that Anglican Orders were not simply to be discussed in relation to the ordination of women.

Father Tillard agreed.

Father Ryan asked for specific questions to be brought in to this introductory material.

Father Tillard questioned whether the issue divided the two Churches. It was rather divisive within the Churches.

But Father Tavard pointed out that one church ordained women and the other did not.

Archbishop McAdoo asked for discussion on para 2.

The Rev. J. Charley asked for something about laity at this point.

Father Tavard was not happy at the reference to I Peter in 2 sub-para 3. where there was no speaking of sharing.

Father Duprey found strange the expression "doing for us what we cannot do for ourselves" 2 sub-para 2.

Archbishop Arnott thought Romans 6 more apposite than I Peter.

Father Duprey asked for the emphasis of the "also" in the last sentence of 2 sub-para 4.

Father Tavard asked for "it is the ordained minister who invokes the Holy Spirit, who repeats the words....."

The Rev. J. Charley again noted his unease at the ambiguity of "unites his people with his unrepeatable sacrifice" in 2 sub-para 4. The New Testament spoke of unity with Christ who offered himself.

Bishop Butler proposed "it is the ordained minister who leads the Church in the eucharistic prayer in which the words and actions of Christ are recited and who invokes the Holy Spirit".

Father Duprey made reference to Canterbury 13. He spoke of the patristic and Eastern tradition in which the bishop represented Christ.

Dr. Halliburton agreed with Bishop Butler that the word "repeat" sounded like "imitate".

Father Tavard did not think it true that the ministry was priestly because it represented the Church.

Father Tillard thought there was something true in the idea of corporate personality. The Latin Fathers endorsed this.

Bishop Clark noted that Canterbury saw the minister as a priest because he presided at the eucharist.

Father Ryan insisted that the representation argument was not separate from this.

Dr. Gassmann wondered whether there was too sharp a distinction in sub-para 5.

The Rev. J. Charley thought the word "analogically" difficult.

Father Tavad pointed out that it was not an analogy.

Father Duprey said it was most important to keep the word.

Professor Root agreed.

Father Ryan said it was an analogy of attribution but not of proportionality.

The Rev. J. Charley asked for a re-drafting using the noun.

Bishop Butler said two misconceptions had to be avoided: 1. the priesthood of the ministry being derived from the laity; 2. the priesthood of the laity being derived from the ministry.

Father Tillard insisted that the word be kept. He suggested "In an analogical way".

Dr. Gassmann pointed out that as it stood the analogy was between the ordained ministry and the people of God but the real analogy was to the priesthood of Christ.

Father Ryan thought that the "both" was the problem.

Bishop Butler proposed a clarification in sub-para 6 "in ways in which it was not expressly employed in the New Testament". He said this was also true today.

The Rev. J. Charley asked for the addition "and new terminology".

Father Tillard did not think that para 3 sub-para 1 said much.

Dr. Halliburton asked whether it was referring to the permanence of Orders or permanence of ministry in the church.

Father Tavad asked if a distinction was being drawn between office and ministry in 3 sub-para 2.

The Rev. J. Charley said that ministry equalled office plus grace. He proposed the removal of the "and".

Father Ryan proposed "are offered the grace". He found "receive" too automatic.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought "empowered in the church" unhappy.

Dr. Gassmann and the Rev. C. Hill asked for an expansion and explicitation of the sub-para, and the following one.

Father Tillard agreed and called for a statement of what a sacrament was in the Roman Catholic tradition.

Archbishop Arnott queried the word "focus" in 4 sub-para 1.

Dr. Halliburton asked whether the Pastorals had been considered.

The Rev. J. Charley answered that 1 and 2 Timothy had exegetical problems.

Dr. Gassmann said they referred to prototypes of ordination but the structure of the ministry was not then clear.

Dr. Halliburton and the Rev. J. Charley disagreed over whether the Pastorals were giving authorisation .

Father Duprey preferred the Commission to use the term "designate" as in the later Roman Catholic tradition of Canon Law authorisation might come after ordination.

The Rev. C. Hill thought that the subject of the paragraph was the three-fold ministry rather than ordination itself.

Father Tavad did not think the I Clement reference was to the three-fold ministry but Bishop McAdoo said that the subject of the reference was "a pattern of episcopacy".

Bishop Butler said that Clement was concerned with the Apostolic Succession of the whole church and the presbyterial succession at Corinth.

Father Tillard asked for the deletion of the "this" in the final sentence of 4 sub-para 1.

Dr. Gassmann and Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that the Canterbury reference ought to be put in at the beginning of 4 sub-para 2.

Father Tavad noted that as the sub-para dealt with two subjects there ought to be a division in the paragraph.

Archbishop McAdoo wondered whether "a new and grave obstacle" was entirely accurate in para 5, sub-para 1.

The Rev. C. Hill suggested it be put in quotation marks as the phrase came from one of the Letters of Pope Paul VI to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Dr. Gassmann, Archbishop Arnott and Archbishop McAdoo thought a reference to the Lambeth Statement on the ordination of women would be helpful.

Father Tillard did not think the second sentence in 5 sub-para 1 true.

Father Ryan said there were some Roman Catholics in the United States who argued for the ordination of women on the grounds that the priest simply represented the community.

Father Duprey asked the Commission to be sensitive on this point. He said the Commission should not underestimate the problem as a negative view had the near unanimity of the Catholic bishops. The Eastern Churches were even more firm. He could not see the ordination of women in the Roman Catholic Church in the foreseeable future. The Roman Catholic Church might have been ready for a fresh consideration of Anglican Orders but the ordination of women brought new opposition.

Archbishop Arnott wanted a reference to the Versailles statement.

Bishop Butler suggested "the ordination of women has created for the Roman Catholic Church 'a new and grave obstacle' to the reconciliation of our communions".

AFTERNOON SESSION: 16th January

From the chair Archbishop McAdoo opened the continued discussion on ARCIC 195/6 para. 5, sub-para. 1.

Bishop Butler suggested "Who can, and cannot be ordained".

On sub-para. 2 Archbishop McAdoo asked whether there could be some reconciliation of ministries before full organic unity in accord with the Malta Report suggestion of unity by stages.

Professor Root said that this sentence was concerned to stress that the Commission was not interested in anything less than full organic unity, though it did not rule out stages towards this.

Dr. Gassmann proposed "apart from the goal of establishing full organic unity" to make this clearer.

Fr. Tillard did not like the phrase "reconciliation of ministries". In the U.S.A. this had come to be used of untheological and purely friendly recognition. An objective judgment on the Anglican ministry in the Apostolic Succession was required.

Bishop Butler therefore proposed "Recognising the apostolicity of our respective ministries".

Archbishop McAdoo remained concerned that no support be given to the idea of a pre-emptive theological strike.

Revd. C. Hill said that the London Colney Group had been concerned with a complacent Anglican acceptance of a half-way house in intercommunion.

Revd. J. Charley thought two sentences were required making clear the ultimate goal, but leaving open stages.

Bishop Butler suggested "a deliberate process towards full organic unity"

Fr. Tillard stated that the recognition of ministries was a step towards organic unity, but an absolute requisite for partial communion, e.g. a relation of bilateral eucharistic hospitality.

Fr. Duprey agreed but did not want to use the term partial communion in this way. Partial communion already existed.

Fr. Yarnold said that if a mistake had been made on the question of Anglican Orders, it should be put right in any case.

Fr. Ryan suggested "The solution of the question is vital for progress towards the goal of full organic unity".

Fr. Tillard was sure a step of communion was necessary before the problem of the Pope could be solved. This was vital for concrete pastoral progress.

Fr. Duprey for prudence sake proposed "The extent of the Commission's agreement".

Dr. Gassmann and Mr. Charley felt that "Sacrificial character" was too strong.

Fr. Tillard insisted that this was important as it referred back to the lack of intention alleged in apostolicae curae.

Fr. Ryan proposed "Sacrificial aspect".

Fr. Tavard questioned what "its" referred to. He also proposed "The purpose of ordination" to indicate intention.

Revd. J. Charley proposed "So far as" in response to Bishop Butler's objection to "At least".

Archbishop Arnott and Bishop Vogel thought the reference to Apostolicae Curae too neutral.

Revd. J. Charley believed that whatever was done would involve some sort of judgment on 1896.

Fr. Yarnold thought that it was possible to envisage reconciliation without retraction.

Archbishop McAdoo referred to Canterbury and the new context spoken of there. Both churches thought differently about ministry today.

Fr. Ryan did not want a re-examination, but a reversal of the judgment.

Bishop Butler noted the different situation caused by Old Catholic co-consecrators.

Revd. J. Charley saw the status of Apostolicae Curae as a problem.

Fr. Tillard said the mandate of the Commission was to understand the two traditional views on the Eucharist and Ministry, not to make a judgment about validity.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed

Fr. Duprey said that in the Secretariat Canterbury 17 had been taken very seriously. The present draft made real progress and he preferred it to stand. Other comments might come in the last report.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested "It has not been in the competence of the Commission to judge previous decisions, although it believes it must include a re-examination of the verdict of Apostolicae Curae."

Archbishop McAdoo preferred to speak of communion with the Roman Catholic Church in the final sentence.

Archbishop Arnott thought the Lambeth Conference resolution on the ARCIC documents was relevant.

Revd. C. Hill thought that this reference was really concerned with unity by stages, rather than a declaration of intent. There had been much discussion at London Colney over the word "communion" which equalled full organic unity.

Fr. Duprey noted that the plenary session of the Secretariat for Unity had called for a study of unity by stages.

Fr. Ryan proposed "churches of the Anglican Communion of their desire to enter into communion with the see of Rome".

Dr. Gassmann and Revd. J. Charley thought that something on both sides was required.

Bishop Clark thought the Common Declaration apposite.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher reminded the Commission that they were replying to correspondents not issuing ultimatums.

Revd. C. Hill agreed and thought the Final Report the place for drawing the implications of ARCIC's work.

Revd. J. Charley thought this too long to wait.

Bishop Howe (present for the day) expressed the hope that the Commission might finish its work by 1981.

Fr. Duprey thought that the Commission must make some response to criticisms of the Authority document.

Bishop Vogel then introduced the draft introductory paragraph ARCIC 200/Canterbury/1, prepared by himself and Fr. Yarnold.

Fr. Tillard proposed "The relationship of episcopacy within the episcopate of the Church", and "Whether the Statement adequately expresses".

Revd. J. Charley thought that there was not only the question of the sacramental nature of ordination, but also the question of sacramental language.

Bishop Clark on the invitation of the chair asked one sub-commission to rework the introduction and paras. 1-2 of the London Colney draft. The second sub-commission to deal with paras 3-5.

Bishop Vogel then reported on the steps the Episcopal Church was taking to respond to the work of ARCIC. He reported on the Detroit Consultation (see Report on Anglican/Roman Catholic Relations 1977-78).

Fr. Duprey asked what status the Eucharist Statement would have if accepted by the General Convention of 1979.

Bishop Vogel said the highest.

Bishop Howe noted that the acceptance of Agreed Statements was new to both churches. The Synods of the Anglican Communion would finally decide.

Fr. Duprey hoped the World Synod of Bishops would eventually assess the work of ARCIC.

Archbishop McAdoo noted that a number of Anglican Synods had responded affirmatively.

Revd. C. Hill reminded the Commission that the Report on Anglican/Roman Catholic Relations brought the picture up-to-date.

The session concluded with initial discussion on the possibility of a standing committee meeting and the planning for

AFTERNOON SESSION: 17th January

Bishop Clark from the chair invited discussion on the Agreed Statement on Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury 1973): An Elucidation (ARCIC 200/Canterbury/2).

After general comment that the draft read well, detailed discussion took place of a drafting nature.

Fr. Tavard suggested that the order of the mention of the ordination of women and Anglican Orders should be the same in paragraph 1 as in the body of the draft.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher in response to Fr. Tillard's point that the problem was the link between Christ's high priesthood and other priesthoods proposed for paragraph 2 "The priesthood of Christ is unique. He is our high priest who....."

Dr. Gassmann thought "All other priesthood derives from his" too strong.

Revd. J. Charley therefore proposed the deletion of "The high priest" in the following paragraph.

Dr. Halliburton felt that this paragraph dismissed in too cavalier a manner the objection of clericalism (para. 2, sub-para. 3).

Bishop Butler proposed reference to the extensive treatment of the ministry of the whole Church in Canterbury where the ordained ^{ministry} was in the service of the people of God.

Fr. Yarnold therefore proposed "In a document primarily concerned with the ordained ministry the Commission did not think it necessary to develop the subject further than it has already done in the Statement".

Revd. C. Hill additionally proposed "Here the ordained ministry is firmly placed in the context of the ministry of the whole Church".

Fr. Tillard further proposed "and exists for the service of the faithful".

Fr. Tillard went on to suggest "With the function of Christ the high priest" in 2, sub-para. 4.

Revd. J. Charley simplified this to "as high priest".

In the same sub-para. Bishops Clark and Vogel had linguistic problems over the association of "recites" with "actions". There followed a considerable discussion on this subject with "recalls", "recounts", and "describes" being offered.

Fr. Yarnold and others preferred "repeats", as this indicated that the president did some of the acts of Christ. Others found the word unacceptable.

Finally Fr. Tillard proposed "Repeats in the thanksgiving the narrative of the institution at the Last Supper".

Dr. Gassmann still found "sacramentally unites" difficult.

Revd. J. Charley proposed "At the Eucharist Christ's people do what he commanded in memory of himself and Christ sacramentally unites them with himself in his self-offering".

Revd. J. Charley wondered whether "model" was right in 2, sub-para. 5, but it was agreed to keep it.

Fr. Ryan proposed the reversal of its order "which is their source and model".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed the sub-title "Sacramentality of Ordination".

Fr. Tavard thought the penultimate sentence in 3 sub-para. 2 could equally mean lay people.

Fr. Tillard proposed "Those who are to exercise the principal ministerial functions of episcope".

Fr. Tavard preferred "main" to "principal".

Fr. Duprey had problems over "unique importance" in 3, sub-para. 3. Their importance was due to the fact that they were for salvation. Under the same heading there followed an extended discussion on the paragraph with Bishop Vogel proposing "A distinction has been drawn between those sacraments that are held to have been explicitly instituted by the Lord in the Gospel, baptism and the Eucharist, which are 'generally necessary for salvation', and other rites 'commonly called sacraments'. Thus both our traditions affirm their pre-eminence.

Fr. Yarnold thought this ruled out the dominical institution of penance.

Fr. Ryan thought this view hardly defended.

Fr. Yarnold also felt the opening sentence implied an Anglican/Roman Catholic distinction whereas the Commission wanted to speak of a common distinction. He also queried whether the Eucharist was necessary for salvation in the Roman Catholic tradition.

Fr. Tillard and Fr. Duprey instanced St. Thomas.

Bishop Clark thought the paragraph needed re-writing.

Fr. Tillard proposed a sentence simply indicating the common distinction.

Archbishop McAdoo took the Chair.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested the sub-title "Origin and Development of the ordained ministry" before para 4.

Father Duprey thought "authorisation" too canonical in para 4.

Father Tillard proposed "evidence of ordination".

Father Tavard proposed "while the evidence leaves ground for differences of interpretation."

Professor Scarisbrick did not understand "focus".

Archbishop Arnott agreed.

Bishop Vogel was unhappy at "pattern. of episcopacy".

Father Tillard and Father Tavard proposed "the pattern of a three-fold ministry centred on episcopacy".

Dr. Gassmann wanted to add continuity of faith in the last sentence of 4 sub-para 1.

Bishop Butler said that Clement did not speak to this point and Father Duprey and Father Tillard agreed.

Father Duprey proposed the addition "not only with the apostolic faith but also.....".

Father Ryan had problems with historical continuity. It did not say anything.

Father Tavard on the contrary thought it said too much.

Professor Scarisbrick proposed "authentic continuity" but Father Duprey finally proposed "in continuity with the commission given to the apostles".

Bishop Butler did not like the conclusion of 4 sub-para 2 and Archbishop Arnott agreed.

The Rev. J. Charley proposed that a new sentence should begin "however both our communions....."

Father Tavard proposed "and remained faithful to the three-fold ministry centred on episcopacy...." in 4 sub-para 3.

At this point Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on two new drafts for the whole of para 3 sub-para 3 prepared by the Rev. Julian Charley and Father Tillard, and the Rev. C. Hill.

Bishop Clark noted that the Tillard/Charley draft did not include a reference to the institution by Christ.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed a third version which after discussion was accepted "both traditions affirm the pre-eminence of baptism and the eucharist as sacraments 'necessary for salvation'. This does not diminish their understanding of the sacramental nature of ordination as to which there is no significant disagreement between them."

Archbishop McAdoo then moved to a draft by Father Yarnold of the last sentence in 2 sub-para 4.

After some discussion Father Tavard proposed "but in this action it is only the ordained minister who presides at the eucharist in which, in the name of Christ and on behalf of his Church, he recites the gospel account of the Last Supper and invokes the Holy Spirit upon the gifts."

The Rev. C. Hill suggested the amendment "recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper".

Archbishop McAdoo then moved on to para 5 suggesting the sub-title: "Ordination of Women".

Professor Scarisbrick proposed "its doctrinal agreement rests are not affected by such ordinations; for it was.....".

Father Ryan proposed that "in those churches of the Anglican communion where canonical ordinations have taken place".

Bishop Butler proposed "while the Commission realises that the ordination of women.....of our communions, it believes.....".

The Rev. C. Hill pointed out that the quotation from Pope Paul VI to the Archbishop of Canterbury was inaccurate. The quotation marks were therefore removed.

Archbishop McAdoo moved to para 6 proposing the sub-title "Anglican Orders". He wanted some mention of the emphasis on the understanding that priesthood had changed in both Churches.

Bishop Butler proposed "On the nature and purpose of priesthood, ordination and Apostolic Succession".

Father Tavard proposed the deletion of "the explanation of".

Bishop Butler felt the final sentence of 6 sub-para 1 was telling the Pope where to get off.

Father Duprey thought that the reference to "the present force of the verdict" raised canonical problems. He preferred to suggest re-examination.

The Rev. J. Charley said that he did not want a re-examination of Apostolicae Curae. He thought it was a question of authority.

It was decided to leave this sentence until the final paragraph had been examined.

Bishop Butler felt "possibility" was too strong.

Father Duprey proposed "consensus in faith on eucharist and ministry" and "this can only be achieved by a judgment of our authorities".

Bishop Butler and Father Tillard agreed with this.

Bishop Butler still had problems over "possibility". It suggested that only obscurantists were holding things up.

Father Tavard said yes!

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Father Duprey was unhappy at the logic of the last paragraph. What could the Commission say to its authorities in its final report?

The Rev. J. Charley proposed that the first sentence end "at ministry" and continue "the Commission believes that its agreements..... had led us to the possibility of such an acceptance. Mutual recognition can only be achieved by a decision of our authorities".

Bishop Butler still thought this too strong. The Commission had not proved an identity of faith in the sixteenth century.

The Rev. J. Charley therefore proposed "brought closer the possibility of such acceptance."

Father Tillard felt a logical step was still missing and proposed the insertion "It hopes that its own conviction will be shared by the members of both our communions; but mutual recognition....."

Bishop Butler and others did not feel the final sentence added anything and it was deleted.

Archbishop McAdoo then asked for a consideration of the last sentence of the previous sub-paragraph.

Father Tillard proposed it be put into the last sub-para in the following version: "This calls for a re-examination of the verdict on Anglican Orders in Apostolicae Curae (1896).

Father Ryan felt re-examination implied a long process.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed "re-appraisal". It was decided to place the sentence in its original position.

Archbishop McAdoo then opened consideration of a re-drafting of the second sentence of the Windsor ~~Elucidation~~ 4 sub-para 6 by Father Tillard and the Rev. J. Charley.

The Rev. J. Charley proposed this as in the eucharist Christians were not so much united to Christ's sacrifice as to Christ himself.

The amendment was accepted as follows: "In the celebration of the memorial Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people with himself in a sacramental way so that the Church enters into the movement of his self-offering."

Archbishop McAdoo turned to the question of the Commission's programme for the future.

Father Duprey proposed a double meeting in 1980, and the pro's and con's of this were discussed.

Archbishop McAdoo noted that as it seemed impossible to hold a Sub-Commission meeting during 1979 Father Tillard and the Rev. J. Charley should prepare a draft continuation to Venice/24 on the basis of the papers commissioned for 1978 and on the St Albans drafts (ARCIC 191/6 and 191/7). They had accepted this.

In view of the doubt about a double meeting dates were arranged for a 1980 sub-commission early in the year with a view to two sub-commissions: January 7th - 12th, 1980.

Bishop Clark introduced the subject of the Introduction. He wanted to see something on ecclesiology and the nature of the Church.

Father Duprey hoped for a more limited consideration of the sacramental aspects of ecclesiology.

Bishop Butler hoped the Commission would reply to criticisms of Venice.

Father Ryan thought this might be one operation.

Dr. Gassmann spoke of a framework.

Bishop Butler thought^{of} an examination of the model of the Church as koinonia.

Father Tillard wanted to look at differences given to the means of salvation. Anglicans were divided and the situation was difficult.

Father Ryan proposed an examination of the process of sanctification.

The Rev. J. Charley wanted something on the nature of salvation.

Father Tillard repeated his plea. There had been a division in the English Reformation between those who believed in an intrinsic justification and those who stressed the sacramental life of the Church.

Father Duprey noted that Cardinal Willebrands hoped for a framework for the three Statements.

Father Yarnold said that the discussion tended towards a fourth Agreed Statement!

MORNING SESSION. 19.1.79.

From the Chair Bishop Clark confirmed plenary meetings for 1979: 28th August - 6th September. 1980: 26th August - 4th September, and if necessary 1981: 25th August - 3rd September. A sub-commission was also finalised 7th - 11th January, 1980.

Bishop Clark then opened discussion on the Introduction and final report. It was hoped that work could begin on this during 1979.

Professor Root thought that much would depend on the continuation of Venice 24.

After discussion it was decided that Father Yarnold (possibly with the collaboration of Dr. Chadwick) should collate suggestions from members of the Commission and begin a draft framework summing up the ecclesiology of the three Agreed Statements.

Bishop Clark asked the theological secretary to invite members to send their comments on the Introduction to Father Yarnold by the 1st June, 1979. He hoped Father Tavard would give some thought to this.

Bishop Clark then opened discussion on the publication of the Elucidations. It was generally agreed that they should be published as soon as possible with a view to the meetings of Synods and the Anglican Consultative Council (May 1979). Caution was, however, expressed that the Commission should not be seen to be by-passing its authorities.

It was agreed that there should be a co-chairmen's note indicating the status of the Elucidations. Father Duprey read a possible draft he had prepared and it was agreed that this should be the basis of the note. (ARCIC 201).

There followed discussion on the final report.

Father Tillard saw three tasks - 1. Elucidation of the existing Venice document; 2. the search for consensus on Venice 24, and, 3. the putting of all this into a final report.

Father Duprey thought the Elucidation should be part of an extension of Venice 24 and be inseparably part of the final volume.

Discussion returned to the question of publication of the present Elucidations.

Father Duprey expressed the hope that the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity would be happy with the publication at the co-chairmen's initiative.

Bishop Clark was uneasy at this.

The Rev.C.Hill saw three possibilities in descending order of merit: 1. Permission to publish through both authorities; 2. publication with the knowledge and tacit approval of the S.P.C.U; 3. unilateral Anglican publication as reporting to the A.C.C. would inevitably mean publication through the Synods of the Anglican Communion.

Father Duprey hoped to discuss the matter with Cardinal Willebrands on his return to Rome and would be in immediate contact with Bishop Clark.

Bishop Clark then opened discussion on business matters.

Archbishop Arnott proposed that steps should be taken to seek charitable status for the Commission so that its investment would not be subject to tax (Graymoor Prize Money). This was accepted with the proviso that it should not cost more than it saved.

Bishop Clark proposed that the Secretary should look at the position papers in the Commission's archives with a view to the possible editing of a companion volume to Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue.

A press release was passed after amendments.