

MINUTESARCIC - Fourth Meeting, Gazzada. 30th Aug - 7th Sept. 1972OPENING SESSIONWed. 30th: 9.0p.m.

Bishop Clark opened the first session, after prayer, by outlining a proposed plan for the next 2 days:

- Thursday: 1. Report of Sub-Commission on reactions to the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine.
2. Fr. H. Ryan to speak on the Woodstock meeting and present the proposed agenda for Gazzada.

Friday: Meet in 3 Sub-Commissions on:-
'Church as Eucharistic Community'
'Ministry in the New Testament'
'History'.

Saturday Full meeting to report on the profitability of this way of working.

There will be Anglican and R.C. celebrations on alternate days, and prayers by members at 7.45p.m. each evening.

The remaining papers were distributed, including one by Bishop Butler on 'Eye-witness: Witness', and the Report of the Eucharist Sub-Commission.

+++++

Thursday 31st. 9.30a.m.REACTIONS TO AGREED STATEMENT

Bishop Clark presented the Report* of the Sub-Commission which had examined reactions to the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine.

In discussion it was made clear that official replies were very uneven, e.g. no replies from some R.C. Episcopal Conferences, yet from most individual members of English and Welsh Hierarchy; replies received immediately from 3 Primates of Anglican Communion but not from the rest.

* attached herewith.

MINUTES

Thursday 31st August. 9.30.a.m. (continued)

It is early days yet for official reactions from Anglican Churches. Resolutions passed by ECUSA House of Bishops in October, by English and Irish Houses of Bishops and Statement debated by Australian House of Bishops.

Further debates in Convocations, General Conventions, in these countries and in Canada, still to come.

(See also ARCIC 53 for resolution in New Zealand General Synod).

Fr. Yarnold said he had been asked for

- 1) stress on, and explanation of, 'substantial agreement';
- 2) avoidance of theory (e.g. memorial) not well-based exegetically;
- 3) consideration for eucharistic faith of converts.

The Bishop of Ossory urged that we should not yield to those who ask the wrong questions. It was recognised, however, that many of our critics had not been through our experience of the process of growing and working together. They could be asked to examine their own assumptions.

The most fruitful way forward was to invite approval of the Commission's method of approach and of the direction taken by the Statement.

The Sub-Commission's Recommended Text for Publication was then discussed in detail, and the secretaries were asked to re-draft it.

11.30 a.m.

WOODSTOCK MEETING

Fr. Herbert Ryan presented the documents from the Woodstock meeting; covering letter, Chairmen's letter, outline agenda, and bibliography.

Meeting: Mon. 22 - Friday 26th May, Woodstock College, New York.

Convenor: Fr. Ryan. Present: Bishop Clark, Bishop of Ossory, Bishop Vogel, Fr. Tillard, Fr. Tavad, Prof. Fairweather, Mr. Charley, and Fr. John Reid, S.J. a Canon Lawyer.

- AIMS:
1. Aid Full Commission to evaluate research done on Ministry.
 2. Isolate the problem areas in specifically Anglican and Roman Catholic understandings of Ministry.
 3. Produce an over-view of how to approach the question of Ministry in the light of the Venice document.
 4. Assess in the light of the above all the material and produce an agenda.

Conclusions:

- (i) Problems are in Anglican - Roman Catholic approach to problem of ministry centred in the nature of priesthood and the problem of Anglican orders.
- (ii) In relation to this papers by Tillard, Tavad, and Fairweather the major documents for this.
- (iii) Not a Statement but an outline agenda produced, in relation to three papers; specifying work of three Gazzada Sub-commissions.
 - No. 1 gives continuity with the Agreed Statement on Eucharist
 - No. 2 relates to Tillard and Fairweather
 - No. 3 relates to Patristic period, normative for both Churches.
 - Nos. 4 & 5 (for our next meeting) relate to Tavad paper.

Letter of Co-Chairmen gives substance of Woodstock's thought.

Bishop Butler opened the discussion by describing agenda as 'misconceived fundamentally'. Better begin with mission and credentials for mission, not with priesthood.

Bishop Clark: Ministry, not priesthood is our starting point.

Fr. Ryan: best order: Eucharist - priesthood - ministry - mission - authority.

Prof. Fairweather: Begin with mission, and totality of ministry in New Testament. Better, too, to produce a more comprehensive thesis on ministry than envisaged by some, i.e. a general statement in the light of which controversial points examined.

It was agreed to reverse 2(b) and 2(a) to read:

'Ministry in the New Testament, and priesthood'

The aim of the meeting was stated as to draft some material on ministry to be used for possible inclusion in statement to be produced after consideration of sections 4 & 5 at next meeting.

Bishop Butler felt root issue the transmission of redemption through 'commissioned witnesses', 'hear ... preacher ... sent'. In spite of confusion over the word mission, the necessity for a commissioned minister a possible starting point.

Group 1 were invited to consider Bishop Butler's points.

MINUTES (continued)

Thursday 31st Aug. (continued).

In discussion of Group 3's assignment, Fr. Ryan said it was to stress the variety of forms of ministry in the Patristic period, which was normative for our theology of ministry but was not monolithic. It was also to explain how we get from the New Testament to a re-sacralizing or re-Judaization of ministry. The Bishop of Ossory added that we have to recognize the plurality of ministry and its development, and their implications. Fr. Tillard argued that although exegetical problems of charismatic and institutional ministry are important, our task is to tackle the problems which divide our Churches. Fr. Tavard pointed to the danger of theologians wanting a Scriptural basis and exegetes saying: start at the 4th century!

Professor Fairweather and Bishop Butler pursued the question of the order of ministry instituted by Christ, 'meant to survive and which has in fact survived!' Bishop Butler referred to Hanson's dismissal of 'orders by consecration' as a 'legend no longer worth discussing', and then mentioned the proposed Anglican-Methodist ordinal which he felt contained almost all that was essential for a doctrine of ministry. He asked that its preface be made available to all and given to Group 1 to see if it could be used in the construction of our opening paragraphs, and compared with Chapter 3 of *Lumen Gentium* on the Ministry.

Julian Charley emphasised the different estimates of the early centuries of the Church made at the Reformation. Fr. Ryan argued that the 16th century Reformed Tradition was not a break in continuity of doctrine but had a good foundation in Tradition, since the Patristic age held the emphasis on sacrificing priest and the counter-emphasis on proclaimer of the word. Bishop Clark summed up the tasks:

Group 1 Anglican-Methodist Preface and Chapter 3 of *Lumen Gentium*, plus work as allotted.

Group 2 Ministry and Priesthood in New Testament

Group 3 Emphasis on sacrificial and ministerial aspects in Patristic and Reformation periods.

Fr. Jean Tillard then presented his paper: "The 'Sacerdotal' Quality of Christian Ministry".

Professor Eugene Fairweather then gave a summary of his researches in the form of Five Propositions from the Common English Reformation Tradition on Priesthood and Sacrifice.

1. There is a strong doctrine of the priesthood and the sacrifice of Christ, the one true sacrifice which atones for sin and reconciles man with God (Hebrews).
2. There is a strong doctrine of the priesthood and the sacrifice of the people of God, a doctrine of the oblation of a holy life. (I Peter).

So far we are very close to the Biblical position given in Jean Tillard's paper.

3. The Eucharist as the link between the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the people of God. In the Eucharist memorial is made of the one true redemptive sacrifice of Christ. The recipients mystically share in the Body and Blood, and in the power of Christ's sacrifice they offer themselves, their souls and bodies, as the priestly people of God.

4. No distinctively sacerdotal act in the Eucharist. Nothing priestly except the self-oblation of the faithful. It is the supreme occasion for this self-offering of the people, which all do together.

N.B. This is on the basis of a prior denial of the offering of Christ in the Eucharist - a violent reaction against the practice of the medieval church.

5. Renewal of a qualified concept of sacerdotium, in light of the renewal of a qualified concept of sacrifice in the Eucharist. (See Hooker quotation in Tillard pp. 3 - 4)

This was the basis of subsequent Anglican theology, including the Archbishop's Responsio to Apostolicae Curae in 1897. Its roots are in that Episcopal doctrine which stressed anew the necessity of proper qualification for the minister of the Eucharist.

N.B. There is a parallel movement in the Early Church, when an unexplicit consciousness of the sacrificial element on Eucharistic doctrine and the concept of the Eucharistic minister gradually become explicit; and in Anglicanism, where the violent negating of the concept of sacrifice in the Eucharist and so of the priest as 'sacerdos' was slower to be overcome. There remained too a strong strain which would stay with the English Reformation position.

Friday, 1st September a.m. and p.m., Saturday, 2nd September 9.30 a.m.

The three Sub-Commissions met separately and prepared the following drafts:

- Sub-Commission 1: General introduction
- Sub-Commission 2: Ministry in the New Testament, and priesthood.
- Sub-Commission 3: Sacrificial and ministerial aspects of ministry:
1. The eucharist and priestly ministry.
 2. The ministry of the word and Sacraments.
 3. The cure of souls and the power of the keys.
 4. The priesthood of bishops and presbyters.
 5. The ordained ministry within the church.

Saturday 2nd September: 4.30 p.m.

The Commission met in plenary session under the Bishop of Ossory's Chairmanship, and the Chairmen of the Sub-Commissions were asked to report.

Sub-Commission 1

Bishop Vogel said his Sub-Commission's aim was to draft a general introduction. For this the Southern Africa Commission's paper had been valuable and the Anglican-Methodist Ordinal rather than its Preface. The aim was to trace from the inter-personal life of God in Trinity the origins of mission (paras. 1 and 2); to link with the Windsor Statement (para. 3); and to relate ministry to the apostles (para. 4).

In discussion Bishop Butler asked for a reference to fallen humanity. Dr. Gassmann and others objected that the Holy Spirit, not the eucharist, is the 'source of ministerial power'. 'Ministerial Priesthood' was felt to be a phrase with associations which prevented its being read as 'non-cultic' and it was agreed to omit 'ministerial'. Julian Charley asked if we share in the priesthood of Christ or in its effects. Bishop Vogel said that by baptism we are made members of Christ's body. Bishop Clark suggested that there was no need to quote from a Roman Catholic source for the sake of matching an Anglican one. Julian Charley and Professor Scarisbrick objected to the clericalism of 'they embody the ministry of the whole Church.' The text was then referred back to the Sub-Commission for re-thinking and re-wording.

Sub-Commission 2

Julian Charley said their brief was not yet completed - a section on priesthood had been drafted but not discussed. Their aim had been primarily to look at the New Testament and work from there. They saw ministry and service as the fundamental life of the church, stemming from the ministry of Christ (para. 1). From there they moved to the special ministers, initially apostles, within this from the beginning (para. 2). They then spoke of the significance of special ministries, how they were raised up, and

their relation to the apostles. (para. 3). Finally they tried to define in the later New Testament development the main functions of ministry that are more explicitly formulated and ordination as we know it in its embryonic form.

In discussion Fr. Duprey pointed to the problem raised by the fact that 'priesthood' translates both 'hierateuma' and 'hierosyne'. Fr. Tavard asked whether we want to locate the apostles among the ministries of the church or to see ministries as flowing from the apostles. He also, like others, asked what was meant by the authenticity of ministries depending on their relation to the apostles. The Sub-Commission were asked to consider conflating No 1's draft with theirs, and omitting their own para.2.

Sub-Commission 3

Dean Chadwick said that they had considered various historical questions, which could be expanded, if required, later. Their intention was to trace the usage of the title of priest (sacerdos) in relation to Bishops and Presbyters in the ancient Church, and how this developed in late medieval theology in a way that caused anxiety to the Reformers. Polemical divinity had caricatured the other side because of a lack of clarity about the relation of the eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ. They had said little about the pastoral ministry and intercession for the flock, but the word 'priest' did not wholly refer to 'cultic ministry'. It was felt that the inwardness of ministry had been forgotten in the Middle Ages. There was also a difference of pastoral style, depending on whether the sacrament of penance was compulsory or not. In discussion Dr. Gassmann felt the first two pages were informative but from page 3 on it became interesting. In section 1E it was agreed to read: 'did not successfully and did not even attempt to explain.' On its last sentence Fr. Tavard objected that there was an identity between the sacrifice of the eucharist and that of Christ but not between the priesthood of the minister and of Christ. On 2B Dr. Gassmann observed that it was unusual for Anglicans and Roman Catholics to describe the eucharist as 'the supreme proclamation of the Gospel'. On 3 Fr. Tillard did not want us to avoid a real point of controversy over the conferring of the power of absolution on the presbyterate.

Sunday 3rd September: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Clark spoke from the chair with urgency about the direction to be taken by the Commission. He felt we had reached a full stop, and must decide what to do next. Consensus does not yet exist, so we must face the issues that really divide us and see if they can be reconciled or not. We are two churches with two confessions of faith. Can we reach consensus on what we believe to be the ministry Christ gave his church and which we exercise? This ministry is apostolic: we must get down to apostolicity and say how ministry is an object of faith. We believe in the church, and ministry is integral to the church.

If this is true, then we must produce something 'consonant with biblical teaching and with the tradition of our common inheritance'. We have to state the Reformation divide on ministry and test this against the Gospel. Begin with the polarization, and then show that our ministries are also apostolic. N.B. Ministry is also mystery, not just a matter of history and church order. The whole Commission must be engaged in this central work. Sub-Commission 2 should finish its paper and this is to become a position paper for the whole Commission. Next spring

a Sub-Commission should then draw up a further Poringland-type position paper for the autumn meeting.

Fr. Yarnold suggested that Sub-Commissions 1 and 3 tackle the key question of apostolicity while 2 finishes work on the nature of priesthood. We should then aim at substantial agreement on apostolicity.

Fr. Duprey urged that all three Sub-Commissions should work on the same subject-matter, to produce a basic position paper to be re-done next year.

Fr. Tillard said the problem of apostolicity divided not our two churches but different schools of thought. Bishop Clark asked that if this was so it should be defined. Fr. Tillard said there are two levels of faith: (i) apostolic succession (ii) the apostolic nature of ministry (which we should examine now), and its relation to the apostolicity of the church. Professor Fairweather added that at some point we should wrestle with Apostolic Succession, a divisive issue still; but first examine the whole range of apostolicity.

Dr. Chadwick confessed he was confused and puzzled by questions to do with priesthood. Some Anglicans will want to know if Roman Catholics believe that 'sacerdotium' is cultic and if the congregation is external to the priest. Something should also be said on the sacramentality of absolution. Will some Roman Catholics object to Anglicans whose view of apostolic succession is more de facto than jure divino?

The Bishop of Ossory added that one of the functions of theology is to separate ecclesial folklore from truth.

Fr. Ryan urged us to consider 'what is a priest', not 'is this man a priest?'

Bishop Butler argued against focussing on polarization at the Reformation.

Bishop Clark said that our theme was: what do we believe on the ministry Christ gave his Church? Sub-Commission 1 and 3 should focus on Apostolicity, while 2 completed their paper on ministry which the others could then examine.

Sunday 3rd September: 4.30 p.m. Meeting in Sub-Commissions.

Monday, 4th September: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop of Ossory asked Sub-Commissions 1 and 3 to present their Notes on Apostolicity.

Sub-Commission 1

Fr. Tward said this was not a document destined to be inserted in a text, but was notes for discussion or clarification. He distinguished two levels of apostolicity: (i) a quality of the Church (ii) signs and criteria of this basic apostolicity. Para. 3 described the process of discovery of apostolicity. Para. 4 was a tentative conclusion, though more reflection needed on some divergences.

In discussion Bishop Butler suggested 'faith and life'. Fr. Tillard questioned the words 'not objects of faith', but Fr. Tward

distinguished between the word of God and the scriptures. Bishop Butler felt para. 3 on development should have referred also to corruption. Julian Charley asked whether in assessing criteria one was concerned with the reality of spiritual life in a church or just with a number of 'notes of apostolicity'. Professor Fairweather distinguished between what differences would and would not imply disagreement in faith. Bishop Butler felt we should hold in tension the "unworthiness" and the call for "holiness". Fr. Yarnold preferred to speak of signs of a growing fidelity to the apostolic church never perfectly fulfilled.

Sub-Commission 3

Dean Chadwick said his group set down a number of heads of their discussion. He added that they were unsympathetic to the view that because we are badly informed about the apostles we cannot say they had no part in founding the church.

In discussion Fr. Yarnold observed that there was no definition of apostolicity. Professor Fairweather said that Episcopi vagantes made it important to deny that apostolicity was safeguarded by a mere succession of ordination.

Dr. Chadwick said the question of whether by apostles we meant the twelve or more was not so important: a later generation looked back to its derivation from the mother church in Jerusalem where the apostles and others were active. Bishop Butler pointed out the danger of thinking of apostle as a title, rather than its meaning 'men given directly by Christ a commission which we believe was given directly to the Twelve by Christ'. He added that when we discuss ordination, we should ask whether some kind of external expression of commission or approbation is more important than laying-on of hands. He also asked by what criteria does one select one group of scattered or diverse evidence as more normative than another. Fr. Dunrey said the letters of Ignatius, being to different churches, were better evidence than Hermas. He later said that what was important at first was not the succession of the Bishop of Rome from Peter, but the Church of Rome's first importance because of Peter and Paul. Dr. Chadwick said they were asking whether the reception of authority or jurisdiction from Rome were any part of what is meant by apostolic succession.

Fr. Yarnold, noting the consensus on apostolicity in the reports from the two Sub-Commissions, contrasted our view with that of Congar, who defines it as the mission or commission of the Twelve which carries on throughout the history of the church.

Sub-Commissions 1 and 3 also presented their proposed corrections to Sub-Commission 2's paper on Ministry, for incorporation into its next edition.

Bishop Clark suggested that tomorrow morning, while 2 worked on the revision of their document, 1 and 3 could meet together to consider 3's additional points on priests and priestliness.

(Instructions were given later that they should also reconsider and if needed expand their reports on Apostolicity.)

Tuesday, 5th September

9.30 a.m. Groups 1 and 3 met together, Group 2 separately.

4.30 p.m. Bishop Clark took the chair and gave out 2's 'Provisional Document No. 1 - Ministry', 1 and 3's revised Note on Apostolicity, and their 'Provisional Outline for a Document on Ministry'.

Julian Charley presented the 'document No. 1 - Ministry', and explained that all comments had been taken note of and most, including 1's suggested para. 4, incorporated in the revised text.

In discussion some further amendments were suggested for the drafting committee to deal with.

8.0 p.m. Dean Chadwick presented the revised Notes on Apostolicity with its catalogue of problems that need clarification.

Professor Fairweather pointed out the two lines of argument, beginning from priesthood and from apostolicity that were being followed and needed synthesizing. Fr. Duprey's footnote attempted to explain why priestly language came to be used.

Bishop Clark asked if the Commission wished to draw up a preparatory document on Apostolicity on this basis and along these lines. Dr. Gassmann suggested it might be done tomorrow morning but this was opposed. Bishop Butler reminded the Commission that a statement on apostolicity would need to begin with 'Christ the great apostolos of God'.

Bishop Clark asked if enough guidance between now and next year for a Sub-Commission to write a section on apostolicity.

Julian Charley felt two more full meetings needed, but Bishop Vogel and others disagreed strongly, while emphasising the need for a complete text to work on at the start of next year's meeting.

Fr. Ryan said tomorrow should be devoted to agreeing on an overall pattern from which a text could be prepared by sections to be assigned to groups geographically.

Julian Charley added that their work should be submitted to a further group to put them together. Dr. Gassmann stressed the need for short theses to guide the groups, not just an outline. Canon Purdy urged us not to stand on the edge of the bath for yet another year, unwilling to plunge in.

Archbishop Arnott asked that the work of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic and Anglican-Lutheran Commission be taken into account, and said we should not fall behind their progress.

Bishop Moorman said it would speed matters if groups worked soon on new material and sent it to A./R.C.I.C. members for comment. Professor Fairweather said we should fix the groups and decide when to meet prior to leaving here.

Fr. Duprey's Provisional Outline for a Document on Ministry' was then discussed.

Fr. Tillard said it was not our task to treat apostolicity on its own, but only those aspects which were directly related to the problem of priesthood. Professor Fairweather said one cannot resolve the nature of ministry by a biblical-historical study. Better, a statement of doctrine of church and ministry and apostolic ministry, backed and illustrated by the biblical and historical material.

Fr. Yarnold suggested that our ongoing work should be allocated to three groups: (a) 3 and 4; (b) 5; (c) 6.

Bishop Clark said we should meet tomorrow in Sub-Commissions at 9.30 to consider the Provisional Outline and the allocation of work, and then meet at 11.0 to discuss this together in Plenary.
