

NOTES ON APPROACHING THE QUESTION OF
CHURCH AND AUTHORITY

William A. Purdy

1. The steering committee, foreseeing that an agreed statement on ministry might well be achieved at Canterbury, and that hence the commission might have to 'start cold' on planning the next stage of its work, with very little time at its disposal, asked the writer to set out some sketch which might serve as a starting point for discussion of "Church and Authority".

2. The most useful way to do this seemed to be to recall compendiously the various points at which the question of authority has been touched on since 1966, and to note any developments. Also to remind ourselves of what material we already have at our disposal. Some lines of approach and some priorities might thus emerge, since we cannot ignore either the terms of reference given us by our masters or the work we have already done or commissioned.

3. The Malta Report refers to authority in several ways. It clearly sees it as one of the divergences, not of substance but of ways of receiving substance, which have kept us apart (par. 4). It suggests that increased, shared knowledge of both the problems and the technique of interpretation have taken some of the heat out of our traditional differences (par. 5). It recommends as part of a second stage of growing together, an explicit affirmation of mutual recognition by the highest authorities, one element of which would be an insistence on Christ as the ultimate Authority for all our doctrine. (Some Anglicans have seen the Pope's declaration at the canonization of the English Martyrs as moving in this direction, but c.f par.40.

4. It mentioned also two practical aspects of our relations in the field of authority: regular meetings of Anglican and Roman Catholic hierarchies* (par.8) and common witness in the form of joint or parallel statements.

* One of the most vigorous requests of Portal and Halifax, remarks Bishop Clark.

(Is it perhaps easier to conceive of an agreed statement on the doctrine of authority appearing plausible in areas where these recommendations have been acted on than in areas where they have not?)

5. Finally in obvious reference back to paras. 4 & 5 it set out explicitly the terms of the problem as it believed the present commission should tackle it. (par.20)

6. These references did not, perhaps could not, adequately reflect the papers given and the discussions held by the J.P.C, especially at Huntercombe. Cardinal Willebrands has repeatedly said that he thinks inadequate attention has been given to the Huntercombe papers. We are directly concerned with four - those of Kemp, Bouyer, Willebrands himself and the paper offered jointly by Moorman and Root. The method of treatment at Huntercombe* perhaps obscured some already important convergences. Kemp, Bouyer and Willebrands all lay emphasis on the local church, essentially a church under a bishop, (though Willebrands uses the expression rather more elastically) as the centre of all Christian life "the basic manifestation and even actualization of the Church, where the eucharist is publicly celebrated and the life of charity embodied in a community of neighbours".

7. One observation here - it seems to me that the 'local church' which is the leading idea throughout especially Willebrands paper is still very much the church of the city-state of late antiquity, where a "tradition" an ensemble of theological ideas, terminology, discipline, usage, etc., is definable in terms of the well-marked city state. This gives an archeological flavour.

*This method was for the paper to be followed by a formal comment or reply by a designated person on the other side. In one or two instances the reply rather swamped the paper.

7. (cont.)

Today's pluralisms are of many different kinds. A single diocese, even a single parish can embrace a bewildering variety of races, beliefs, social classes, etc. We would do well to be clear about what useful content, or contents, we can give to the term 'local church' here and now.

8. They all see episcopate as focus of this life (and of unity) not as status or rank (Kemp), not as dominium but ministerium (Bouyer). The end of all ecclesiastical institution, says Willebrands, is to gather all into Christ. As principle of unity it is live only if submitted to liberty. Otherwise it remains only in the juridical order. Authority, says Bouyer, is to promote unity which is not dead uniformity but the living unity of a missionary church.

9. Moorman and Root were given the same assignment as Willebrands - "To what extent can or should there be diversity in a united Church. Freedom and Authority" - but saw the theme as better expounded from the Anglican point of view by explaining the relation of Unity and Comprehensiveness. The unity we seek is not for them the negative comprehensiveness of the liberal democratic state, not pragmatic or politique but deeply theological, rooted in the mystery of faith, in the limited powers of human comprehension. Any other attitude is "non-historical orthodoxy". They see the need for a focus of authority to give breath to liberty but also for freedom and flexibility which is openness to the Spirit. This theme recurs frequently in subsequent Anglican papers. There is clearly widespread Anglican doubt whether the present Roman system is compatible with full openness to the Spirit. (cf. below, pars.18,20)

10. Moorman-Root see in certain council documents and papal speeches a beginning of R.C. comprehensiveness. It would be interesting to know what is thought of this six years later. I think I can discern at least three different views:

10. (cont.)

- a) R.C. comprehensiveness has already gone disastrously (bracingly) beyond a beginning.
- b) A promising beginning has been stifled (a view much prevalent at the recent ACC in Dublin)
- c) Officialdom wants to stifle it but does anybody really take much notice? (Another ACC reaction).

These all bear interestingly on the realities of our subject.

11.

On the question of central authority, the RC writers at Huntercombe emphasise the analogy of papal and episcopal authority. Rome is a local church, though 'special as Petrine' (Bouyer). Willebrands quotes historical examples of differences between local churches not involving loss of communion. Anglican papers see need for a focus of authority (Root) and regard 'lack of jurisdictional relationship between provinces of the Anglican communion as a serious defect and a growing weakness' (Kemp). (In another place Kemp also touches on the analogy of papal and episcopal authority, in asserting that the argument of "Doctrine in the Church of England" (1938) in favour of episcopacy - "a committee cannot be a father in God, etc" - can be extended to primacy, though it is a much further step to seeing this primacy in one particular see, especially by divine right.)

Willebrands said at Huntercombe "Christ did not will the schisms and ruptures which we have dragged on with for centuries but he did will diversity within communion." Anglican commitment to the first half of the statement can be measured by its commitment to ecumenism. Its commitment to the second half is hardly in question. R.C's have always in their own way accepted the first half, but are now busy puzzling out how much they are allowed or committed to by the second half.

(Since I wrote this sentence the International Theological Commission has issued 15 propositions on Unity of Faith and Theological Pluralism (Tablet, July 7) including one (No.7) which offers a criterion to distinguish between true and false pluralism. Anglicans may feel inclined to examine this, and perhaps to see how it compares with the still more recent 'Mysterium Ecclesiae')

12. When the present commission first met at Windsor it decided that the three main themes of the Malta report were to be linked firmly to an ecclesiological reflection. On the subject of 'Authority' this meeting had before it papers by Professor Chadwick and Bishop Butler. Of Professor Chadwick's 'Some Observations on Authority, its nature, exercise and implications' the first seven pages offer a general survey of the subject. There follows a tightly-packed paragraph summarizing the problems of Christian authority as they presented themselves in the first four centuries. Finally there are reflections on two questions:

- (i) What today are the fundamental differences on authority which RCs and Anglicans have inherited from past history and which still have influence over the conversation between them?
- (ii) what prospects are there for a restatement of religious authority in the modern world?

13. Whatever influence this paper may have had on the Venice draft, I think it should be the object of fresh careful study. The reflections on question (i) (pp 3-10) seem to me to deal with the human as well as theological realities of the situation in a penetrating and sensitive way not often achieved by academic theologians. I think that if we wander far from this circumscription of the problem we shall be wasting time on unrealities. It does seem from these papers and from others (e.g. Root-Moorman op.cit) that Anglicans see the whole RC conception of magisterium and of infallibility as in danger of throwing "the cloak of divine authority " over "human weakness and error", of making authorities insufficiently "well aware of their own imperfections and blindness" and inducing an inappropriate "fully sheep-like submissiveness to ecclesiastical shepherds" (It should be added that Prof. Chadwick is anything but unaware of the corresponding dangers of the Anglican attitude.) RCs should ask themselves whether these dangers (which certainly exist and have certainly been realised) are inseparable from the doctrine

13.(cont.)

or whether they belong to a style and a mythology which have been superimposed on it.

14. Bishop Butler begins with a similar general survey, distinguishing authority from power and considering how the latter is a necessary supplement to the former; he then examines the nature and exercise of authority in the Church, and especially of its teaching authority; he then shows how the Nicean 'definition' of consubstantialis satisfies the conditions of an infallible definition, and he distinguishes between the transmission of revelation by the Church as a whole and its articulation by the magisterium, in order to throw light on the significance of ex sese non ex consensu.

15. We have the two-page skeleton (ARCIC II) for the treatment of Church and Authority. It described the purpose of the exercise as: "Not to describe positions which hold here and now, but to reflect on an ecclesiology which would help shape the future Church, built upon the primary biblical concept of koinonia (organic unity). "This method enables us better to shed past accretions and to enrich authentic traditions, in order better to carry out the Church's mission to the world.

This exercise is only possible because we take development seriously* and look at it together; development of the Church's self-understanding, and therefore of its doctrinal understanding of the revealed word. For example, the authority of the Church and in the Church, seen in the light of koinonia." (ARCIC II)

* cf. infra, par 49

16. (The Lambeth Conference of 1968, in setting up a sub-commission on Papacy and the Episcopate and including in its report on 'Renewal in Unity' a section on Episcopacy, Collegiality and papacy (Resolutions and Reports, pp. 137-8) has already set an example here. The writer remembers vividly how this subcommittee, thrown together with that on RC relations to produce a final draft, after earlier drafts had been sharply criticized, started from the traditional 'rejection of papal claims' firmly though courteously stated, and reached by the end of the morning what is found in the last two paragraphs. (ibid, 138). It was an example of what the Windsor skeleton called 'taking development seriously and looking at it together.)
17. For Venice the Oxford subcommission supplied the group of papers linked as ARCIC 18 and following the general lines of the Windsor skeleton. The Anglican contributions to this group unfortunately outweighed the RC by six to two.
18. Dr Allchin does not touch all the questions set out under "Church as Koinonia" in the skeleton; he concludes that, though Anglicans have never ceased to recognise in the RCC a true church, they do not find in her
- (i) a sufficiently clear recognition of the priority of Scripture as witnessing to the Lordship of Christ in the Church
 - (ii) nor of the freedom which the Spirit brings, not only to each local Church, but to each Christian within the communion of the whole body.
- He adds that ' if the Anglican Churches were assured of these two essential points then full communion could be restored.. '.

19. I doubt whether he would feel satisfied on the first point by the brief passing references to Scripture in the Venice document - perhaps because Canon Turner's exposition of the Anglican view of the Authority of Scripture was never matched by the promised expert paper from the R.C. side.

20. Fr Yarnold here gives an earlier and shorter version of the paper referred to in para. 34. Commenting favourably on this approach D.W.Allen writes "Our theological attention needs to be directed to the work of the life-giving inspiring and guiding Spirit. This is much more difficult than tying down indefectible guidance in certain organs of the Church, or maintaining too static a view of the Church's doctrinal authority as was, perhaps, the tendency of the Anglican Caroline theologians."

In view of this and of Dr. Allchin's second point it is perhaps noteworthy that in the two rather jejune paragraphs of the Venice document entitled "the RC view of the koinonia and of Authority in the Church" the Holy Spirit does not get a mention.

21. B.Green reviews the question of the 'location of infallibility' from this pneumatological standpoint, but arrives at the glum conclusion that the RCC still labours under what he calls 'Denzingen-fundamentalism'.

22. Mr. E. John's paper really belongs with the group referred to later in para. 34. He argues, as a rather sceptical medievalist, that 'the ambiguous picture of Peter's authority presented in the New Testament has been given a thousand years later (in the Dictatus Papae) a very specific interpretation', in the very special circumstances of the Gregorian reform, and that 'Roman Catholics are not committed to the medieval canonists' model of papal authority'.

23. Fr. Halliburton's very irenic essay on the Marian dogmas ends with some interesting questions of which No. 4 has a wider application and has a kind of basic candour which may be something we can do with. Finally, Canon Walker offers some interesting quotations for comparison.
24. A general doubt suggests itself about several of these papers - whether they stick to the agreed aim "not to describe positions which hold here and now but to reflect on an ecclesiology which would help to shape the future church."
25. In the Venice Documents, Church and Authority is treated ex professo in No.1, paras. 1 - 18, and again under Church and Ministry, paras. 9 - 14. The first of these begins by defining 'three elements constitutive of a church, the centre and agent of whose koinonia is Christ:
- profession of apostolic faith
 - use of the sacraments
 - oversight of a fully accepted apostolic ministry.
- A mutually acceptable relationship of Scripture and tradition is proposed, touching on the place of ecumenical councils and the ordinary teaching office of bishops.
26. The document then gives (7 - 8) 'The R.C. view on koinonia and authority' as set out in Vatican II. This distinguishes perfect from imperfect communion; touches on the infallibility of the magisterium of the college (speaking collectively or through its president); on the functions of the pope within the Church, on his potestas ordinaria et immediata. (It gives these terms once in Latin and once in inverted commas, but makes no further attempt to emphasise or explain their technical character. - cf. H.Ryan's paper infra.)

27. The Anglican view of koinonia and authority is set out at considerably more length, (paras. 9 - 14) and more discursively. The contrast of style and tone of these two sections mirrors the different conceptions of authority in the two churches. Paras. 9 - 14 leave no doubt that for their authors papal authority is the main question, though some doubt remains in what proportion the 'papal claims' as such are the obstacle and in what proportion their elaboration (popular? juridical?) since 1870 and the 'style' in which papal authority is, and has been, exercised. The last sentence of par. 13 seems particularly suggestive.
28. The Anglican dislike of infallibility is reiterated and the idea of ultimate protection from the consequences of error (indefectibility through continual correction) offered as alternative.
29. An account of the development of Lambeth '68's statement (13) leads to a very open-ended paragraph (14) in which the papacy is seen as possibly a 'guarantee of comprehensiveness against the tyranny of sectarianism' of the sort already sketched in the Root-Moorman paper at Huntercombe.
30. The joint conclusion (paras. 15 - 17) registers agreement on the Primacy of Scripture and freedom of scholarly enquiry, and suggest the former as a possible basis for an interpretation of the idea of the hierarchy of truths. It repeats the agreement of the Malta Report (par. 7), and suggests that differences in interpreting papal authority might be assimilated to (non-divisive) differences of theology and devotional practice. Finally, it raises the possibility of an interim stage on the way to final union. (This last is a question calling to be cleared up. An unsuccessful attempt to do so what made at Windsor II.)

31. The third Venice document (par.10) repeats the argument of Doc.I (par.11) as 'the broadest Anglican consensus' but argues startlingly that development in N.T. exegesis may call for a modification of this view. It adds -

"While the claim that the Petrine office has been transmitted to Roman bishops presents historical difficulties which to Anglicans may seem insuperable, can we not recognize that, in the age of the fathers, the Roman primacy, exercised as a primacy of responsibility and service, played a providential role in the Church's life, and that it may well be called to play similar role in the new and critical situation of our own time - and indeed in the future? Furthermore, insofar as this primacy reflects the model of the original Petrine office, may it not be acknowledged (by imitation, if not by direct succession) truly "Petrine"?"

This represents the furthest point of 'concession' among the Anglican utterances here reviewed - but it naturally raises the question whether it may not be "comprehended" within the Anglican spectrum without seriously affecting the prospects of Anglican/RC union one way or the other.

32. Included in the Venice programme were four papers on moral themes, our treatment of which has since been matter for some unrest of conscience. The first two of them dealing with the making, commending and enforcing of moral judgement in our respective traditions (things which 'come home to men's business and bosoms' more than many doctrinal questions) will certainly have to be reconsidered with the respect they deserve. RCs, I suggest, will have to pay particular attention to the argumentation of Prof. Dunstan's pars. 20.21.

33. The six papers assembled by Fr. Yarnold.

Four of these are by Roman Catholics, one by an Anglican and the sixth is a series of quotations about the 'Hierarchy of Truths'. They are too long and closely argued to summarize here. H.E.W. Turner's paper in the main reiterates the Anglican dislike of the whole notion of infallibility, though in the latter part of its section 4 it raises some questions which are often pointed and always revealing.

34. Of the Roman Catholic papers the two historical ones seem to me to offer the most interesting critiques of 'non-historical orthodoxy', showing how there have been exaggerations and retractions in the long history of papal claims.* Of the other two, the most interesting object of Fr. Yarnold's analysis is the infallible definition of papal infallibility; Fr. Franssen's paper, even apart from the execrable translation, is not uniformly crystal clear but has valuable pages, e.g. on not closing dialogue and polarizing heresy and orthodoxy by definition and anathema (pp.6-7). (He also raised the vital question-how does the magisterium work?) cf. infra. par. 51.

35. A doubt remains with these papers whether they will not be seen by some as trying to quiet Anglican fears about infallibility by emptying the notion of content. This leads to a doubt similar to that raised above about Venice paper 3, Roman Catholic theology can currently 'comprehend' ideas which have not much chance of affecting official agreements.

* Eric John's contribution to ARCIC 10 comes in the same category. see par. 22.

36. Fr. Ryan's paper (U.S.ARC) on the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff according to Vatican I has the merit of dealing closely with the text of Pastor Eternus and explaining the scope and significance of such technical terms as *ordinaria*, *immediata* and *jurisdictio*. The last is not, as he shows, used as it often was in popular discussion at Vatican II, as antithetical to 'pastoral care', but as synonymous with it. The Lambeth Conference of 1888, e.g. describing the Vatican I claims as 'extravagant' seemed not to understand very clearly the significance of these terms and there is evidence that they still need clear explanation.
37. Fr. Tavard's paper "A Theological Approach to Ministerial Authority" is, in its first part at least, both clarifying and very challenging. It reminds us of the close link between this meeting's theme and that of the next: the nature and extent of ministerial authority depend on our conception of the origin of ministry. Is it a) the creation of the church or b) fixed by Christ? He sees five possible positions:
 1) that underlying Pastor Eternus and Lumen Gentium = a 'dominical' extreme based on totally indefensible N.T. exegesis. (cf. E.John's paper)
 2) Ministerial structure is 'apostolic' because determined by the N.T. picture. But evidence for fluidity and plurality in the N.T. tells against this view.
 3) Norms are not provided by this fluid N.T. picture but by irreversible post-apostolic decisions.
 4) Only some general principles are irreversible. Which?
 5) There have never been irreversible determinations.
38. Next comes a methodological question. What is the chief source of faith and doctrine? Who speaks for the Word of God? Four answers are given - a) New Testament? b) Patristic model of Church? c) Fully developed model of Church? d) concrete demands of gospel in the present situation.

38. (cont.)

Catholic permutations and combinations of these principles and methodologies have led to a vicious circle in which magisterium pronounces on its own authority ('I am infallible because I infallibly say so') The way out of this circle is in closer functional analysis of ministry. *(1)

39.

From a reading of this material for several reasons inadequate, some impressions and questions emerge:

Anglicans and RCs in the climate of today can increasingly agree on how ecclesiastical authority ought to be exercised - its right style. Insofar as this has been the difficulty, it is possible to see it disappearing. But style of exercising authority is a practical, empirical matter, and what kind of evidence would suffice to satisfy Anglicans that Roman style had changed enough to make them risk any kind of jurisdictional relationship with Rome? * (2)

* (1) One Anglican member feels that this paper as a whole "neglects 'the Authority of the Holy Spirit in the Church' and tends to reduce the meaning of 'authority' to 'competence to teach or preach'. There is a need for some clarification and closer definition at this point. Otherwise (as emerges in paragraph 8 of his tentative draft on Ministry) one is given an ideal which must be followed instead of being led and empowered by the Holy Spirit. May be there is a problem here about our understanding of the Gospel".

* (2) These words were written before the appearance of "Mysterium Ecclesiae" and its impact on the Dublin meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council.

40. Much has been made by Anglicans of the passage in the papal allocution at the canonization of the English martyrs (Oct. 1970). This suggests that for them style is a very important part of the difficulty since the passage can hardly be made to say much except about style. That no offence will be inflicted on the honour and sovereignty of England seems to me to be, for Englishmen, except extreme high Tories, an unnecessary assurance (we are not living in the days of Innocent III, Boniface VIII, or Pius V) and for other Anglicans without great interest. The next sentence is an assurance about style and about the future of what might be called the spirit and character (or what Cardinal Willebrands at Cambridge called the typology) of Anglicanism, but it leaves untouched the hard problems of what must precede the looked-for sisterly embrace.

41. The same pope who uttered the words just quoted, said to a full meeting of the Secretariat for Christian Unity in April 1967 that his own office was the chief obstacle to ecumenical progress. He added that it was for the secretariat and its collaborators to explain the office to others. "We prefer to remain silent and pray".

42. How far is repudiation of Roman claims an integral part of the Anglican 'patrimony'? For the Anglican, the answer to this will determine how far he sees the papal overture as 'movement' (Mascall, quoted by Dunstan in Theology, Feb. 1971), a sign of the pace at which the era of exclusive claim is passing (Dunstan, *ibid*) or as the gesture of grandma wolf to Red Riding Hood.**

**In my seven years' experience, Anglican notabilities who have come to Rome, sought papal audiences and talked of their impressions have given no hint of regarding the papacy as the big bad wolf. But they are only a small proportion, and clearly any Anglicans who did so regard it would be unlikely to come to Rome and ask for an audience anyway.

43. On the RC side, while I agree with the contention of Mr. E. John's last paragraph that considerations about the papacy rarely enter the lives of those who are concerned with "birth and copulation and death" (though these rare occasions can be taxing), I think it is equally true that the developments of the past century have given many RCs a greater emotional investment in the contents of Pastor Bternus than in the Tridentine formulations on the Eucharist. Hence I am tempted to think there would be a greater practical difference between any agreed statement on authority which said anything at all and, e.g. that on the Eucharist. The difference between those Catholics (a large and increasing number) who could find a common voice with Anglicans and those who would stand behind a conservative officialdom is here I believe a deep one.

***** **

44. Can the claim to universal papal jurisdiction be so explained (along Fr. Ryan's 'hermeneutical' lines or as a temporary or fluctuating historical phenomenon, or in any other way) as to become compatible with a form of union which would satisfy both Anglicans and RCs? Is the 'development' several times referred to in our documents likely to be in this direction? A note by Fr. Duprey, "Brèves Réflexions sur L'Adage "Primus inter Pares" in La Documentation Catholique for Jan 7th, 1973, may be found valuable here though written with Orthodox concerns in mind.
45. Venice I, para 11, says "Any view of the papal authority likely to commend itself to Anglicans would have to make clear that a 'primacy of service' was central". There should be no great difficulty about this, (cf, e.g. Paul VI's speech referred to above, par.41), while "the occasionally autocratic style of the magisterium" which is said (ibid, par. 10) to divide Anglicans from RCs, can be said equally to divide RCs among themselves.

46.

In the Lambeth '68 report and in the Venice documents certain Anglican emphases take the eye:

- The Provisional character of the references to the primacy of the see of Canterbury.
- The looking forward to the primacy as taking on a new character.
- "The President might most fittingly be the occupant of the historic see of Rome" (Too much for the Lambeth Conference '68 but none the less thought at Venice to "represent something like a moderate Anglican view of the role of the papacy in a united Church").
- The idea of the papacy as a guarantee of comprehensiveness against the tyranny of sectarianism (elaborated in Venice I,14)
- "If there are substantial Anglican hesitations about the papacy as such it would not be unreasonable to say that these generally have far more to do with the actual exercise of papal authority at various periods in history than with the papacy itself or the subtleties of definition" (Venice I, par. 13)
- The relationships between the pope and the episcopal college, of which he is a member, are however still being clarified and are subject to development... (Lambeth '68)
- Is there not a basis in the N.T. for speaking of a Petrine office, peculiar to Peter himself within the apostolic college and community? (Venice 3, par. 11a) (This seems to invite comparison with Fr. Tavares' comments on the exegetical foundations of Pastor Eternus and Lumen Gentium).
- The papacy in the age of the fathers playing a providential role as primacy of responsibility and service - it may well be called to play a similar role in the critical situation of our own time - and indeed in the future. (ibid, par. 11b)

47.

These are Anglican reflections which show a real desire to see the papacy not merely as an obstacle to unity but as an aid to it, even as a focus of it. While acknowledging the historical difficulties they seem to look forward to the "reconciling answers" of Malta Report, par.17.

48. The R.C. reflections I have considered seem to offer an uncomfortable contrast between the rather dogged and laconic tone of Venice I, pars 7 - 8, whose only forward-looking or 'open-ended' phrase is the paranthesis 'although undergoing considerable development', and the sometimes very radical theorizing of individual papers.
49. There seems to be a danger of using the idea of development simply as a device for putting off confrontation, drawing a sort of blank cheque on the future, (though "Mysterium Ecclesiae" seems very bent on eradicating this danger), or seeing it simply as movement from one definition to the next. Moorman-Root at HUntercombe already saw a difficulty about definitions and their relation to development if they were conceived as static and self-explanatory.
50. The crux seems to be that, while "none of us thinks that communicatio in sacris can be achieved without mutual agreement on a profession of faith" (Venice I, par. 18) for RCs profession of faith involves commitment to Vatican I views of the papal authority which remain unacceptable to even the most irenic Anglicans. We ought perhaps to plunge straight in there. A very detailed and critical examination of the text and background of Pastor Sternus should be jointly undertaken with those who make the examination bearing in mind that we are dealing with authority in the 1970's not the 1870's.
51. Some attempt should be made to show how teaching authority and jurisdiction actually works in the churches. The increasing numbers of Anglicans (and others) who come to Rome to examine and discuss the working of the Roman curia at first hand seems to me to be encouraging. They may not always like what they see, but at least they are substituting fact for mythology. The experience of a Gordan Dunstan as observer at the Commission for Revising the Code of Canon Law is a remarkable thing

51. (cont.)

which should be properly valued. Perhaps he might be asked to offer us a paper.

52. A point made by Moorman-Root at Huntercombe, that 'secondary' questions may in practical and public terms be very important, is worth bearing in mind, v.g. ordination of women, re-marriage of divorced persons, some moral questions.

53. A sub-commission should be charged with determining what, if any, future there is for our purpose in the conception of a 'Hierarchy of Truths'.

54. In the section of the RC/Methodist report which has been circulated there is a section on Authority to which Prof. Gordon Rupp made a major contribution. This should be taken into account.

55. Finally, perhaps some notice should be taken of "Theology's" editorial comment on the Venice papers:

"Some readers may be slow to see their own personal difficulties or anxieties touched on in the papers: the very agenda, they may feel, is an old, unfinished one, left over by Hildebrand, the Council of Trent, Vatican I and Apostolicae Curae, and does not reflect the practical difficulties of Christians today whose circumstances place them at the junction of two moral traditions, two concepts of authority, two life-styles."

At the moment our concern with the difference between Anglican and Roman life styles is so close as to obscure our view of this larger and graver difference.