

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONMeeting at Canterbury, 28th August - 6th September 1973MINUTES28th AugustOPENING SESSION: 8.30 p.m.

In his introductory Address Bishop Clark reminded the Commission that the theme of our meeting took shape at Venice in 1970 under the title of 'Church and Ministry'. This has since been abbreviated to 'Ministry'. Our work on this subject is in the context of the studies and clarifications made by others such as the Faith and Order, Dombes, and Catholic-Luthern groups, though we have our own methodology and competence.

The PORINGLAND DRAFT DOCUMENT must be the basis of our ongoing work these next few days. Those at Poringland gave full attention to the research and study of individuals and groups. Their purpose was to provide a draft statement of the faith of our churches regarding the Christian ministry - an essential element in the life of the Church which exists by the mind and will of Christ. Some see it as a divisive issue between us. But can we reach substantial agreement on it at the level of faith.

Our Gazzada meeting specified four areas to be covered: Ministry in the New Testament, Apostolic Succession; Ministerial Priesthood in relation to Christ and the Church; Ordination.

Poringland produced a draft of the agreement we are here to achieve, seeking "a deeper understanding of the reality of ministry which is consonant with biblical teaching and the tradition of our common inheritance." Not a history of, but a historically informed document on the ministry.

The Poringland draft is unfinished, but represents agreement in substance on the Church's faith regarding the ordained ministry, with an emphasis on episcopate. The following criticisms have been made of it: Does it set out the status questionis? Why was the New Testament evidence, worked over at Gazzada, omitted? What is the criterion for the discernment of authentic ministry? Is it fidelity to the Gospel? Is there too limited a view of the function of the bishop?

The section on Apostolic succession was much praised. Our brief is to set out what we believe constitutes this, not to make a judgment on Anglican orders.

Our aim is to achieve consensus on the central meaning of Christian faith. Should we mention Primacy and orders as well as stating what our ministries do and are? Should the document be longer, less cryptic and subtle?

The end product of this week's work will be new, not just a filling out of the Poringland draft. But we must start from it - not from elsewhere - and work on and through, adding, subtracting, revising. We are not here to formulate a common statement but to achieve a substantial agreement.

After clarifying that all three groups would work on the whole document - not on a section each - and possibly produce a version each, one of which would form the basis for an Agreed Statement. Bishop Clark invited comments on the Poringland document.

Bishop McAdoo wished it had drawn conclusions and so had a definite thrust looking towards the recognition and reconciliation of ministries. The sacramental aspect of Ordination should be mentioned, and the section on the priesthood of people and minister and Christ be expanded.

Fr. Ahern wanted the common convictions and conceptions to be more clearly expressed and historically illumined by scripture and from tradition.

Fr. Yarnold, as a member of the Oxford Subcommittee, felt half the points which needed to be included had been omitted.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher felt it was too condensed. Canon Purdy that points thought essential at Gazzada were left out.

Dr. Halliburton wanted familiar things and terms such as 'character' or 'validity' to be mentioned. Fr. Tavad felt that faith concerning ministry is really fairly simple and does not need scholastic apparatus for it to be explained. He wanted fewer theological points, not more. Mr. Charley explained that in order not to write a full treatise, some previous spade-work was omitted. Bishop Moorman said we could allow ourselves more space. Bishop Clark asked if the work at Gazzada has disappeared, or has been applied? Fr. Tillard said a general treatise on our faith in ministry is impossible. Better to concentrate on the points of agreement and disagreement between our Churches. Bishop Vogel missed the Biblical basis supplied by Gazzada. Fr. Ryan agreed, adding that the Poringland draft is too refined to convey the experience it should communicate. He liked the introductions to the drafts by Bishop McAdoo and Fr. Tavad. Professor Fairweather said (i) the document did not have enough on the doctrine of the Church and so in paras. 8-10 the connection between ordained ministry and eucharistic celebration was not clear; (ii) Para 9 was rather thin on the doctrine of role of the minister in word and sacrament and in pastoral care and their ^{inter}relationship; (iii) no reference was made to the ministry of reconciliation as exercised in absolution.

Bishop Butler asked: (i) is there any ministry that can claim the authority of Christ other than the charismatic ministry? (2) if we agree that this is so (a) does the Church determine the forms of the institutional ministry or (b) is there an element in it derived from the mission of Christ himself which is unchangeable and historical continuous? (3) Have we avoided the issue of the doctrine of the Church all the way along?

Some felt we had, Fr. Ahern said it was not a loss: rather by taking first these concrete aspects in which our vision of the Church is seen, we reach a new vision of the Church.

Bishop McAdoo said his paper showed that great length was needed to include all that the Subcommissions had done.

Bishop Vogel said a more complex subject would mean a longer document.

Bishop Clark asked members to say where our disagreements lay if we have substantial agreement already on ministry.

Wednesday: 29th August

9.30 a.m. Full Session

Bishop McAdoo asked for further reactions to the Poringland draft document. Some feel we have substantial agreement on the ministry; if so, would those who do not feel this say where disagreements lie.

Fr. Yarnold specified disagreement over (a) the nature of apostolic succession, whether this is based primarily on fidelity to the faith of the apostles, or whether there is also some sort of transmission of authority; and (b) what freedom the Church has to modify ministerial structures especially that of the three-fold ministry.

Fr. Ahern said the appeal to Scripture was inadequate in the Poringland draft and omitted in Fr. Tavard's draft.

Bishop Clark said his faith was that the college of bishops was of the esse of the Church - was it this for the Anglicans, or of the bene esse or plene esse?

Bishop Butler felt it vital to say that the episcopate as we have it is a genuine form of episcopate, though historically there is a good case for its being embodied in group presbyteral ministry. Monepiscopacy is a genuine inheritance from our origins but not the only possible development in the past or for the future. Episcopate is of the essence of the Church, and that which is currently operated should be in authentic continuity with its historical origins. Fr. Duprey agreed that the function of episcopacy is the continuity of episcopate, but added that in Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses*) Presbyters had "the function of episcopate". Perhaps the Poringland word 'co-ordination' was not enough and should be enlarged by speaking also of authority.

Fr. Ryan felt that para.6 of Poringland gave an insufficient delineation of episcopate - which was really a modern theological construct, so it is a mistake to look historically at the exercise of authority and ask if episcopate is of the esse, bene esse, or plene esse.

Para.8 does not give an adequate reason for the co-ordinating minister being the celebrant of the Eucharist. What is missing is the sacramental element which is the difference between ministry in the Church and the exercise of authority in a secular context.

Fr. Tillard said the section on the reconciling office of the minister and his function in the Eucharist were meant to provide the sacramental setting and show the mystical dimension of "co-ordinating minister", which is not just used in a secular or sociological sense.

The episcopos is a co-ordinator who receives the plenitude of the gospel from the past, transmits it today, and hands on to the future a real interpretation of it.

Bishop McAdoo added that to spell out the meaning of "co-ordinator" will fill out the idea of sacramental priesthood.

Bishop Butler said this approach might help us over a real difficulty: the relative deficit of historical evidence in the New Testament to support the grand theological idea of the authority of the minister in the context of the Eucharist, as outlined in Fr. Tavard's paper in the *Jurist*.

Fr. Duprey added that such filling out should include the explanation that through the co-ordinating ministry the promise of Christ is fulfilled that he would be with his Church in his Spirit.

Bishop Moorman welcomed the emphasis on the sacramental essence of ministry, which would help our conversations with non-Episcopal Churches.

Fr. Yarnold said we have no substantial agreement on the essential point about Christian ministry. He advocated the definition in section 20 of the Dombes document: 'the essence of the pastoral ministry is to ensure and signify the dependence of the Church on Christ, the source of its mission and the origin of its unity.'

Dr. Halliburton said there was precedent in Cyprian for isolating 'episcopate' without necessarily opposing its exercise by some to that of others. 'One ministry historically diversified' (para. 6 of Poringland).

Bishop McAdoo asked whether we were not quite ready to ditch the term 'co-ordinating ministry' - though expansion was needed. Some wanted it to go. Bishop Vogel preferred 'the man of the community' or 'the receiver and personification of the tradition'. The secular analogy was inadequate for what Mr. Charley called 'the supernatural community which is more human, not super-human'. Bishop McAdoo said there was a tactical advantage in using an arresting phrase people would notice, provided it was filled out. Fr. Yarnold wanted the heading 'special ministry' to include the section on 'co-ordinating ministry'. Fr. Ryan asked whether the 'co-ordinating ministry' was a special gift in itself, 'not derived from the baptismal ministry', a sacramental notion this, the institutionalization of a charismatic ministry. Fr. Duprey said he had been asked if 'special ministry' was more biblical than 'priest'? Fr. Tillard said we had to use abstract titles since the ones we use come from the second century, not the New Testament. Bishop Butler asked for 'sacerdotal ministry' to be avoided. Bishop Knapp-Fisher felt 'ordained ministry' is sufficient. Fr. Yarnold liked 'pastoral ministry'.

Julian Charley asked what is meant by agreement at 'the level of faith'. Fr. Tavard said our faith concerning ministry is very little and can be presented in Biblical and traditional terms without too much theologising. Dr. Halliburton said theology is the articulation of our experience; so we cannot articulate what we feel about ministry without theology.

Fr. Yarnold said 'the level of faith' meant that which was contained in our Churches' authoritative documents - what was not in them is 'of theology'.

Fr. Duprey compared this with the Orthodox distinction between dogma and theologoumena. He added that there was a temptation to identify our theological interpretation with the faith of the Church. But Trent had very little on the priesthood.

Fr. Tillard said our main problem - now reached - is Tradition, from which our doctrine of ministry comes, since there is little to say on this on the basis of the Bible.

Bishop Vogel said the documents Fr. Yarnold spoke of contain both faith and theology. He suggested borrowing from the US/ARC document on methodology.

Julian Charley distinguished (1) the basic faith needed to become a Christian (2) believing more after becoming a Christian and (3) accepting as a member of a particular Church its traditional understanding and pattern of belief. We are relating the traditions of our two Churches and asking how far (3) is exclusive or open to others whose belief is legitimate though different.

Bishop Butler was highly sceptical about the distinction between faith and theology, but wished to distinguish between 'faith' and 'the faith'.

Fr. Ryan said that as Anglicans and Roman Catholics we shared a context of faith that made it possible for us to enunciate a common faith in different but compatible theologies.

Fr. Ahern asked if we have to accept the galvanization of the Church's ministry in episcopacy after the New Testament period as an illuminating development?

Bishop Butler said he was expected to believe that Christ instituted an ordained ministry which took the form of Bishops, priests and deacons, but not that 'Christ instituted these three orders'. However it was difficult to see how changes such as the abolition of episcopacy should take place unilaterally.

Bishop McAdoo agreed that Subcommissions should work on a critical re-appraisal of the Poringland document, listing addenda, excisions, and corrections, including the question of its size and scope and lay-out and general structure. But first Julian Charley was asked to speak about the structure of the Poringland draft document.

11.30 a.m. FULL SESSION

Julian Charley first made some general observations on the Poringland document.

The basic approach was to begin existentially from where the two Churches stand, not from a sequence 'Christ, apostles, ministry...' Brevity was to be maintained.

The priority of the Church in importance ('Church and Ministry') was to be stressed, and the ministry in the context of the whole Church's 'diakonia'. Historically loaded terms were avoided, as well as too tight a definition of ordination. A distinction made between explicit New Testament data and the move to subsequent tradition and development.

Para. 1: introduction: 'special ordained ministry' different from wider variety of ministries of Christian people.

Paras. 2-3: The origin of the Church, and the need to be faithful to its origins, with the Apostles' relationship with Christ and mission from him to Church and world. The role of special ministry is to co-ordinate external and internal service.

Paras 4-5 show that the greater liveliness and diversity the more need for a co-ordinating ministry, which is itself varied and so best described by a series of New Testament images.

Para. 6: Vocation to episcopate, widely understood as receiving and transmitting the truth.

Para. 7: the special minister is appointed by Christ who equips him. The essence of our belief about Ordination is that it is 'a new relation of responsibility to Christ and the Church.'

Paras. 8,9,10 contain the sacramental aspects: of reconciliation, the heart of the Gospel expressed by the Eucharist; of Apostolic succession, for Ordination relates ministry to the universal life of the Church and to its historical origins; of the priestly role (especially in relation to the Eucharist) which is not derived from the royal priesthood of the whole people of God.

Our aim was to move from the general to the particular, and in the second half to touch on the main issues involved.

Fr. Yarnold said he would prefer a return to the structure: Christ, Church, ministry. Fr. Ryan agreed, asking for considerable expansion of the Introduction. Dr. Halliburton felt the general balance should be maintained and the objection answered by expansion in paras. 2 and 8.

Fr. Tavard wanted a more logical structure, not a succession of topics, and the New Testament images after para. 2 on the origins of the Church; also the linking of the two functions of oversight and reconciliation; and a proper conclusion to be added.

Bishop Vogel emphasised the difficulty of those who had not been at Poringland, and the need to begin with a proclamation of common belief, taking up the thoughts expressed in the minutes.

Fr. Ryan said we must show e.g. from St. Paul, that it is legitimate to incorporate the varieties of ministry into one 'co-ordinating minister'. He also felt a need for the Gazzada

document on ministry in the New Testament to be incorporated, as the grounds for statements like 'the Church is called to be faithful to its origin.'

Fr. Ahern was uneasy about starting from the idea of the Church, which emerged historically from the activity of ministers.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher felt para. 8 on Reconciliation should come nearer the beginning combined with Fr. Tavard's Introduction. Fr. Ryan said this would provide a better link with the document on the Eucharist.

Dr. Halliburton said para. 8 could stay where it was provided it was expanded with reference to the Gazzada document.

Fr. Yarnold (i) wanted most of that document included (ii) felt that in para. 6 the important point on the three-fold ministry was lost by its being under the heading of vocation.

Bishop Butler suggested that as the document went deductively from empirical evidence to conclusions, it did not satisfy those who moved more naturally by induction from general principles.

Canon Purdy said discussion of procedure and communication must not lead us to overlook existing substantial disagreements.

Bishop McAdoo said the first task of the Subcommissions was to produce an outline structure.

Bishop Clark said the Christian logic is in building up a picture of our faith regarding ministry.

It was agreed to meet in Subcommissions at 4.30 p.m. and report back in Full Session at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thursday, 30th August

9.30 a.m. FULL SESSION

Bishop Clark introduced the three schemata prepared by the three groups, pointing out that I and III were similar while II followed a different pattern. He said that I's Introduction might form part of an Introduction to the document by the Co-Chairmen, to which the Steering Committee at Poringland had agreed that a longer 'historical introduction' should be added. Group III's schema was incomplete, but began with the existing situation then back to its New Testament grounding and forward again. As yet it lacked a conclusion.

Fr. Ryan added that this approach would show the substantial agreement we have reached on handling the New Testament material on ministry. This would be important for the U.S.A. and elsewhere.

Professor Fairweather spoke to Group II's schema, which though it would use previous material, re-organised it drastically, to show ministry in the context of the mystery of salvation, then a logical move from a general statement to a particular account of the role of the ordained ministry; then, logically, answers the question 'by what authority?' and includes Apostolic Succession, apostolicity, and ordination in this; this leads to the conclusion that this bears on the question of the reconciliation of our two ministries. He added that the group, following Woodstock 1972, wanted to develop the concept of mission, and were aware of reverting to the pattern proposed at Gazzada last year.

In discussion Bishop Moorman said our document should be easy to apprehend, and so a clear logic was needed. Bishop Clark added that a need was felt for a footnote on validity and what the Roman Catholic Church means by it. He asked whether the existential approach of I and III was preferable to the more thematic approach of II.

Bishop McAdoo, unable to avoid being unmodest, said II was a pretty good description of his own Draft Statement, which was a compilation built on the work of preparatory subcommissions, W.C.C. and Tillard papers etc. Having done what II adumbrates, he added, I am not very satisfied with it.

Fr. Ahern said the difference between the subjects of Eucharist and Ministry meant there was no need for II's parallel presentation of material. He supported Julian Charley's rejection of the thematic approach which was less easy for those outside to latch on to. Professor Fairweather recorded that II proposed to begin with some reflection on the present situation. Fr. Tillard thought II a timeless, abstract, and metaphysical treatise. The logical problems we had yesterday were better solved in III's existential approach. Mr. Charley said III intended to use a lot of previous material including most of the Gazzada New Testament paper. Fr. Yarnold thought there was no difference between II and III. Bishop Clark felt differences were over approach, not content. The incompleteness of III, Julian Charley said, meant there was no mention yet of authority. Fr. Tavard said each of the three schemata satisfied his concern yesterday for a logical structure. III is the most satisfactory and meets the

problems to be faced. Professor Fairweather agreed with Fr. Yarnold and answered Fr. Tillard's criticism. He said that III would be as acceptable as II if it included - rather than refusing to face - these points: the priestly quality of the minister.

the Role of the minister as celebrant

the Role of the minister in absolution

Apostolicity

Ordination

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said III was acceptable if its section C included the points in II's section 3 and had a further section corresponding to I's section 3.

Bishop Moorman said two questions should be asked:
(1) What is the purpose of the document? Will it pave the way towards our goal which is to unite the Churches? (2) Who will read it and who are we writing for? Not just theologians but parish priests and intelligent laymen. We should write it so that they see it deals with their problems and helps towards a solution of their difficulties.

Canon Purdy said to omit 'validity' and a conclusion on the bearing of our agreement on the reconciliation of our ministries would make people say we're dodging the real issue. We should consider whether to include this, and if so how to do so, perhaps using para 10 of Fr. Tavad's draft.

Bishop Clark felt a consensus on the material, and a much surer footing in III's approach with a counterbalance from II and I.

Bishop Butler questioned whether the ordinary reader would see in these schemata a frank facing of the question of whether we feel ordination is a sacramental act.

He also spoke of the juridical aspect of the sacrament of penance as re-accepting the penitent into the communion of the Church and so into the friendship of God. (There was later some discussion of this). He wanted more to be said on the collegiality of the ministry, and perhaps on primacy?

Dean Chadwick said something must be said on the 'power of the keys' and also on primacy. He felt that para 21 on sacramental ordination in Bishop McAdoo's Draft might well be used.

Fr. Ryan felt we already have substantial agreement (a) on sacerdotium - the priestly role of Christ, and (b) on magisterium - the prophetic role of Christ, but not on (c) jurisdiction - the kingly role of Christ.

As the Eucharist statement led on to ministry, so our work on ministry will lead forward to jurisdiction and authority, provided we indicate - but do not do too much on - the sacrament of Penance within the context of jurisdiction.

He added that there is an element of collegiality in Sacerdotium. But the mutual recognition called for in II is premature since it deals with the question of the theological reality of the college of bishops which exists apart from the Roman Catholic College of bishops - and this belongs to the questions of Authority and jurisdiction.

We agree on magisterium because we have identified the double apostolicity of orders and of faith, rather than identifying jurisdiction with magisterium.

Fr. Duprey wanted to avoid the 'western impasse' which began with the college of bishops not with the communion of the Churches.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked that III should have added to it 'Apostolicity and Reconciliation' which would include the 'power of the keys'.

Bishop Vogel wanted collegiality to be shown under Apostolicity.

Dr. Halliburton felt para 9 of Poringland spoke of collegiality. He added that perhaps the problem of Primacy could be solved on the principles of collegiality and universality.

Dr. Fairweather hoped that we would retain a separate section on the New Testament material.

Bishop Clark said that after coffee we should meet in groups, take Schema III as it stands as the basis for discussion, and complete it. After meeting at 4.30 p.m. in full session Group 3 would be asked to take the proposals from Groups 1 and 2 and produce a Schema taking them into account.

4.30 p.m. FULL SESSION

Bishop Clark spoke of the three group's Second Draft Schemata. I and III were full. II took for granted the first two sections. I's section B(ii) 'Ministry in the New Testament in the light of Ahern' was established as a more precise form of the same section in III. A new addition was I's section B (iii) which Bishop Vogel said provided the grounds here for the later section on the apostolicity of the koinonia and mission also.

Fr. Tavard said the distinctive aspect of group II's schema was to put together in one place a more complete description of the tasks of ministers, word and sacrament, sacerdotium, reconciliation, mission, all under the heading of episcopate. This he preferred to group III's placing of the Sacramental role as a sort of Appendix. Bishop Clark agreed and asked for the addition of vocation to holiness of life, as in para 7 in Poringland, which, said Bishop Vogel, stressed the role of the Holy Spirit. Bishop Moorman asked for stress on ministry to the world. Fr. Tillard and Fr. Yarnold wanted more in III's schema on the Ministry of the Word.

Julian Charley said Group III's schema aimed to speak generally about the role of the Ministry, then to proceed to the whole realm of vocation as divine, not just ecclesial, appointment; then ordination and the relation of this to Apostolic succession; then moving on to the sacramental role central to the role of ministry in building up the fellowship.

Fr. Tavard said III's section IV(iii) (b) seemed to make apostolicity the purpose of ordination - but ordination also derives from apostolicity.

Fr. Tillard said III's section V was a caricature of the sacramental role of the minister. Bishop Butler replied that sacramentality was not limited to these two sacraments. Julian Charley said there were the controversial areas. Professor Fairweather objected strongly to section V's separation from section III; there was a danger of treating sacramental action either as an appendix or as the climax. Bishop Vogel said Group I's schema corrected this.

Julian Charley said we began with 'normative New Testament principles and traditions' and so placed the sacramental role second as it was based more on our traditions than on the little New Testament evidence for it.

Fr. Tillard asked for section V to be preceded by something on 'Word and Sacrament'.

Fr. Tavard said III's schema is a bad model for section C. The mind of III was better understood by I and II.

Bishop Clark asked if group III would feel anything was missing if we took I and II and combined them.

Julian Charley said I and II had too much material in section C and were a treatise instead of a logical, ecumenically slanted document.

Prof. Fairweather said II's logic was clearer before it was put in III's framework! Fr. Ryan said III formed a gradual process of coming to substantial agreement step by step ending with the most controversial points in section V. It would be a mistake for this to come too soon.

Bishop Vogel said the president of the Eucharist was not a controversial problem. Fr. Yarnold said we should deal with the priestly role uncontroversially early on, if we wanted to discuss it at the end as controversial.

Fr. Tillard and Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked for section V to come before section IV. No fundamental objection was raised to this.

In commenting on I, Bishop Butler said that as Reconciliation is the heart of the Christian Gospel, and the minister is entrusted with a ministry of reconciliation, it should be more prominent. Bishop Vogel said perhaps it could be linked with mission in section B (iii).

Dr. Chadwick said he was a convert to I's draft, though a member of III. Fr. Yarnold asked for 'word and sacrament' to be under the section on ordination not that on Ordained Ministry.

Bishop Clark asked if I should now be taken as the basis for the Schema, but not in isolation. Archbishop Arnott asked what material from II should be added? Fr. Tillard said 'vocation to holiness of life' and II's Conclusion.

Fr. Yarnold proposed that Group I should be asked to re-draft section C. Fr. Duprey felt III should do this for the sake of continuity. Julian Charley said it would be difficult for him to do this.

Prof. Fairweather proposed that the three assigned Drafters (Bishop Knapp-Fisher, Canon Purdy, and Julian Charley) should write a summary text. Bishop Butler supported this, stressing that they should write a whole text, not just another outline schema.

This was agreed and Bishop Clark asked the Drafters to begin drafting a document. At Archbishop Arnott's suggestion it was agreed that the Commission could look at sections A & B as soon as they were ready, while the Drafters completed section C.

Friday: 31st August

9.30 a.m. Full Session

Bishop McAdoo introduced the Drafters' Introduction, paragraphs 1-3. He emphasised that as we had drawn up a specific schema for filling out, we know what is coming and we can discuss and criticise the introduction to the document. He later added that the Co-Chairmen would consult the Commission about the contents of their introduction to the document.

Paragraph 1. Criticism of its final sentence, which seemed to allow any variety of ministry; of the phrase 'common faith', which implied (which was doubted) that ministry is an object of faith; led to the substitution of a sentence from Fr. Tavard's draft after 'treatment of the subject', as this centred on Anglican and Roman Catholic patterns of ministry, and expressed the limited scope of the document. Fr. Ryan re-drafted para 1 accordingly.

Paragraph 2. Fr. Tavard and others were dissatisfied with almost every sentence. The Commission accepted Fr. Yarnold's proposal that the first para of the Gazzada New Testament paper and the first para of Poringland (omitting the 2nd sentence) provided a better account of types of ministry and ways of service. Eventually a modified Poringland para 1 was accepted for use at this point.

Paragraph 1. Fr. Ryan's Draft was then discussed. A clearer description of the scope of the document was asked for in place of the final sentence, showing what we aim to achieve in relation to our divisions. Dr. Chadwick provided an acceptable alternative.

Paragraph 3. Prof. Fairweather said that if 'particular forms' meant the three-fold ministry, these were shaped by 'Tradition' as complementing Scripture in the establishment of Church order, and this should not be described as needing re-assessment. Fr. Duprey distinguished between the essential and the organisational level of ministry. Bishop Butler and others criticised 'comprehensive pattern'. Bishop Clark objected to the assertion that a principle of flexibility in the New Testament allowed flexibility now to do what one liked. Fr. Ahern said the Pastoral Epistles gave a very precise pattern of ministry, but not a blueprint, and our present ministries are rooted there. Prof. Fairweather said forms of episcopacy have been painfully similar. We still have, though they are faded, feudal magnates in chairs! Fr. Ryan said the essential point is that development is already apparent in the New Testament. Fr. Tavard warned that by substituting 'mariology' for 'ministry' one could see the dangerous implications of these sentences. Fr. Yarnold suggested an amended text, taking the criticisms into account. Dr. Chadwick offered a new paragraph which was accepted as a better line of approach.

4.30 p.m. Full Session

Bishop Knapp-Fisher presented the Drafters' Section 2 'Ministry in the Life of the Church'. He named as its sources: para 4: Gazzada, Ministry in the New Testament. Poringland para 8. Para 5: Poringland para 2. Gazzada, Note on Apostolicity. Jean Tillard, Note on Apostolicity, Koinonia, and Reconciliation, of which more will be used later. Para 6: Gazzada, Ministry in the New Testament. Fr. Ahern's Synopsis.

The Section had deliberately omitted:

- (i) Developments subsequent to the New Testament, so references to Ignatius and the emergence of the three-fold ministry would occur in Section 3.

(ii) Priesthood

(iii) Oversight, to be dealt with together with Apostolicity in a more specialised way than hitherto.

Bishop Butler said that as the Epistle of Clement probably falls within the New Testament period, it is a cardinal or hinge document. He agreed with Dr. Chadwick that it does not assert Apostolic Succession but takes it for granted as the basis for its argument. He asked the Drafters to take note of this.

Paragraph 4. Bishop Vogel and the others from A.R.C./U.S.A. disliked the equation of sacrifice with death and immolation, and wanted any reference to sacrifice to imply 'his whole life culminating in his death and resurrection'. Bishop Butler warned against the difficulties that would be caused for Julian Charley by a statement different from the New Testament assertion that what reconciles us to God is the death and resurrection of Christ. Justice was done to both, and to Prof. Fairweather's objection to "potted New Testament and early Church history" by omitting 'in the New Testament' and speaking of the "self-offering" of Christ. Fr. Tillard asked for a reference to 'communion' as a link with reconciliation. Dr. Chadwick, Fr. Tillard and Fr. Tavard were asked to re-draft accordingly. Their draft was later accepted. Fr. Yarnold asked that something somewhere should be said about the mission of Christ.

Paragraph 5. The threat of getting bogged down in a further discussion of the several sorts of Apostle in the New Testament was averted by Bishop Butler's proposal to qualify 'apostolate' by 'original'. The problem of their 'special relationship' was resolved by its being described as 'with the historical Christ', as Bishop Vogel suggested. Dr. Gassmann proposed a reference to the Church being charged 'to continue in the apostles' commission'. Dr. Fairweather still wished for further reflection on the connection between 'the apostles' and 'apostolic'.

Paragraph 6. This was taken from Gazzada and was accepted in its original version.

The revised Introduction paras 1,2 and 3 was slightly amended to assert that 'normative principles' are 'already found in the New Testament documents' (rather than 'period' as Bishop Butler had wished - to avoid failing to describe the New Testament as normative, and in the light of the reference to the Canon emerging later than the three-fold ministry.)

Saturday, 1st September

9.30 a.m. FULL SESSION

The Commission began by discussing the first three paragraphs of the Draft of sections 1 and 2. Some questioned the desirability of the Footnote, others wished it to be left or modified.

Paragraph 1 It was agreed that our intention was to 'seek' rather than 'gain' a deeper understanding of Ministry, and to 'attempt' rather than 'seek' investigation etc.

Paragraph 2 It was agreed to begin: 'within the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion'. Fr. Ahern questioned the multiplicity of 'ofs'.

Paragraph 3 The placing of this paragraph was questioned. It was agreed however to omit 'the' before 'normative principles' to substitute 'purpose' for 'task', and to add references, to be supplied by Fr. Ahern, after the words 'New Testament documents'.

Bishop Butler raised the question of a possible joint commentary on the document by Bishop Clark and Julian Charley. It was felt that this was not desirable, as an 'Agreed Commentary' is too much to ask for and there are different audiences to be addressed.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher then introduced the Drafters' new Section 3 on the Ordained Ministry. He said they had drawn largely on Poringland material, re-arranged in a more logical order, and including as requested a more expanded section on the priesthood. Para. 9 incorporates revised versions of Poringland para. 6 by Fr. Tillard and Dr. Chadwick. They had kept to Group III's schema and included here part of the material on the priest as president of the Eucharist. The Final Section 4 on the Ordained Ministry will include Apostolic Succession using Poringland para. 9 and Ossory 21. They will not attempt a conclusion but will suggest topics for it. If a note on Validity is to be included it should be appended to the conclusion rather than the section on Ordination.

The Commission finished its discussion of paragraph 3 before turning to the new draft. It was agreed to retain the reference to 'normative principles' as a foreshadowing helpful to the reader. 'Ministerial office' was accepted in place of 'ministry'.

Section 3: The Ordained Ministry

Fr. Tillard said the balance between Word and Sacraments should be watched. Dr. Gassmann missed, though others saw, explicit statement that the ministry is a Divine gift.

Paragraph 7 Fr. Tavard detected a triumphalist view of the ministry, which ignored its moments of decadence and decay. Fr. Ahern said 'may assume various patterns' removed this impression.

Fr. Ryan raised the problem of the disjunction between ministry to those outside and inside the Church. It was agreed to treat these together, and Bishop Vogel proposed saying ministry is to the Church to enable the royal priesthood to be itself in mission to the world. Fr. Tillard proposed re-shaping it using Fr. Tavard's draft.

Bishop Vogel, Fr. Tillard, and Fr. Tavad were asked to re-draft accordingly.

Paragraph 8: Objection was again made to the word 'co-ordinating'. Fr. Ahern said it failed to imply a respect for diversity and, Fr. Duprey added, we need to avoid the impression that the bishop is the source of everything in the Church. Bishop McAdoo proposed, for the final sentence, 'co-ordinates and promotes diversity within the unity of the Church's life.' However Fr. Ryan's suggestion "discerns the Spirit-given diversity of the Church's life and promotes its unity" was preferred.

Paragraph 9: Professor Fairweather said this was too simple a summary of the New Testament material. Did a special ministry 'soon emerge'? Were bishops and presbyters interchangeable terms?

Bishop Butler asked if the fluidity was in the terms or in practice?

The conflation of paragraphs 3 and 9 was agreed, taking note that these terms 'were applied to people with identical or similar functions', and avoiding the phrase 'three grades of bishops'. Dr. Chadwick and Fr. Ahern withdrew to re-draft this.

Paragraph 10: Fr. Ryan argued that this paragraph gives us our substantial agreement on the ministry, provided one says episcopate is 'an essential element'; we cannot reach agreement if it is described as 'the one essential element' while we differ over whether episcopate does or does not contain Papal jurisdiction. If we are here moving towards a mutual recognition of Churches we can say there are different communions and episcopate can be realised analogously in two sister Churches.

Dr. Halliburton's suggestion to begin with 'An essential element' was also accepted.

Paragraph 11: Dr. Gassmann proposed beginning a new paragraph at 'Because the Eucharist'. Professor Scarisbrick raised the question whether here or elsewhere there would be something on the Godward ascending action of the Eucharist, a development of 'enter into his self-offering'. This was a lacuna in the Windsor document. Bishop Butler hoped a minimal statement of this would be acceptable, fearing our being involved in too big a subject. Fr. Yarnold proposed the insertion of part of Ossory para. 32 (or para. 34). If this was acceptable to Julian, Bishop Butler suggested, all well and good if not a footnote to the word 'memorial' might say 'in the full sense given to it in our Agreement on the Eucharist'.

Saturday: 1st September: 4.30 p.m.
Full Session

Bishop Clark welcomed the Drafters and congratulated them on the completion of their work. He added that they might be uncomfortable with the alterations made in their absence, but it was right to resume discussion of paragraphs 10 and 11.

Paragraph 10

The overlap of the first sentence with the last sentence of para 3 was noted.

Fr. Tavad questioned the appropriateness of the word 'appropriate'. Prof. Fairweather said the reference to Ignatius appears unjustifiably to suggest that the innovation of having a minister presiding was happening sporadically. Fr. Ryan said it took 314 years to exclude the Deacon from presiding at the Eucharist and sentence 3 was unsatisfactory therefore. Dr. Chadwick questioned whether we should speak of the limitation of the power to celebrate. Julian Charley said this point about the celebrant was the lynch-pin of the whole argument and absolutely fundamental. There is nothing in the New Testament about this, so stress the theological rightness and fittingness. 'Proper' or 'right' were proposed instead of 'appropriate' and the latter was agreed.

Fr. Tavad argued that the sentence should be the other way round: the Eucharist is at the centre and so the one who presides is the focus of unity. Bishop Butler proposed: 'Hence it is right that he who presides ... has oversight ... and is the focus of unity.' He also proposed, and Dr. Chadwick supported, "Evidence as early as Ignatius shows that ..."

Paragraph 11

Bishop Clark referred to Prof. Scarisbrick's request for the insertion of the notion of the upward movement of the Eucharist through the Church in Christ to God, possibly by using paras 32 or 34 of Ossory. Julian Charley said this does not logically fit in, 34 is highly controversial material, and 32 is even worse. Unless very strong negatives were added to counterbalance the assertions there, it would be rejected. Fr. Yarnold asked for the positing of para 5 of the Windsor Statement as a footnote. Prof. Scarisbrick wanted the addition not just as a corrective to the Windsor document, but to spell the point out more fully. Dr. Gassmann wondered whether a legitimate diversity of opinion should not be expressed.

Fr. Ahern disliked the sentence that 'in the New Testament ministers are never called priests.' Fr. Duprey and Bishop Knapp-Fisher wanted it to begin with 'Although' and be attached to sentence 1 or 2. Julian Charley said it would be hedging to make it a subsidiary point. The essence of ministry is episcopate; it is right to have this man presiding; there is no New Testament evidence; but it is a theological deduction. Fr. Yarnold and others discussed whether priestly vocabulary was used as it was felt the minister shared or reflected Christ's priesthood, or because of the Jewish parallel. Julian Charley said he regretted the elimination of para 3 and its 'basic principles' laid down at the start. At what level of authority do these developments stand? Is it honest to put 'not in the New Testament' in a subsidiary clause, and just state what evolved. He would have brickbats thrown at him if he agreed to this - and he is not prepared to do so. He wanted an explicit statement at this point. Bishop Butler proposed: 'Despite the fact that in the New Testament these ministers are never called 'priests', Christians came to see the priestly role of Christ reflected in them and use

priestly terms in describing them'. Fr. Yarnold wanted a footnote on priest as a translation of both hiereus and presbyteros. Dr. Chadwick said we should affirm that the meaning of the word priest as applied to bishops and presbyters is determined not by the Old Testament but by the priestliness of Christ and the Christian doctrine of redemption. Julian Charley said he found this confusing. Bishop Vogel felt the limitation of sacrifice to immolation may cause this confusion.

Bishop Butler wondered if this discussion was profitable. Bishop Clark said it touched a central part of his faith in the priesthood and we could not write an expression of our common faith without thinking this out and finding a formula acceptable to Julian and to us. Dr. Gassmann said more should be said about what we believe is meant by priest and priestly. Canon Purdy said we should not get very much further on these lines. Julian Charley said he had been misunderstood. He does not object to the use of priestly terms. He is concerned, because of how priestly terms arose, and how this language has been at the heart of misunderstandings, that when we use it, it must be so clear that people see exactly what we are saying. Canon Purdy said it would be difficult to achieve clarity without reflecting disagreement.

Sunday: September September

9.30 a.m. Full Session

Fr. Ahern expressed his regret that we have not made it clear whether we're talking of bishop or priest or deacon when discussing the New Testament material. Nor have we said that he who confects the Eucharist has power over the Body of Christ. Poringland's inner logic was unacceptable to some, and patching over this is unsatisfactory.

Bishop McAdoo said not all shared this. In any case the Document will be worked over again. Dr. Chadwick agreed with three-quarters of Fr. Ahern's points, but felt much greater clarity is possible, helped by Bishop Butler's paper on Apostolic Succession. Bishop Butler said it would be good if we do produce a document, but we are not bound to, nor should we produce a poor one.

Paragraph 11

Bishop Clark said the ordained ministry reaches its highest point in the celebration of the Eucharist, as the Synod of Bishops' document shows. A difference on this would be of substance.

Fr. Duprey asked for the addition of 'the unity of the local churches in themselves and with each other.' Paragraph 12 was then accepted as amended.

Paragraph 13

Fr. Tavad asked for an additional passage on the ordination of presbyters, or like Vatican II we should be criticised for having too much on bishops, and a sort of afterthought on priests. Bishop Clark suggested a separate paragraph. Prof. Scarisbrick and Bishop Butler wanted reference to the continuance of a body of authorised persons by co-optation down the centuries, and so a description of the continuity 'of this church with the original apostolic community and of its bishops with the original apostolic band.'

Dr. Chadwick wanted a statement that ordination is irrevocable. (Cp. Romans 10).

Prof. Fairweather and Fr. Tavad agreed to draft new paras 13 and 14.

Paragraph 13

After the drafters had replied to some preliminary questions, Fr. Ryan asked for 'a' rather than 'the' communion of churches, since e.g. the consecration of a new Greek bishop does not heal the schism with Rome, as the equation of this with the universal church implies. Bishop Butler said what he means by Apostolic Succession of Bishops is not adequately dealt with here. To 'historical continuity ... with the apostolic community' Clement would add 'and of this bishop with the original apostles.' Bishop Vogel wanted not a pipeline of individuals but a succession of the koinonia of ministers.

Fr. Tillard and Julian Charley went to re-draft para 11, and Fr. Ahern and Dr. Halliburton to draft a paragraph on Word and Sacrament.

Paragraph 12 as re-drafted by Dr. Chadwick was then discussed. Fr. Ryan asked for the omission of 'by the essential form of' before ordination. Bishop Butler and Fr. Duprey asked for the insertion of 'when the bishop prays ... and lays hands on the candidate'.

Bishop Butler felt a less restricted understanding of priest and sacrifice, like that of the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving',

both understood as being done inasmuch as Christ does it in us, would be a safeguard against illegitimate fears. Dr. Chadwick commended the Six Propositions of the International Theological Commission, as containing valuable material for our purpose. Bishop McAdoo asked Julian and Jean to bear this in mind when re-phrasing para 11. Julian Charley objected to 'sharing in the priesthood of Christ'. Others agreed, but Fr. Ryan said it was legitimate when understood as not detracting from Christ's unique priesthood.

Paragraph 12

Fr. Tillard asked for further material on the balance of Word and Sacrament between paras 11 and 12. Fr. Duprey asked for the introduction of Poringland 7 material as the qualification of the minister coming from God. Bishop Moorman wanted also the quotation from II Cor. 3. Fr. Tillard suggested the title to be extended as 'Vocation and Ordination'. Dr. Chadwick withdrew to draft accordingly.

Monday: 3rd September

9.30 a.m. Full Session

Fr. Ahern said he was very happy that the laoumas he felt yesterday have been filled.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the Revision of Paragraph 11.

Bishop Butler suggested adding '(hierais)' after the word priests. It was agreed also to alter the third sentence to: 'action of ... in reciting ... distributing.' Julian Charley said hackles would rise unnecessarily if we said 'the priestly sacrifice of Jesus is' rather than 'was unique' and it was agreed to leave this. Bishop Clark said of 'sacramental relation' that this leaves options open to theological interpretation which are not mutually exclusive, while sharing a common mind on essentials. It was left to the drafters to consider sub-paragraphing. 'Holy gifts' was left in, though interpretation might be needed. Dr. Gassmann suggested more sub-headings on the final draft. Discussion of 'addition, continuation, or repetition', while appreciating the problems for some, concluded in agreement to let it stand, for the sake of clarity for others. The voting was 12 for; 5 against with one abstention, it was agreed to add a footnote referring to the Windsor Statement here. Dr. Chadwick felt what is said here is not quite rich enough or clear enough to bring the celebrant into relation with the eucharistic action. It was agreed to insert after 'continuation or repetition' the words: 'there is in the Eucharist a memorial (anamnesis) of the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ, who through his minister presides at the table and gives himself sacramentally'.

Draft between paras 11 & 12

Fr. Duprey said this did not cover the point of the original request for it: to express the deep unity between Word and Sacrament. Julian Charley bewildered by this and the suggested placing of it. Better after 9, others felt it should be after 6. Bishop Butler felt an unfortunate disjunction between proclaiming the word and the sacramental ministry. Dr. Chadwick and Fr. Tillard agreed to re-draft and re-locate this, emphasising that the ordained minister 'stands under the word of God'.

Paragraph 13

For 'indelible mark' it was eventually agreed to substitute 'seals'. Discussion of the reality of the gift and promise of divine grace, of the distinction between validity and faithfulness, and of automatic effects, resulted in the suggestion: 'God gives his Holy Spirit through this act for his office and work'. There was discussion of whether 'Christ the good shepherd', 'the care of Christ for his flock', or 'priesthood of Christ', or the 'ministry of Christ' should be named as the model for the ministers. The Drafters were asked to take all this into account.

5.15 p.m.

Paragraph 14

'Ensures' was agreed in place of 'indicates', and 'the' not 'a' communion of churches. Julian Charley urged the clear statement of what we mean, as Roman Catholics and Anglicans. Dr. Chadwick felt there was no need for a sort of indication of episcopacy.

Bishop Butler said 'the essential functions' were not covered unless there were expressed the continuity 'of bishops with the original apostolic college'. Dr. Fairweather said the draft had moved in this direction. Bishop Butler added that we would be gravely defaulting if

we failed to say 'yes' or 'no' to the traditional view of Apostolic Succession. Fr. Ahern proposed 'the relation of its bishop to the original apostolic ministry'. Prof. Scarisbrick suggested 'historical dependence'. Dr. Chadwick said we were facing historical, not theological criticism on this point. Bishop Butler asked if the succession goes back to the Apostles or only to 130 A.D. and loses itself in the sands? This point was met by Bishop Vogel's proposal: 'ensures the historical continuity of this church with the apostolic church and of its bishop with the original apostolic ministry'. This was agreed with only one dissentient vote.

Paragraph 15

It was agreed to put the first two sentences at the beginning of para 14, and the last two sentences modified after the first two sentences of para 9.

Paragraph 9 revised

Fr. Tillard requested some reference here and/or in paragraph 6 to the fact that it belongs to episcopate to give a lead to the Church in problems of the world. With 'restore' for 're-admit' and the omission of 'sin and unbelief', and other promised modifications the paragraph was accepted.

Julian Charley regretted the loss of the original para 3 from its position. Fr. Ahern suggested the integration of paras 5 and 8, and this Dr. Chadwick agreed to undertake. Discussion of I Clement was held over until the full revised draft was available.

Tuesday 4th September

9.30 a.m. Full Session

Bishop McAdoo said our task was to go over the draft, referring points to the proposed re-drafters, Dr. Chadwick and Fr. Ahern, discuss the conclusion and the Co-Chairmen's Introduction, and the possible Note on Validity.

He read out Bishop Clark's embryo draft for the Co-Chairmen's Introduction, with its references to validity, to doctrinal agreement as the first step towards reconciliation of our Churches, and the consequences of consensus for our growth in communion.

Bishop Clark said nuancing was necessary and political considerations would be taken into account.

Dr. Gassmann asked for the document to be put in the context of recent developments in theology and the churches' life.

Bishop Butler underlined that we should be aware of taking one definite option in speaking of reconciliation of ministries being dependent on the reconciliation of our churches. He also emphasised his conviction that the solution of theological and doctrinal problems will flow from our getting together in practical life. He added that for him Papal ministry is part of the question of ministry as a whole; others linked it purely with authority however.

Fr. Duprey asked for some words on the authority of this agreement and our purpose in publishing to invite comment and criticism, as well as on the next stage of our work. Bishop Moorman said all this should be in the conclusion of our Report, rather than in the Chairmen's Introduction. Fr. Tavard said he was not sure if the document adequately expressed the substantial agreement we possess. He also urged that para 10 of his own draft, or something like it, be included to meet the great expectation that exists that we shall deal with validity of orders. Fr. Ryan asked for emphasis on our document contributing towards the solution of the problem. He added that fifty or more years of sacramental sharing would be needed for the evolution of the structures for a visible organic union. Archbishop Arnott asked for an outline of our next course of studies plus practical recommendations on living together as members of two communions. Fr. Duprey said that the removal of the doctrine of the ministry as an obstacle to our growth in faith was an important and necessary step forward to our churches' reconciliation. This needs to be in our conclusion. Bishop McAdoo invited Bishop Vogel to draft for inclusion his suggested account of the human dynamic which led to the Commission adopting the Chairmen's introduction as their own conclusion. Dr. Gassmann suggested the common renewal of forms of ministry might be mentioned. Canon Purdy asked for clarification of what is meant by the reconciliation of our churches. Fr. Duprey said we can only report to our authorities; but it would be better to say we publish with their approval. Fr. Yarnold asked for an explicit disclaimer that we cannot, on the principles laid down, reach further agreement on e.g. the Papal Primacy. The Commission did not support a summary of agreed points at the end. Dr. Chadwick suggested rather "we believe that in what we have said above about X Y and Z, both Catholics and Anglicans will recognise their faith". Bishop Knapp-Fisher hoped that material from Fr. Tavard's paras 10 and 11 would be included in the conclusion also. The Co-Chairmen agreed to draft their Introduction and the Conclusion accordingly.

The 'Note on Validity' was then discussed, but reservations expressed by Fr. Ryan (because of the matter being anyway under dispute by Canonists, but more because of the 'cheek one church had of applying its canonical

tradition of the ministry to another church' and the wish to heal not open up old wounds) and others, and Bishop Clark's promise that the Chairmen's Introduction would say why it was not within our competence to deal directly with this, led to agreement that the Note should not be included.

11.30 a.m.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Rev. Colin Davey to read the full text of the document before discussion of it. He asked the re-Drafters, Dr. Chadwick and Fr. Ahern to note modifications agreed or suggested.

Paragraph 1. By 10:4 it was agreed to omit the second sentence unless the minority produced an alternative.

Paragraph 2. A request for specifying our recognition both of basic agreement concerning the ministry and of legitimate different emphases which do not undermine that agreement was accepted but it was agreed such material should be in the conclusion.

Paragraphs 3 and 4

Dr. Gassmann suggested the addition of: 'The Apostles exercised a ministry in the early Church which remains of fundamental significance for the Church of all ages'. Bishop Butler added: 'All Christian apostolate originates in the sending of the Son by his Father'.

3.0 p.m.

Paragraph 5

Fr. Ahern said there was missing an explanation of Apostolic Succession as a basis for the assertions we affirm in para 14. However the Commission agreed with Fr. Ryan that there was a sufficient basis in para 4; further clarification was not essential to our argument.

Paragraph 6

Colin Davey said we had agreed to provide Biblical references to illustrate 'normative principles'. It was left to the drafters to include these. Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested 'the terms ... could be applied to the same man or to ...'. By 13:1 it was agreed to leave 'may well have had'. Fr. Tillard proposed the addition: 'we have no indication that in the primitive period presbyters and bishops were appointed everywhere.' Fr. Ahern proposed also: 'though it is clear that some churches were headed by ministers who were called episcopoi or presbyteroi'. He felt that development in articulation did not necessarily imply a real historical development. Bishop Butler said you cannot go from a possible diversity to a certain uniformity and call it development.

Dr. Chadwick proposed: 'while the primitive churches were not understood to be a loose aggregation of autonomous communities', to indicate that diversity goes with a consciousness that there is not a free-for-all. In reply to Bishop Moorman he emphasised that the point of the bracketed phrase about the canon was not to make an academic joke but to show that the establishment of authority was a process. It was agreed to ask the drafters to take all this into account, and to conclude the paragraph with: 'Thereafter the three-fold structure remained universal in the church'.

4.30 p.m.

Paragraphs 7 and 8

It was agreed to move the final sentence of 8 to the end of 7 and clarify it.

Paragraph 9

Julian Charley asked for a still stronger emphasis on the Ministry of the Word. Dr. Chadwick advised us to be aware this was a very Western statement of the nature of the presbyteral office, since in the East there was a disjunction between presbyter and preacher. It was agreed to split 9 into three paragraphs and that Julian would re-draft an amplified central one.

Paragraphs 10 and 11

Reference to para 5 of the Windsor Statement was requested here or in para 11.

Further discussion of the inclusion or deletion of the word 'continuation', and of the word's ambiguity in English and American usage, led to its deletion by 12:2 rather than the omission also of 'addition and repetition' (10:4).

Paragraphs 12 & 13

'Time and space' was deleted as were the references to II Timothy and Romans. The drafters were asked to reconsider the word order of 12's first sentence and their proposed modification of its third sentence was agreed.

Paragraph 14

Fr. Tavard's basic difficulties, arising from his broader sense of the Apostolicity of the Church, and his feeling that the two arguments given did not automatically ensure historical continuity, led him to propose a new ending to the paragraph. Fr. Ahern proposed a modification: 'Moreover because they are representative of their churches' fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles' which it was agreed 17:1 should be made to the original text. Bishop Vogel argued that the affirmation that this happens 'in this way' does not mean 'it cannot be achieved in any other way'. Fr. Tavard said he was not convinced, and having signed the Lutheran-Catholic Statement which said the opposite of what is here, he was not prepared to sign contradictory statements. Bishop Vogel suggested the addition of 'in the tradition of our two communions', which was agreed should meet Fr. Tavard's objection. By 16:1 it was also agreed to retain the original penultimate sentence, with the addition of 'mission' before 'faith and holiness'.

Professor Root and Fr. Yarnold were asked to draft a Press Release.