

MINUTES OF ARCIC-II - PALAZZOLA - ROME
2 - 10 September 1987

9.15 a.m. 2nd September

From the chair, Bishop Mark Santer opened the session.

After practical arrangements had been discussed, the two Co-Secretaries reported on responses to the Final Report of ARCIC-I.

Fr. Kevin McDonald noted that the official response of the Roman Catholic Church would be prepared by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity but with consultation with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Canon Hill drew the Commission's attention to the Emmaus Report which had been prepared for the Lambeth Conference.

Fr. Yarnold hoped for a high level of response on the Roman Catholic side.

Bishop Lessard asked about the relation of the Unity Secretariat's response to the C.D.F.

Fr. McDonald thought there would be independent and joint deliberations.

Sr. Boulding asked about the response of Episcopal Conferences.

Fr. McDonald was glad to say that most had been positive and enthusiastic. At the same time, there were questions on all three of the subjects treated by ARCIC-I.

Bishop Baycroft said it would be helpful to have some knowledge of the Roman Catholic process similar to the Emmaus Report. Could ARCIC have a summary of what the Conferences had said?

Bishop Cameron noted the different nature of Anglican responses. Some provinces were able to spend much time and resources on a response. Making a second point, he felt an important remaining issue was the question of whether the threefold ministry of the Church was accidental or embryonic. The principle also related to primacy.

Mrs. Tanner asked if the Commission could be given the official Roman Catholic response to BEM. This would be important for the Commission's work on 'Marks of Koinonia'.

Prof. Wright wanted to know whether the response would be the official Roman Catholic response or just one response amongst others. He also asked whether information about the publication of Anglican responses could be made available.

Mr. Charley asked what happened to criticisms of Eucharist and Ministry. Who was to deal with them?

Bishop Santer was clear that ARCIC-II had a mandate for dealing with any remaining problems.

Sr. Boulding felt any suspicion of secrecy on the Roman Catholic side would reinforce traditional Anglican suspicions and undermine the work of ARCIC-I.

Fr. McDonald said they were not secret as they did not yet exist.

Bishop Wallace questioned the final character of the ARCIC documents if they were approved. They would not be new creeds yet they would be glosses on the faith.

Fr. Tillard pressed for the publication of the responses of all Episcopal Conferences.

Bishop Santer noted a tendency in both Communion to demand a tighter degree of agreement with outsiders than with those already in communion.

Fr. McDonald then outlined the detailed arrangements for the visit of His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, to the Commission.

At just after 1.30 p.m. His Holiness Pope John Paul II arrived at Palazzola. He was greeted at the door of the church by Cardinal Willebrands and the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC together with the Rector of the English College and the Commission's Co-Secretaries. A short Ministry of the Word followed, presided over by the Holy Father and the Co-Chairmen. Psalm 121 (122) was recited, after the Commission sang John Henry Newman's hymn, 'Praise to the Holiest in the height'. The Readings were from St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians, Chapter 4 verses 1 - 8, 11 - 13 and Bede, Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People, Book II, chapter 1. The extract from Bede was the story of Gregory seeing the Angle slaves in Rome and determining a mission to England. Intercessions and prayers followed and at the conclusion the Holy Father bestowed his blessing. The Holy Father then joined the Commission for lunch, during which the Co-Chairmen addressed speeches of welcome to him and he spoke to the Commission and encouraged its work.

5 p.m. Bishop Cormac Murphy-O'Connor opened the afternoon session.

Canon Hill raised the question of a single press release on the Pope's visit and the current work of ARCIC which might have appended the texts of the three speeches.

Prof. Pobee hoped that the release would be composite.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor then asked the Commission to report on reactions to Salvation and the Church. In his experience they had been very positive but there was the issue of Indulgences.

Fr. McDonald reported that SPUC had commended an article by Fr. Valentini. This had been enthusiastic. The Final Report was coherent with Trent, if passive on the Church.

Canon Hill drew attention to the criticisms of Dr. Alister McGrath.

Bishop Cameron noted the Agreed Statement was being studied in the Diocese of Sydney and within the Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion. With hindsight, the document would have been stronger if it had stressed more the common background. In the 16th century there was a consensus on the Person of Christ - the Augustinian doctrine of Man together with the Calcedonian doctrine of Christ. He did not wish to elevate a particular doctrine of justification as that by which the Church stood or fell.

Sr. Boulding felt that work on Indulgences would have to keep an eye on Catholic anxieties. There was much ignorance of what Trent actually said.

Mr. Charley said there had been a very warm welcome for the doctrinal section though more criticism of the historical Introduction and the section on the Church. The Commission needed to be careful about last minute alterations. There had been some criticism of matters not raised, especially Indulgences. Dr. McGrath and Bishop Fitzallison of the United States had both raised the question of the formal cause of justification.

Mrs. Tanner wondered whether the Commission had paid enough attention to contemporary Old Testament scholarship.

Fr. Tillard pointed out the interesting fact that Evangelicals had most disliked the parts Roman Catholics had admired, i.e. the section on the Church. Perhaps the Commission should make more use of background papers by scholars outside the Commission.

Prof. Iobee thought the Commission needed greater clarity about the target group of its documents.

Canon Hill thought that many who criticised the section on the Church had not disagreed with what was said. But they were suspicious of its cryptic nature and had some anxieties that the Commission was slipping in something by slight of hand.

Prof. Chadwick had the suspicion that Dr. McGrath thought the Church was accidental and had no relevance to salvation.

Mr. Charley felt the Commission needed to explain why it had dealt with the Church. There was a suspicion that it intruded between believers and salvation.

Bishop Wallace hoped elucidations would not be taken up too quickly.

Prof. Wright agreed there had been very little dissatisfaction in the U.S.A. He hoped the Commission would learn from the publication of the Ilandaff Statement. In particular, there might be need for biblical studies on koinonia, historical and theological studies of the 16th century context, and the Commission might also wish to use outside consultants.

Prof. O'Donovan asked whether there had been any liberal Anglican comment.

Bishop Vogel urged a stronger emphasis on pneumatological christology.

Sr. Boulding regarded elucidations as inviting others to join the ARCIC process.

Dr. Gassmann informed the Commission of the German publication of the text in conjunction with other statements on justification.

Prof. Chadwick (replying to Prof. O'Donovan) reminded the Commission that John Wesley had once been criticised for preaching on justification. He had been told "Old sermons, Sir, old sermons".

Prof. O'Donovan was then invited to report on a meeting of Moral Theologians - (Prof. O'Donovan, Fr. Brendan Soane, Fr. Kevin McDonald and Rev. David Brown.) He would be able to offer a paper for the Commission's consideration. It would look at the question of moral issues from the point of view of koinonia. They have asked whence the view that Anglicans and Roman Catholics are disagreed about moral issues and for how long.

Fr. Peter Damian asked whether the group had treated specific questions.

Prof. O'Donovan spoke of a drag-net which had pulled in some examples.

Fr. Yarnold was extremely anxious about the over-loading of the Agenda. The Commission must have a clear idea of priorities. Moral issues were not in the mandate.

Canon Hill pointed out that the mandate included "all that continues to divide us".

Bishop Baycroft told the Commission of a Canadian ARC resolution that Anglicans and Roman Catholics should not work on new moral questions separately.

Prof. Wright was sympathetic with Fr. Yarnold. He asked for suggestions of practical next steps. Could the Commission propose such?

Bishop Vogel warned of people who raised moral issues as an excuse for inactivity. He thought that the formation of the moral conscience gave a theological entry to the subject (ARCIC-I).

Sr. Boulding believed that authority issues were fundamental.

Prof. O'Donovan hoped the Commission would not try to resolve all the moral issues held to divide Anglicans and Roman Catholics. At the same time he did not want the subject simply reduced to ecclesiology. There was a painful divide in the U.K. between Anglican and Roman Catholics over artificial fertilization.

Prof. Chadwick hoped the Commission would encourage its moralists. It did not have to do everything at once.

Bishop Baycroft underlined the urgency of moral issues. But what Anglicans and Roman Catholics actually did and believed were much the same, at least in Canada.

Fr. Yarnold again expressed his anxiety about the backlog of work. Perhaps a group could put out a paper in their own name on behalf of ARCIC.

Fr. Peter Damian said that morality was an aspect of dogmatic theology and what had kept the Churches apart was dogmatic.

Fr. Tillard agreed with Bishop Baycroft. In Canada, at the level of praxis, Anglicans and Roman Catholics were agreed. He also agreed with Bishop Vogel. The Commission should try to discover the roots of ethical judgment. This was the obedience of the baptised.

8.15 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor invited discussion on Growth in Communion (ARCIC-II 67 (87)), and described its origins. The Commission had received Fr. Tillard's paper on koinonia at Llandaff and the Steering Committee had asked itself how all the questions on the ARCIC Agenda could be handled. It had felt that they were not best dealt with separately but in relation to Growth in Communion. ARCIC 67, at Storrington, was a revision of ARCIC 66 which had been drafted at Maryvale in the U.K.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor outlined the contents. He went on to say that its status was imprecise. Other subjects had been Church dividing but koinonia was presumably not so. The paper was taking stock of the present situation. It asked what communion Anglicans and Roman Catholics already shared and what were the obstacles to fuller communion.

Bishop Santer also spoke about the paper. The theme of communion underlined earlier Anglican-Roman Catholic agreement. It was also found in the 2nd Vatican Council, the recent Synod of Bishops, and was prominent in the statements of Lambeth Conferences (compare Emmaus Report). He did not believe that issues like the ordination of women could be tackled head on. There was also the need to educate constituencies in the essential marks of communion. It was a tentative document and different parts of it had different characters. The theological guts were in section I and section II. The document then applied this to the Anglican and Roman Catholic situation. The Commission first had to agree on the nature of the problems before their solution was attempted. It was necessary to agree on what the real questions were.

Canon Hill also commented on the document. He saw it as a theological framework and perspective for the future agenda of the Commission.

Mr. Charley wanted to stress that unity was fundamental to This was a new insight for many. Furthermore, unity by stages had been advocated from the beginning. The draft set unity by stages in a proper theological context.

Prof. Pobee thought that the semi technical use of koinonia would lead the Commission into trouble with New Testament experts. There was a slipshod use of Scripture; Koinonia generally meant 'participation' rather than 'community'.

Fr. Soane remembered that the Commission was not entirely agreed that an approach through koinonia was the only possible way forward. He also noted that full organic unity had been stressed more strongly in the earlier draft.

Bishop Cameron underlined Prof. Pobee's anxieties about the use of the word 'koinonia'. The rehearsal of salvation history needed more attention. He was cautious about making koinonia bear too much.

Bishop Baycroft urged the Commission to be clear what were the real dividing issues. He did not want the Commission to work for several years and then be told there were further questions. Any practical steps should be revealed as soon as possible. He did not feel the Commission could abandon koinonia but perhaps the Commission should not be so exclusive in its use.

Fr. Yarnold pleaded for something practical at the end of the 1988 meeting. It was essentially to clarify the status of the draft; if it was to be an agreed statement it could take 20 years!

Bishop Wallace was afraid of a purely theoretical framework. Could something grow out of the work on salvation. Arising out of the concept of communion, the Commission could at least present an ideal of authority.

Prof. Wright endorsed the reservations of Prof. Pobee, Fr. Yarnold and Fr. Soane.

Fr. Thornhill also felt the Churches should not lose the opportunities offered by the acceptance of ARCIC-I.

Dr. Gassmann speculated on whether the draft was really a final framework for all the work of ARCIC. Perhaps part of the Commission could work on specific projects.

Bishop Lessard was positive about the methodology outlined in the draft but had some hesitations about making communion so all embracing.

Fr. Peter Damian believed the Commission must have the right theological backing for any practical steps. The Council of Florence had not produced lasting results.

Arbp. Butelezi hoped that justice and peace issues could arise from a discussion of koinonia.

Bishop Vogel defended the trinitarian base of koinonia in the Capadocian Fathers. For the Capadocian Fathers it explicitly did not mean 'participation'.

Fr. Tillard passionately defended koinonia. All recent scholarship indicated that it meant more than participation. He cited Raymond Brown and C.H. Dodd as well as the Fathers in the W.C.C. it was also the notion which held the theological work together.

Fr. Adappur drew the distinction between organic unity and practical steps. He hoped the Commission would draw up the latter. But there was no universal meaning for koinonia.

Mrs. Tanner was insistent on a right relation between communion of the Church and the wider human community. There was also the relation of the Son to the Father as developed in the New Testament.

Sr. Boulding was aware of clientele who did not have koinonia as their perspective.

Bishop Mark defended the use of communion but its meaning could not be simply deduced from texts a, b and c. Behind it lay personal relationships in community.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor reminded the Commission that there was spiritual growth in communion all the time. The Commission's task was to explicate this growth.

3rd September 1987:

9:15

Bp. Santer invited members to go into four groups to discuss the following questions:

1. How do we react to the proposal that the next piece of work should be an ecclesiological study
 - a) as a background and framework to particular issues,
 - b) to get a clearer perception of the goals we envisage for Christian unity.
2. Would the publication of an agreed statement on these lines be helpful?
3. If we do this, should the treatment of particular issues, e.g. ordination/ practical steps be included in the ecclesiological paper or published separately?
4. In the light of the discussion what shape should our work now take on?

The groups were as follows:

Group A:

Bishop Wallace (chairman)
Bishop Santer
Fr. Duprey
Professor Wright
Archbishop Butelezi
Bishop Baycroft
Rev. Julian Charley

Group B:

Bishop Cameron (chairman)
Bishop Murphy-O'Connor
Professor O'Donovan
Fr. Adappur
Fr. Yarnold
Bishop Gitari
Mrs Tanner

Group C

Bishop Lessard (chairman)
Professor Chadwick
Professor Pobee
Fr. Soane
Sister Boulding
Canon Hill

Group D

Fr. Thornhill (chairman)
Professor Davis
Bishop Vogel
Fr. Akpunonu
Fr. Tillard
Dr. Cassmann
Fr. McDonald

Wednesday, 3rd September 11.15 a.m.

Bishop Santer in the chair. The groups reported.

Bishop Wallace reported from Group A:

1. The Group was unanimous in supporting the desirability of the ecclesiological study. But it called for the treatment simultaneously of some particular issues (e.g., mutual recognition of ministries, a practical step in dealing with the problem of mixed marriages, moral questions) by smaller groups of the Commission members: but with the publication of any prepared statement only if approved by the whole Commission.

2. This group was in favour of publication; but called for the preparation of preliminary drafts (cf B.E.M. document) which could be published in some manner for criticism and review.

3. Some 'particular' issues are so closely linked to the ecclesiological study of communion that we feel they should be included in the Statements, e.g. the richness and the limits of diversity within unity; the use of Authority, its style or praxis - in reference to Authority in general (not in reference to Papacy in particular).

We feel that other particular issues should not be treated extensively; but the ground should be laid, the links built in, for the future treatment of the particular questions within the framework of Communion.

We believe the document should be such that - if accepted by both Churches - it will commit both of them to work on the solution of remaining obstacles to unity - as well as providing a theological foundation for doing so.

Bishop Cameron reported from Group B:

The questions were not considered in detail but rather there was a general discussion on the topics thought to be implicit in the questions as a whole.

There was not decisive unanimity in regard to the general proposal, some feeling for a general ecclesiological paper providing a general framework of reference, while other members gave preference to papers suggesting action on specific issues, e.g. mixed marriages. It was generally agreed that these two tasks might possibly be taken together as attempted in "Growth in Communion - Unity in Diversity".

Lastly it was felt that there would be some advantage in the preparation and issuing of "semi-official" preliminary statements on some of the issues mentioned above. Responses to these statements could assist in the preparation of a formal "Agreed Statement" and ease the necessities of later Elucidations.

Bishop Lessard reported from Group C:

- I
1. Helpful first step
 2. Recognises existing communion
 3. Provides framework for other issues, including moral issues.
 4. Necessity to "define" goal: clearer perception of goal = clearer perception of path.

? = theoretical/deductive
? = inductive = looking at reality

5. A lot has already been done in previous statements/
documentation

II = arguments pro/con
= play by ear - decide along the way
= "might be published"

- III
1. Certainly should be noted (e.g. as per "last page" - page 15 of "Growth in Communion")
 2. Possible to treat adequately in this study? = too long
= too late - five years
 3. Distinguish kinds of issues = not all of the same quality
 4. Farm out to sub-commissions of ARCIC - cf experts/
specialists, e.g. sub-group on moral issues.

- IV Name sub-groups
1. Overall framework paper
 2. Particular issues - four perhaps -
including practical steps (to be tied in
with general ecclesiological paper)

Fr. Thornhill reported from Group D

1. Not a new theme - gather and builds on ARCIC-I and "Salvation and the Church". Concrete issues concomitant (not incompatible) related to deepening.
"Steps" and "Goals" separate?

2. Different nature and authority of document needs clarification:
which model?:

BEM
Convergence can be
changed in light of
wider wisdom

Consensus
articulating existing
agreement

Form to be determined as our work proceeds.

3. What is "treatment"?

A commitment to deal with these issues should be made clear, e.g.:
"this is context in which we will treat..."
Setting out a configuration of the question in terms of
ecclesiological statement

Important to identify issues, their relationship, and their weight

4. Methodology - Group work/ loss of time in large committee.

Sr. Cecily We're neither writing a purely theoretical nor purely "guess-work" paper. It's something in between.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor We need guidance on how groups might work on the issues now facing us.

Fr. Yarnold Could we consider working very fast. cf. ARCIC-I's method. Could we not try to get something out on this issue by next summer and then look at the "next stage" in our relations.

Bishop Lessard: Agreed.

Bishop Santer attempted to summarise the emerging consensus:

- a general acceptance of the profitability of preparing and publishing a paper on the Church, to give a theological basis

- need to circulate drafts before committing ourselves to a final text.

- desire to work in small groups

- to give topics to different groups

Professor O'Donovan Publication on some issues should happen soon.

Revd. J. Charley against idea of separate group on practical steps, it should be in context of ecclesiology.

Canon Hill the section on "our existing communion" of the new project is precisely the context in which "steps" would be dealt with.

Bishop Vogel agreed with Julian but said we need sub-groups on specific issues relating them to the ecclesiology.

Fr. Yarnold enlarged on what he meant by "practical steps" in relations between the Churches on basis of responses to

ARCIC-I: Either

1. implementing some Malta Report provisions

2. new stage inaugurated by change of Canon Law, e.g. on mixed marriages

Bishop Baycroft Canadian discussion of the mixed marriage issue has rooted this in the theology of koinonia; it would not be a purely symbolic gesture.

Bishop Santer asked for advice as to how we should practically go forward.

Bishop Gitari We should go back to four groups and work on -

- authority
- morals
- ecclesiology
- practical steps

Mrs. Tanner Don't we need a list of issues on which we have agreed to work.

Bishop Baycroft: We need a group

1. to look at how to build on the paper we have;
2. to look at how we are to work on practical steps
3. to look at what the major issues are.

Bishop Lessard Assuming that the General Map is acceptable, we address:

1. What is best approach to ecclesiological study;
2. What other issues should be addressed:
3. Do we want small group discussion on "practical steps".

Canon Hill We referred in our group to issues set out at Storrington, cf. p.15 of the paper we have. That could be a useful guideline.

Bishop Santer: Some issues, like authority etc. fit more readily into the ecclesiological perspective than others.

Professor O'Donovan The "steps" group is sui generis. We need a letter that can be sent to our authorities about practical steps after we have heard responses to ARCIC-I from our communions. We don't need a theological study of koinonia to underpin a change in discipline on mixed marriages.

Rev. J. Charley We need to show that the degree of communion between us is strong and is a basis for real possibilities. Not against Prof. O'Donovan's suggestion.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: Do we need to go back into groups to do more work on the schema?

Professor Wright referred to conclusion of ARCIC-I's request that a new "relationship" be established on the basis of the Final Report. Could this be something more than just an adjustment of our arrangements on mixed marriages.

Dr. Gassmann: We need a methodology, but that method always develops as we deal with any specific issues. Especially we need a group to look at how specific issues fit into the whole ecclesiological perspective.

Professor Davis drew attention to phrase "new relationship" on p.15 of "Growth in Communion". Could we not have a holistic approach, seeing the specific issue to be dealt with in total context of developing relationships between our Communions.

3rd September, 1987 4.15 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor (in the chair) invited people to go into groups to discuss the following points and to produce a typed page of response to it.

1. What is the best approach to the ecclesiological study; what particular issues should be addressed within it?

2. What other issues should we deal with and how do they relate to the ecclesiological framework?

3. Do we need a separate study on immediate "practical steps" and what is the relation of the study to the ecclesiological framework?

Friday, 4th September, 9.15 a.m.

Bishop Mark Santer invited members to review the schemas presented by the four group chairmen. He proposed that the four chairmen should conflate the four schemas. This procedure was accepted. General comment was then invited.

Bishop Cameron was encouraged by the high degree of consensus.

Sister Boulding had reservations about the proposal for two separate documents.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor liked the outline of the third group.

Bishop Baycroft did not want the Plenary to accept one schema rather than another, but he asked for a synthesis.

Professor O'Donovan noted that Groups 1, 2 and 3 seemed to be recommending a multiple document approach. Only Group 4 recommended a single document. This was the question before the Commission.

Fr. Tillard clarified the intention of Group 4. They did not want a single document, but a coherent ecclesiology which showed where particular issues would be dealt with.

Dr. Gassmann wanted more than just a sentence on particular issues. Methodologically this would imply the commencement of work on particular issues in the immediate future.

Fr. McDonald spoke of the image of a canvas. Group 4 had intended a painting on which the configuration of the issues could be seen.

Fr. Tillard noted that Groups 1 and 4 were very similar.

Professor O'Donovan proposed that the Commission should now work in groups.

Bishop Cameron asked for this to be based after the conflation of the schemata.

Bishop Mark Santer detected a favourable response to group work by the Commission.

The group chairmen then departed.

Mr. Charley asked about the nature of groups.

Bishop Cormac hoped for discussion of this when there was a unified schema.

Professor O'Donovan and Sister Boulding asked for some discussion on the membership of groups.

Dr. Gassmann asked whether there should be one group on ecclesiology or two.

Bishop Cormac thought two, but Fr. Yarnold disagreed, as the work on Ministry was very heavy.

Bishop Baycroft argued for a higher degree of trust to groups.

Professor O'Donovan agreed, but future working groups would need to keep the Commission well informed while the rest of the Commission needed to be alert.

Mr. Charley stressed the short-term goal of discovering where particular long-term issues fitted in to the ecclesiological framework.

Professor Wright thought that the present session's working groups might be different from on-going groups. Some overlap was also desirable.

Mrs. Tanner was convinced that all the groups would need a thorough immersing in the ecclesiological framework if specific issues were to be properly located.

Bishop Baycroft put a question mark against the term "specialist groups". He pleaded for groups comprising more than specialists.

Professor Wright hoped for agreement on the ongoing groups before the end of the present session.

Fr. McDonald delineated the first task of specialist groups as owning the ecclesiological framework.

Dr. Gassmann warned the Commission that it should discuss the scope, content and focus of particular groups at this meeting.

Professor Davis saw the Commission as fellows well met standing outside an empty building. What were the Commission going inside to do? A document on ecclesiology which would state a shared ecclesiology, one we seek, or both?

Sister Boulding wondered whether the ecclesiology group should have one person from each of the particular issues groups.

Fr. Tillard spoke of liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic Church. Everybody in that Commission discussed the Eucharist, but smaller groups were responsible for lesser matters, e.g readings. All should be involved in the ecclesiology.

Fr. Yarnold reminded the Commission that the task was not just ecclesiology, but growth in communion. He feared there were two rival versions of the end product.

Mrs. Tanner was also confused. Some people spoke about an internal position paper, others an agreed statement, others again a convergence paper.

Bishop Vogel found the discussion reminiscent of teaching days: students talking about a paper but not writing it. ARCIC-II was in the unique position of setting a basic agenda in which even the work of ARCIC-I would find its context.

Professor Wright prophesied that the Commission would entangle itself in a long discussion of the composite schema. He hoped, on the contrary, the Commission would start work on what the group chairmen proposed.

Bishop Mark Santer thought that many people felt that some issues would not be clearer until the Commission started writing.

11.45

Bishop Lessard introduced his recommendations of group chairmen (ARCIC-II 72(87)). The proposal was that the four present groups would each deal with a chapter of the ecclesiological paper. After this session one group would need to carry on with the ecclesiology paper and other groups would take up specific points.

Bishop Vogel thought 4.1 was more inclusive than the Introduction.

Bishop Lessard explained that 'steps' would be included at 4.4.

Professor O'Donovan was disappointed that Fr. Yarnold's plea for 'steps' ready for 1988 had disappeared.

Bishop Cameron was persuaded that such proposals could be counter-productive.

Bishop Lessard intended them to be included at 4.4 under the necessary implications of existing communion.

Professor O'Donovan asked for a vote, but Bishop Wallace did not think the paper was rejecting Fr. Yarnold's plea.

Bishop Vogel was satisfied with the draft, but he took seriously Fr. Yarnold's point. There was no better subject than mixed marriages, yet action on this subject could be separate and based on the past agreed statement on the Theology of Marriage and Mixed Marriages.

Professor Chadwick sensed a hesitancy that ARCIC should ask the Curia to negotiate on television. A public statement could be counter-productive.

Fr. McDonald argued for a proper theological demonstration for any next steps. He reminded the Commission of its Canterbury mandate which included the possibility of recommendations "on the basis of agreement in faith".

Fr. Yarnold had only proposed some next step. But he hoped the Commission would understand 4.4. in this way.

Bishop Gitari strongly agreed.

Bishop Baycroft reminded the Commission of the Canadian presentation at its last meeting.

Professor Wright regretted that a next step of changed relationship had not been specified at 4.4.

Professor Davis was concerned that something should be done with which people could identify, e.g. marriage.

Professor O'Donovan regretted that the paper deferred specialist groups. It was a slow start.

Bishop Cormac clarified that the groups would not all be working on the same material.

Fr. Akpunonu felt that a proposal which was valid in the UK or USA might be counter-productive elsewhere. The Commission must therefore give its reasons for change.

Canon Hill detected an oscillation between steps based on existing communion and steps based on future agreement. But Fr Yarnold had the latter in mind.

Fr. Thornhill had an immediate taking up of issues in view, but in the context of ecclesiology.

Bishop Santer asked where particular issues were to come in 4.2 or 4.3.

Fr. Tillard proposed the same question. Issues must not be added to ecclesiology. He did not want an abstract ecclesiology. This was the insight of Llandaff - the special relevance of particular issues to ecclesiology.

Bishops Wallace and Lessard said that the group dealing with 4.2. would take up the special issues, but not necessarily in that chapter. This group would show their relevance to ecclesiology.

Dr. Gassmann hoped for a clarification of the positioning of particular issues.

Bishop Baycroft thought work could go ahead, providing the Co-Chairmen checked for duplication.

Bishop Cameron defended a proper form of imprecision at this stage.

Mr. Charley was very uneasy that two different groups were dealing with 4.1 and 4.3.

Sr. Boulding saw 4.3 as a consequence of 4.1. They were not identical.

4.15 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor after discussion with his fellow Chairman and the group chairmen invited four groups to work on the unified schema. The groups were to correspond largely in membership with the earlier groups. Group A would work on 4.1 corresponding to Storrington I and II (Signs) (pages 1-4 and 7); Group B would work on 4.3 corresponding to Storrington II (unity and diversity) (pages 5-6). (Groups A and B to liaise closely.) Group C would work on 4.2 (Storrington pages 13 and 14 plus 15?) and Group D would work on 4.4 (Storrington pages 8-12, plus 15?)

Group A will work on
Storrington I and II (Signs)
(pages 1-4 and 7)

Group B will work on
Storrington II (unity
and diversity)
(pages 5-6)

Group C will work on
Storrington pages 13 and 14
plus 15?

Group D will work on
Storrington pages 8-12
plus 15?

Group A and B to liaise
closely.

Group C and D to liaise
closely.

Group A and C to liaise
closely.

Group B and D to liaise
closely.

Group A and D to liaise
closely.

Group B and C to liaise
closely.

4.15 p.m. Sunday 6th September, 1987

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor, in the chair, asked the chairmen of the sub-groups to introduce the work they had done. The drafts were distributed.

Bishop Wallace said their group had, in the Introduction which they had prepared, related the ecclesiological theme to ARCIC's previous work. Then in the main text they had given a theological and historical introduction to koinonia: biblical, patristic and dogmatic. They had shown the relation of unity and diversity in communion and prepared for material on 'signs' but not drafted anything new on them.

Fr. Thornhill's group had dealt with unity and diversity in principle; diversity within the communion of Churches; limits to diversity.

Bishop Lessard's group had studied the scandal of division in their origin and issues that are thought to be divisive today.

Bishop Cameron's group had studied signs of existing communion and possibilities of fuller communion including "implications" of our present degree of communion.

The Commission broke up to read the drafts and reconvened at 5.20 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for general reactions to the draft material.

Bishop Lessard said material showed good possibilities and overlaps can easily be dealt with.

Bishop Baycroft found much that is good but thought that it was not yet all there. Let us be careful not to demolish things before we have absorbed them.

Fr. Peter Damien: Much of the material here already in Salvation and the Church and Final Report. We must ask, therefore, what is the main thrust of the document.

Bishop Cameron: We have here the framework of a final document, more than the beginnings. This document is reflecting a global outlook and in the introduction this needs to be said.

Fr. Yarnold: Now we can ask ourselves what the purpose of the document is. I see the value of sections on Church and of diversity. I do not see that the shape of the document justifies what we say at the end of page 1, viz. that if we put our problems in context of koinonia then they can all be solved. This is not borne out by document.

Canon Hill: The process of putting problems in context of koinonia has hardly been begun in the document.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor stressed ^{Canon} Hill's point.

Bishop Santer: Needs more attention at certain points to authority in relation to the whole koinonia issue.

Mrs. Tanner understood Fr. Yarnold's point but said it was because the first section's material on marks of communion had not yet been developed.

Fr. Tillard disagreed with Mrs. Tanner: more work on Section 1 would not resolve Fr. Yarnold's problem. Group C and D do not have same perspective as A and B. They have a different ecclesiology.

Fr. Duprey: There is still much confusion about the notion of communion, especially in C and D.

Bishop Cameron: There will have to be redrafting of later parts of document with A as the controlling perspective on communion.

Prof. Wright asked Fr. Duprey and Fr. Tillard for clarification.

Fr. Tillard: I agree entirely with A and B but C and D at times mean something different by communion from what A and B mean.

Prof. O'Donovan: Document is clear on unity but obscure and abstract on diversity. It fails to recognise the sin of cultural tyranny into which our communions have both fallen in the past.

Fr. Thornhill: The document is not so good on relation of horizontal dimension of communion to the vertical. Our communion is in the Gospel.

Canon Hill: Fr. Tillard's point is that parts of C and D have a different ecclesiology: these parts would need to be detailed. Puzzled that D is alleged to be out of line. Perhaps accidentally formulations are out of line. But these need to be noted.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor supported Canon Hill. A and B are descriptive rather than using the notions.

Prof. Wright asked group to give guidance to A for definition of communion before they do more work. Do people want to say what it is.

Fr. Soane: Wrote some of C and wanted to know if criticism was of principles of ecclesiology or on terminology. We have never actually agreed on the terminology of full, perfect, organic communion.

Bishop Santer: On specific issue in C we have not yet said what is the nature of the specific issue in relation to communion. Need more on eschatological character of communion of the Apocalypse.

Mr. Charley: Commission has to ask itself, do we believe that the problems facing us will best be resolved in context of

communion. If we are not agreed on that we are in trouble.

Fr. Peter Damien: Also clear that we are not in agreement about what communion is. We need a thorough study and we will beat about the bush if we do not do this.

Bishop Lessard: Our group (C) was overly tentative. We felt we did not want to anticipate the solution. In relation to Mr. Charley's question: we have to wait and see how good the context of communion will be for resolving problems. I think we do not have anything better at the moment.

Bishop Baycroft: Do we regard our objective as the restoration of something? I do not. That represents a cyclical approach to life. We have to have a theology of metamorphosis and transformation. But this needs to be debated and resolved.

Bishop Cameron: The word "communion", do we not need a paragraph showing shifts and developments of usage of the word (as with hilasterion in Salvation and the Church). We are using the word with ecumenical overtones at times - (viz. not going to each other's eucharists).

Prof. Davis reviewed some of the points made. The real light emerges in first paragraph of group D. It provides the best introduction.

Sr. Boulding: Our understanding of communion is actually developing as we work and we will at some point have to say how exactly we are using it.

Dr. Gassman pointed to an ambiguity in the sentence beginning, "It is our conviction", on first page of Introduction. Perhaps the two meanings can be held together.

Mr. Charley said that in that sentence "context" means more than concept: it is not just saying that if we adopt concept of koinonia that can resolve all our problems. It is a reference to the existence of communion that there already is.

Fr. Yarnold: My concern is the question of whether the theory of koinonia will shed a lot of light on our problems. I think it will on women's ordination but not on reconciliation of ministries.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: Language of "partial" and "full" communion is, after all, the language in which we are asked by our mandate to address ourselves to our work.

Bishop Santer: The institutional communion is instrumental for relationships. The ecclesiastical bit must not be the be-all and end-all of everything.

Bishop Baycroft said he thought reconciliation of ministries would also have to be done in koinonia context.

Mr. Charley: If we rightly understand koinonia, then we will be able to see how much closer we are than we thought we were and see new possibilities.

Bishop Vogel: We did not think that we were just operating on the level of the concept of koinonia.

Sr. Boulding: We need another section on institutional dimension of communion.

Bishop Wallace stood behind the sentence on page 1 but said resolution of our problems will not simply come from our treatment of them. He apologized for incomplete state of A.

Bishop Santer warmed to Sr. Boulding's remarks. He felt need for more systematic theology.

Fr. Peter Damien: We need to develop our own theology of communion and make it precise for our purposes.

Dr. Gassmann: The introduction should be a real introduction showing nature and purpose of document. It need a paragraph giving the rationale of the document.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: In conclusion. We seem to want to continue with our text and we need to help the groups to clarify what they should do. At 8/15 we will need to "hone" the tasks of particular groups.

Sunday, 6 September, 1987; 8.15: Bishop Santer in the chair.

Canon Hill spoke about the confusion about the dates of the 1988 meeting. The Secretariat and most members thought it was 30th August - 8th September. But Mary Tanner, Jean Tillard and Günter Gassmann are committed to a Faith and Order meeting at the same time; Faith and Order dates are 2nd - 9th September. Canon Hill set the dates for 1989:

Tuesday 29th August - Thursday 7th September

Bp. Santer: We will now try to give guidance to the group on their future work. Beginning with Group A

Bp. Vogel: Group A should start with a systematic rather than historical approach beginning with the doctrine of the Trinity.

Sr Boulding agreed.

Prof. O'Donovan was alarmed at the impression that pp.1 & 2 are teaching that redemption is simply the restoration of original innocence.

Prof. Pobee: Is there any particular virtue in using Koinonia rather than communion?

Bp. Vogel: We cannot altogether drop Koinonia given all the use we've already made of it.

Sr. Boulding: We've got to explicitly relate Koinonia to communion.

Mrs. Tanner: We hoped that we did that in the Introduction.

Bp. Cameron asked about future work.

Fr. McDonald recalled that, earlier, people had asked that A should give a clear definition of communion and a clear explanation of the rationale of the study.

Fr. Yarnold: Do we mention the communion of the saints anywhere? He asked about the methodology i.e. taking a biblical term, seeing its usefulness and relating it to similar NT concepts. Our further work on indulgences will relate to communion of saints.

Bp. Cameron: Koinonia never used of the Trinity in the NT.

Fr. Thornhill said it began with S. Basil and the Cappodocian Fathers.

Bp. Lessard: are we getting any consultants for our work?

Canon Hill suggested Raymond Brown.

Bp. Baycroft: We've gone too far on Koinonia to seek consultants: we ought to send a draft to a consultant for an opinion. I don't see how the typed section on Church fits in with what preceded it.

Fr. Tillard: What is the title of Bp. Santer's material in Group A 1? The mention of the English situation (Bede) at the end is a narrowing.

Fr. Akpunonu: I'm not happy with O.T. exegesis: childish and unscientific. Why is there such an excursus into O.T. theology of Koinonia?

Bp. Cameron said that O.T. material was excellent.

Fr. Soane found some of the exegetical judgments rather arbitrary.

Fr. Yarnold: Last page of draft: jump from "division" to "diversity" too sharp.

Group B

Prof. O'Donovan: pp. 3 & 4: This section on beauty of diversity needs more concrete definition and we need to affirm that it is a sin to deny and oppress diversity.

p.5: in "Limits of diversity" why is not the denial that "Jesus is Lord" included in the things that threaten unity. This is pre-scriptural and is the bedrock of the Creed.

Frs. McDonald and Yarnold spoke to this.

Prof. Wright doubted whether this list (p.5) could ever be ratified by our two communions. Some of these things happen all the time and who is to decide when a denial of some basic thing was being made.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: p.3, n^o 8: It would be helpful if the group had more concrete examples of the kinds of diversities mentioned here.

Bp. Lessard: What is the relation of the quote to the rest of the paragraph in Para. 2?

Fr. Yarnold: The document has not got to the bottom of the need for diversity: it is the richness and diversity in God.

Mr Charley questioned the word "threatened".

Group C

Prof. O'Donovan: Analysis of the problem of Christian marriage is confused. "Church and State" need expansion.

Fr. Soane: It is difficult to resolve all these issues simply on the basis of the doctrine of communion.

Bp. Gitari: p.3: We have to be careful about defining people in negative terms.

Prof. Wright: p.6: absence of anything about the Marian dogmas.

Bp. Santer: These dogmas are not sufficiently treated under the notion of Authority; they also come under "communion".

Fr. Akpunonu: This group seems to think that authority is what is responsible for division; rather than seeing authority as a gift.

Fr. Soane: It is supposed to be a negative section that takes for granted the value of authority.

Group D

Fr. Tillard: Is not enough in relation of visible to eschatological Koinonia. When we're speaking of the unity of the Church, we're talking of the visible Church.

Fr. Yarnold: Shouldn't this come in the general treatment of Koinonia?

Prof. Wright: cf. questions about our communion; I'd like to see the words of Paul VI at Canonisation of the 40 martyrs included.

Fr. Akpunonu saw problems in the treatment of mixed marriages. We're soft pedalling on very difficult issues.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said that the need for the chairmen to have reactions to the "steps" section was urgent.

Fr. McDonald: One of the problems is the lack of a sufficiently clear shared understanding of the nature of Koinonia.

Mr. Charley: Drafts of C and D being a bit of a mish-mash. Group C needs to locate much more sharply how these issues fit into communion context.

Tuesday 8th September, 9.30

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor in the chair: it seems from our discussions that a great amount of work is still to be done, especially on group A which is the foundation. Groups D and B say their work needs more work on section A done before they can do more themselves.

Better if Group A only goes away to work on a fuller resumé of their section. Groups B, C, D meet in plenary to discuss "impediments" in Group C to see how they relate to ecclesiology of communion then to go into groups to consider the specific topics. We could also have a session together on "Steps" later today.

Wednesday, 9th September: 4.30 p.m.

From the chair Bishop Cormac Murphy-O'Connor invited discussion on the work of Group A (75/a/1 and 75/a/2).

The composite draft was applauded.

Fr. Akpunonu asked for a statement of why communion was so important.

Fr. Yarnold asked for a little help over the connections.

Prof. Pobee felt the themes of being 'in Christ' and Covenant needed more emphasis.

Bishop Cameron felt a little more time was required to take in the exegesis. There needed to be time for response during the year. It only required refining. Were there not three New Testament uses of church.

Fr. McDonald - answering Fr. Akpunonu - saw the document as a sonata with recapitulation. The whole document will explain the importance of communion.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor - following Fr. Yarnold - wondered whether pages 9 and 10 ought to come earlier so that the Old and New Testament concepts of communion are held together.

Mrs. Tanner resisted this.

Bishop Baycroft asked whether the substance of the work allowed the Commission to move on to 'unity in diversity', 'the scandal of division' etc.

Professor O'Donovan found the Biblical material much improved but the drafters could have had a Bible without the Gospels! The treatment of the Old Testament lacking a documentary awareness. The different strands of the Old Testament needed to be brought out rather more. The reference to Moses suggested a tension with the notion of communion.

Fr. Yarnold was now happier with the coherence of Part I. He had a minor problem with sentences beginning with communion itself.

Fr. Akpunonu still had misgivings about the use of the Old Testament - for example the lack of scientific exegesis of Adam and Eve and the Flood.

Sr. Boulding also had a feeling that koinonia had taken off. It would be better to say we could find our conviction in the Scriptures.

Prof. Davis noted a state of development about the Church. He wanted a sense of dynamism right from the beginning. The very end of the second document was not rooted in the text. The work of the systematic theologians had not been sufficiently felt. The transition from I to II would have to be more skilfully engineered. Finally, would the signs of communion on II, pages 5 and 6, be elaborated on later?

Professor Pobee hoped the Introduction would not be quite so long. It could be shortened by removing 'dodgy' exegesis. But Communion with God was all important - and the covenant theme. The theme of a sharing of goods also needed expansion.

Bishop Baycroft did not want too much reduction - even some amplification. Communion as People of God would allow a greater dynamism.

Bishop Santer welcomed detailed comments but wondered whether they would help today. Detailed points by letter would be more helpful. He shared the concern for exegetic responsibility. But he did not want to be in the tyranny of the scholars. We read the Scriptures as part of our story. Reductionism in the Old Testament leads to the same in the New. There should be no crypto-Marcionism.

Fr. McDonald thought the Commission should ask whether the 10 questions could flow from the Introduction. He saw some links for moralists. Others should also look out for the links for other questions.

Fr. Thornhill reminded the Commission of ARCIC's good tradition of brevity. Yet it had been admitted that this document was of a different kind. Another ARCIC tradition was to look back to the undivided tradition. Fr. Yarnold's request for more on the communion of saints had not really been followed up.

Fr. Duprey did not yet see the aim of the document clearly enough - this must be more precisely expressed.

The Commission altered the 1989 dates by one day: 28th August - 6th September.

Canon Hill noted the absence of reference to John the Baptist and Mary as fulfilment of the Old Testament.

Bishop Baycroft: If the signs of communion are numbered it suggests a temporal or logical sequence. the Lordship of Christ was 1 and the 10 was sharing the eucharist! This looked like the official Roman Catholic position.

Canon Hill saw the eucharist as the visible expression of all the signs of communion.

Fr. Thornhill wanted a reference to the fact that we recognised five other sacraments as well as baptism and the eucharist. Church and society issues needed to be signalled.

Mrs. Tanner thought the language of pages 5 and 6 in II needed some attention. The communion and reconciliation language was imprecise. In pages 1-4 it was not clear what period of history was being referred to. Primacy also needed to come earlier or it polarized.

Bishop Santer agreed. The silence on primacy was inconsistent with ARCIC-I. 'Shared structures' was rather mealy-mouthed as an

instantiation of communion. the section on signs needed fleshing out.

Sr. Boulding lacked a sense of the Church as Sacrament (cf I page 2).

Bishop Cameron noted an unresolved question about the usage of the word sacrament.

Professor Pobee asked for a reference to worship in general before moving to the eucharist. In II.1 there would be a good place with the Ignatian language. Care also needed to be taken over triumphalist language. 'Recognition' also needed careful use.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor understood Bishop Santer's point about Primacy.

Bishop Baycroft queried: "schism from the main body", the high place accorded to the WCC, the juxta-position of the Scripture with Episcopal Succession lists. the Trinitarian baptismal formula had not been discussed but some were working for inclusive language!

Bishop Santer felt mutual submission needed some discussion as the Commission examined authority.

Fr. Akpunonu wanted to emphasize the place of the local Church in the New Testament. This was essential for diversity.

Fr. Yarnold felt the thrust of the signs of communion was towards two distinct bodies in full ecclesial communion. Or should two bodies become institutionally one. Mrs. Tanner agreed. There was a particular model at work here.

Fr. Tillard spoke of the Uniat experience within the Roman Catholic Church.

Bishop Santer was unhappy at this being the only model. There should be a description of Christian communion as such.

Sr. Boulding saw this as describing pluralism.

Mrs. Tanner saw the signs as along the way.

Professor Pobee hoped to see both communions changing. He hoped for an open-endedness.

Fr. Yarnold was not clear about the exact meaning of baptism. Nor was a commitment to mission alone a sign. Shared mission was required.

Professor Davis detected a Trinitarian hiccup. The reference on page 5 was not appropriate on page 5.

Bishop Wallace asked whether the whole document was or was not an adequate framework for the later questions.

Fr. Duprey thought it was so. He wanted more work to see what were the essential elements for full ecclesial communion in the local church.

Bishop Santer agreed. The real essentials of communion must be described.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor reminded the Commission that thought on communion was still in its infancy in the Roman Catholic Church.

Bishop Baycroft also asked whether the basic doctrine was the right platform.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor put this question.

Bishop Cameron felt this case had now been made.

Bishop Murphy -O'Connor again asked for comments to be sent to the Secretaries.

The Co-Chairmen proposed five groups:

1. An Australian Group to study Authority, Primacy and Communion: Bishop Wallace, Bishop Cameron and Fr.Thornhill.

2. A North American Group to study Reconciliation of Ministries: Bishop Lessard, Bishop Vogel, Professor Wright, Professor Davis, Fr.Yarnold, Fr.Tillard.

3. A group to study Moral Issues: Professor O'Donovan, Fr. Soane, Fr. McDonald.

4. A group in the United Kingdom to carry on work on the Introduction and on Unity and Diversity: Bishop Santer, Fr. Tillard, Mr. Charley, Prof. Pobee and perhaps Professor Chadwick.

5. Another group in the United Kingdom to study the Ordination of Women: Bishop Murphy-O'Connor, Canon Hill, Fr.McDonald, Bishop Baycroft, Mrs. Tanner, Sr. Boulding.

It was agreed that members in Africa and India would be kept in close touch with the groups.