

A NOTE ON THE PUBLICATION OF POSITION PAPERS

by

Christopher Hill

At the Salisbury meeting of the Commission I was asked to give some preliminary thought to the publication of a number of ARCIC position papers (see Salisbury Minutes, ARCIC 198, page 32). I have taken it that at this stage I was being asked to give some 'pre-editorial' consideration of the matter to stimulate members' discussion of the subject. The following is, therefore, essentially tentative and presupposes that members would be invited to revise their papers for publication if and when we arrive at an editorial stage proper.

If the projected volume is to be some sort of companion to Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue (Oxford University Press, 1974) it would need to include more than a selection of ARCIC papers. The earlier book also included the Common Declaration of 1966, an introduction to the work of the Anglican/Roman Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission, the Malta Report, Cardinal Bea's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and an extract from the Lambeth Conference of 1968. It would make sense for the projected volume to contain equivalent material if it is to be in any way a comprehensive handbook alongside ARCIC's Final Report.

I therefore see it opening with an extended introduction on the work of ARCIC, perhaps not unlike Colin Davey's semi-official Appendix to Ministry and Ordination or my own The Course of ARCIC's Discussion on Authority (ARCIC 154). But I feel the need for such an introduction to be given a little 'flesh'. Could an introduction include some picture of how discussion fared at particular meetings? If not, the position papers will give only a very inadequate presentation of ARCIC's method and dynamic. I am thinking of occasional illustrations of the issues by extracts from the Minutes. No doubt very great care would have to be exercised in such a selection. Furthermore, the Commission as a whole would obviously need to scrutinize and agree to any judicious quotation, especially as the Minutes have admittedly been informal and non-verbatim. Yet such a method seems to have been successfully pursued in Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue (SPCK, 1977). I believe it would at least be worth attempting such an 'illustrated' introduction, for without such a device a fairly 'dry' skeleton will be the inevitable alternative.

For similar reasons I would further suggest that the more significant draft statements be included. Of course their status, or rather lack of it, would need to be clearly indicated, as well as the fact that they will not have come from the Commission as a whole. (The Venice Papers and the Norwich Eucharist Statement have already been published.) By such a device the progressive stages of the dialogue could be clearly indicated.

What of the editorial selection itself? Obviously there can be no question of the publication of the 200 or so papers in the Catalogue; what should the grounds for inclusion be? I would suggest that papers of members only be published because, important as the contribution of non-members has been, a readership will be interested in the thoughts of the Commission

itself. I would also suggest that there be no attempt at 'party' editorship in the form of an equal number of Anglican and Roman Catholic papers. The Commission has never worked in a denominational fashion and it is a fact that the Roman Catholic team is stronger in its number of professional academics than the Anglican. It is also worth remarking that at least some of ARCIC's subjects have required specifically Roman Catholic exegesis, not least the Papacy.

The selection might well be uneven in another way as far more work has been done on the question of authority than on the other two subjects. This no more than reflects the progressive difficulty experienced by the Commission in tackling its three subjects.

Granted all this, I believe that the actual choice of papers should be made on the basis of their contribution and relevance to the special areas of difficulty the Commission has had to confront in reaching agreement on its three mandated subjects. On this basis I would not wish to exclude at this stage the consideration of those composite offerings prepared by sub-commissions when the Commission was at the earlier stages of its work on the Eucharist and Ministry, though it must be admitted that these short reflections on specific issues by different members lack the coherence of the longer papers by individuals.

The Introduction would need to draw attention to all the above as well as describing the crucial work done in sub-commissions, drafting teams, and in full session. It would also need to speak of the 'fatherly guidance' and co-ordination of the two Co-Chairmen as a sine qua non.

In the light of the above, and after a careful re-examination of the Catalogue and the re-reading of a number of ARCIC papers, I suggest the following for consideration:

Eucharistic Doctrine

"The Church, Intercommunion and Ministry"- Arthur Vogel-ARCJPC

* "Roman Catholics and Anglicans: The Eucharist" - J.M.R.Tillard,OP
ARCJPC 4/A

"Church and Eucharist" - Venice (1) Sub-Commission - ARCIC 21

"The Notion of Sacrifice in the Eucharist in Anglican and
and Roman Catholic Theology" (edited version?) - Oxford
Sub-Commission - ARCIC 28

"The Norwich Statement on the Eucharist" - Sub-Commission -
ARCIC 31A

Ministry and Ordination

"Ministry in a Divided Church"- H.Ryan, SJ - ARCIC 15

"Church and Ministry" - Venice (1) Sub-Commission - ARCIC 22

"Ministry in the New Testament" (edited version?) - Oxford
Sub-Commission - ARCIC 46

* English published title.

- * "What Priesthood has the Ministry?" - J.M.R.Tillard, OP - ARCIC 47
- "The Recognition of Ministry" - Georges Tavard, AA - ARCIC 49
- "Draft Statement on the Ministry" - Poringland Sub-Commission -
ARCIC 71

Authority in the Church

- "Church and Authority" - Venice (1) Sub-Commission - ARCIC 20
- "The Nature of Schism: How Complete Can it Ever Be?" -
C.Butler, OSB - ARCIC 101
- "The Primacy of the Jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff" -
H.Ryan, SJ - ARCIC 104
- "Some Reflections on Magisterium in the Early Church" -
H.Chadwick - ARCIC 108
- "Sensus Fidelium" - J.M.R.Tillard, OP - ARCIC 116
- "Ecclesiology and Koinonia" - Grottaferrata Sub-Commission -
ARCIC 124/II/3
- "The Horizon of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome" - J.M.R.
Tillard, OP - ARCIC 133
- "Schema on Church and Authority" - St.Katharine's Sub-Commission -
ARCIC 136/11
- "Truth and Authority" - H.Chadwick - ARCIC 139
- "Note on the Papacy as an Object of Faith" - G.Tavard, AA -
ARCIC 150
- "Hengrave Document on Church and Authority" - Sub-Commission -
ARCIC 151
- "Note on Peter in the New Testament" - G.Tavard AA and
A.Vogel - ARCIC 181
- "Anglicanism and the Nature and Exercise of Authority" -
H.McAdoo - ARCIC 186A
- "The Spirit's Abiding in the Church" - H.McAdoo - ARCIC 186B
- "A Roman Catholic Response to above" - H.Ryan, SJ - ARCIC 186C
- "The Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome" - J.M.R.Tillard, OP -
ARCIC 190

Concluding Postscript

Thought would also have to be given to the final phase of ARCIC's work, with the possible addition of papers on Venice 24 and the 'ecclesiological framework' of the Final Report. An edited version of the final Catalogue might also be a useful addition. Yet even this modest selection from over 200 papers would probably require a volume of 400-500 pages! Publishers would probably require financial inducement to take it on!

* English published title.