

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC CONSULTATION ON THE ORDINATION OF WOMENVersailles: 27th February - 3rd March 1978Monday, 27th February: Opening Session

Mgr. Purdy took the chair. There was initial discussion on the mandate of the Consultation, the divergence between the Declaration on the Ordination of Women and the Canterbury Statement of ARCIC.

Miss Christian Howard asked concerning the degree of agreement necessary for sacramental communion and how far there could be a Roman Catholic pluralism.

Fr. Duprey drew a distinction between the content of faith, doctrine and theology.

Bishop Cameron returned to the Terms of Reference of the Consultation and asked what were the criteria for reconciliation.

Fr. Duprey noted the new factor in Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue.

Mgr. Purdy noted the Anglican insistence at the Chichester meeting of ARCIC that the Ordination of Women did not imply departure from the Agreed Statement on the Ministry.

Bishop Cameron stressed the divergence between the picture of ministry presented in the Declaration and the Canterbury Statement.

Tuesday, 28th February: Morning Session

Fr. John Hotchkin took the chair.

Miss Howard presented her paper and drew particular attention to the movement of Anglican thought between the Lambeth Conferences of 1948 and 1968. There had since been an assumption in the Anglican Communion that there had been a sufficient debate on the question. Nowhere was the ordination of women felt to be totally impossible. The question was asked as to whether the plurality within the Anglican Communion was also possible between Communions.

Revd. Christopher Hill spoke of the background paper presented to the Central African Episcopal Synod by Bishop Mabula. Although against the ordination of women, the Bishop appeared to believe it possible. The Synod subsequently asked the Church of Canada not to take action until after the Lambeth Conference, but it was agreed not to break communion. This was endorsed by the Provincial Synod.

Professor Fashole-Luke noted the importance of the Anglican Consultative Council for African Churches. The international dimension of Anglicanism was especially important in countries where political pressures arose.

Professor Griffiss noted that some in the USA did not believe the ordination of women possible, but nevertheless remained in communion. There were larger issues behind the schism, e.g. a conservative political movement.

Miss Howard noted that in Sweden also there were those who took an absolute view but remained in the Church.

92

Fr. Eric Doyle wanted clarification of the word pluralism.

Bishop Cameron agreed and asked when pluralism became indifferentism.

Miss Howard wondered why the issue had become so urgent now.

In answer Professor Griffiss affirmed a degree of cultural pressure, but thought more significant a movement within the christian community. The conviction of women was not decisive but their pressure was a pastoral factor. He noted ordinands of both sexes were equally inarticulate now, and that the question of women's rights had diminished as a factor in the USA.

Bishop Valentine put the question into context. There was the tremendous rapidity of change in the twentieth century. There was also the current re-examination of the christian ministry ordained and lay. Some Canadian bishops felt the issue was not as important as the latter. He also felt that the ARCIC document on the Ministry seemed to be unknown to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Bishop Cameron noted that the ordination of women had only come on to the Australian agenda because of the ACC. He thought the issue raised questions of authority and God's purpose in the Church.

Fr. Doyle noted a contradiction between recent Roman Catholic teaching on the role of women, e.g. Gaudium et Spes and the present Declaration. It appeared that the doctrine of the ministry was not susceptible to development. He also noted the novelty of the presentation of the ministry in persona Christi. He asked what one said to a girl with a claimed vocation.

Professor Fashole-Luke thought the original Hong Kong action to be the practical solution to a pastoral problem. He noted the ACC claim that Anglican pluralism might be a gift to the universal Church (Trinidad).

Professor Griffiss argued that definition was subsequent to pastoral development.

Fr. Congar noted Cyprian's dictum licet diversum sentire salvo jure communionis. (Malines Conversations).

The issue was not only one of discipline for the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches. There were three aspects: 1. The idea of tradition and the identity of the Church indicated a 'typos' for the ministry. 2. The concept of the ministry was seen in the mystery of Christ himself; it was not merely an ecclesiastical organization. The idea of 'representation' was found in the Roman Declaration. 3. Anthropology was important; in the Bible the role of man and woman was basic. The Church needed to consider this more in the whole context of the ministry. Women did much more today than the ancient deaconesses. Women should play a larger teaching and prophetic role, and in the councils of the Church. Why was the issue so urgent now? The Roman Catholic Church had made unilateral decisions (Immaculate Conception, Vatican I, Assumption). Now there should be a reconsideration of the decision on Anglican Orders (1896). The Anglican Communion should be recognised as a real church with an apostolic faith and ministry, in spite of comprehensiveness. The question of the ordination of women was not a clear one, but there was no evidence that a male priesthood was de jure divino. An Ecumenical Council was needed.

73

Mgr. Purdy introduced his paper. He stressed the disparity between the structures of the Anglican Communion and that of the Roman Catholic Church. He preferred the attitude of the Dublin Meeting of the ACC that in the end the Churches of the Anglican Communion should make up their own mind, to Metropolitan Antony Bloom's suggestion that the Anglican Churches must do what was right. He drew attention to the phrase in the Archbishop of Canterbury's second letter to Pope Paul VI "A diversity of legitimate traditions".

Fr. Congar insisted that unity needed diversity.

Mgr. Purdy continued by speaking of the Declaration in terms of the stylus curia. It was the lowest rank of document. The Commentary, he stressed, was not official. He also stressed the odd way in which deductions had been made from the Declaration's reflection that classical theology hardly treated the issue. He agreed with others that vocation was relevant. It had a right to be tested. Attention was drawn to the ecumenical discussion of the question in the USA (US ARC). On the manner of the Holy Spirit's operation in changing situations he drew special attention to the earlier sections of the Venice Agreed Statement.

Fr. Hotchkiss drew attention to Karl Rahner's finding the Statement an authentic declaration of the Roman magisterium, but contesting that the conclusions can be drawn from the arguments. The decision nevertheless stood firm.

Fr. Congar noted the disparity of the arguments used in the Declaration. Tradition was the conclusive argument, yet even this was strange because of its negative nature

Fr. Doyle noted that Epiphanius was facing a different question. He noted that on the two previous occasions when the Holy Office had argued a case in this century (1927 and 1948) it had been explicitly stated that this did not end study and discussion.

Revd. C. Hill noted the distinction drawn in the Declaration itself and in the Commentary between the disciplinary decision and the reasons for it.

Professor Griffiss felt that the Ministry and Authority documents of ARCIC had covered new ground but the Magisterium raised problems for Anglicans just as Anglican experimentation raised problems for Roman Catholics.

Bishop Cameron and Professor Fashole-Luke thought the document would be regarded as having said the last word by the Roman Catholic bishops in their countries.

Fr. Duprey did not think the Declaration merely signified a disciplinary decision. The Roman Church deemed the ordination of women inadmissible not merely for secondary or cultural reasons. It was more that the Roman Catholic Church did not feel it could take the risk of possibly going against the will of Christ. Others felt that it was impossible and yet others again that pastoral reasons prevented it. There was therefore a quasi unanimity.

Bishop Cameron commended the Venice Statement paras. 1-7 and 15. Some experiments were illegitimate, e.g. lay presidency. In Australia there was not only the question of the General Synod but also the Canon Law Commission and the constitution of the Church.

Tuesday, 28th February: Evening Session

Bishop Valentine took the chair.

Fr. Hotchkin introduced his paper drawing particular attention to the ARC Consultation on the Ordination of Women. He noted that not all bishops in the United States regarded the question as finally settled. Legitimate diversity was a problem, as also the divergent discipline over marriage.

Bishop Cameron added celibacy to that context.

Fr. Doyle asked who believed it was not possible to ordain women: Jesus, theologians, or the Church? The Declaration was inopportune and dioceses and parishes should still be consulted. He agreed that at the pastoral level the question was probably premature for Roman Catholics.

Fr. Hotchkin noted that women extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist did much more than ancient deaconesses.

Fr. Congar said that the Declaration had indicated signs of the Church's teaching.

There was discussion between Professor Fashole-Luke and Professor Griffiss on the coming issue of homosexuality in the Episcopal Church.

Revd. C. Hill noted the divergent Anglican solutions to the relationship between Churches ordaining women and Churches not. Some allowed women priests to celebrate, though they did not ordain women themselves.

Professor Griffiss added that this was not only between church Provinces but also even within some dioceses in the USA.

Fr. Doyle pointed out the difficulties when ^{women} bishops were ordained.

Professor Griffiss proposed that as the three ARCIC documents had gone behind both traditions, so this Consultation might try to point out the underlying theological issues. He suggested that unity was sought for rather than achieved. For Roman Catholics traditionally it had been given. But there was an eschatological dimension: the Church was in pilgrimage. A theological view was needed to allow a waiting to see the outcome and in the meantime some form of communion.

Bishop Cameron proposed the Consultation should look at the aim of Roman Catholic/Anglican dialogue, then the attitude of the Churches to the ordination of women and the consequences of Anglican ordination of women to the original aim.

Fr. Congar thought that the aim of dialogue was more than a hope for unity, rather it was organic unity.

Professor Griffiss disliked the concept of organic unity as suggesting a merger of bureaucracies.

Fr. Duprey noted previous confusion over the word organic. It should indicate a dynamic growing quality rather than organisational identity.

Professor Griffiss noted a traditional Anglican acceptance of diversity of structures in the Caroline recognition of the Reformed ministry in Europe.

Mgr. Purdy saw problems because ministerial structures touched the heart of things.

Revd. C.Hill noted the current United Kingdom preference for the phrase "visible unity" which indicated a sacramental reality. He agreed with Mgr. Purdy that confidence in the ministry was vital.

Fr. Doyle noted that the High Priestly prayer for unity was before ecclesiastical division. It was an eschatological gift of Grace both given and to be attained.

Professor Fashole-Luke stressed the unity and diversity of the Anglican Communion.

Mgr. Purdy felt the question was how decisive this new factor was in the dialogue.

Fr. Duprey saw full communion in faith and sacramental life as the mandate of Anglican/Roman Catholic dialogue (Pope Paul VI/Archbishop of Canterbury 1966). While there was unanimity amongst Roman Catholic bishops, it was not de jure divino that women could not be ordained.

Revd. C.Hill drew attention to the Anglican feeling that Churches ordaining women did so in good faith as true Churches. There was a mutual Anglican trust which was important.

Bishop Valentine felt this was the case in Canada.

Fr. Duprey did not feel good faith was enough.

Revd. C.Hill agreed that good faith could be mistaken. He referred however to Archbishop Scott's comment that in the Early Church councils met to judge the appropriateness of local initiative rather than initiate action themselves.

Professor Griffiss felt the dimension of trust to be very important.

Bishop Valentine saw questions of authority in this as in many other issues.

Fr. Doyle wondered whether even though Rome might proceed in a safe way, it could still recognise Anglican initiative because the Declaration was not infallible.

Mgr. Purdy also felt that inter-Anglican trust was very significant, though noting that for the Roman Catholic Church the local-provincial church was not enough.

Fr. Doyle saw new sources for the discovery of doctrinal development in ecumenical discussion.

Professor Fashole-Luke felt the recognition of ministries was basic.

Fr. Hotchkin saw trust on the Roman Catholic side as well in the magisterium. He doubted whether the Anglican Communion could go back.

Professor Griffiss said the ordination of women might not work.

Bishop Valentine felt it might still be right for its time.

Fr. Doyle reaffirmed that the ministry could be re-defined. He also drew attention to Phoebe in Romans XVI. Whatever Timothy was, she was. He noted that doctrines had been re-defined.

Bishop Cameron saw less difficulty in dogmatic diversity and had no problems with Roman Catholics holding/he could not, e.g. the Assumption. doctrines

Mgr. Purdy noted Cardinal Willebrands' view that Anglicans could not be expected to hold doctrines the history of which they had not gone through.

Fr. Congar drew attention to the importance of intention.

Fr. Duprey saw it as important to trust the intention of others.

Fr. Congar posed the question as to how far the facts of the incarnation were normative.

Revd. C.Hill felt that the ARCIC Agreement on the Ministry and intention should be examined together in relation to the question of the ordination of women.

Fr. Doyle felt that the evidence of protestant women's ministries could not be ignored, a celebration in such a case would not be a vacuous act. Could it be said to be invalid?

Fr. Congar did not think that validity was the right concept.

Fr. Duprey insisted that the ordination of women was a matter which was a fact in the life of the Church and impinged more directly on the Church than doctrine and an explanation of intention.

Bishop Cameron said that for him the question of receiving communion from a women priest was whether it would be a disobedient act.

Professor Griffiss cited Quick on the success or failure of the ecumenical movement being on the degree to which all Christian bodies recognised their eucharistic acts to be deficient in separation.

Fr. Hotchkin agreed there was a deficit. The separated churches could not give the sign to the world Christ intended, but the deficiency was on our side.

Fr. Duprey agreed that Roman Catholic terms such as perfect communion could be misleading.

Fr. Doyle said that the Roman tradition was that unity and communion could never be actually broken but he did not accept this.

Professor Griffiss felt that baptismal unity was fundamental.

Fr. Hotchkin said that even the sign value of baptism could be defective.

Professor Griffiss repeated that the question of women's ordination raised larger questions. It was not simply could a Roman Catholic receive the sacraments from an Anglican women priest. Could a Roman Catholic receive from a Reformed pastor?

Rev. C. Hill noted that the Agreed Statement on the Ministry had seen episcopate as fundamental to the christian ministry. This had some relevance to dialogue with non-episcopal churches. Moreover the ancient deaconess shared in episcopate and there was the Roman Catholic tradition that Holy Order was in the singular. The fact of the deaconess and the silence in the Declaration on this issue was relevant to the debate.

Wednesday, 1st March: Morning Session

Fr. Hotchkin took the chair.

Mgr. Purdy read out a draft outline he had prepared and shared with the Co-Chairmen and other Secretary.

Professor Griffiss reacted strongly to the outline. It put him on the defensive. There was too much weight on the Declaration, which had no authority for Anglicans. He did not wish to have to justify the position of his Church and felt that it was for Roman Catholics to get round that particular road block.

Fr. Hotchkin saw a road block in Anglican decisions as well.

Professor Fashole-Luke repeated that there were tensions within Anglicanism but Churches remained in communion.

Professor Griffiss thought that the whole of the first section was really dealing simply with the Magisterium. The problem was not an Anglican one.

Mgr. Purdy rejoined that the problem spoken of was that outlined in the mandate of the Consultation, not the Declaration.

Fr. Doyle added that the Declaration was now the formal Roman Catholic position.

Professor Griffiss accepted Mgr. Purdy's point, but still felt that the purpose of the Consultation was not to examine the legitimacy of the ordination of women. There was general agreement.

Professor Fashole-Luke recalling the mandate of the Consultation hoped that a way could be found to go forward without repeating the discussion of the last two days.

Fr. Duprey sympathised with Professor Griffiss but affirmed that the Roman Catholic position was unlikely to change as it had behind it the near unanimity of the Roman Catholic bishops. Did the two positions preclude communion?

Miss Howard asked if the situation had changed by the valid ordination of women priests in the Anglican Communion. The second factor was the Declaration itself. She was not happy that the issue should be left till an ecumenical council met.

Bishop Cameron felt there were scriptural problems as well as the problem of tradition, but

Mgr. Purdy pointed out that his draft merely reflected the previous day's discussion.

Bishop Cameron felt it wise to go back to the mandate. He also felt that reference to the ARCIC Statement on the Ministry would be important.

Fr. Doyle saw the question as going back to the problem of the recognition of the ministry.

Fr. Duprey noted that the Canterbury Statement had not dealt with the capax of the ministry, the radical capacity required for the ministry of the priesthood. At the Chichester meeting of ARCIC it had been clear that Anglicans did not see the ordination of women as a departure from the Canterbury Statement. The Venice Statement had built up a certain notion of tradition: history could be seen as guided by the Holy Spirit in the Church's

search to understand the Word of God.

Professor Fashole-Luke echoed Bishop Valentine's plea for a radical examination of the ministry.

Miss Howard understood this as asking how the total concept of ministry was changed by the ordination of women.

Professor Fashole-Luke emphasised the contextual nature of theology. The Church was incarnate and so in certain places the ordination of women was possible while not in others. He noted Fr. Congar's statement that unity required diversity. This was where trust was also required.

Revd. C. Hill thought that a document might begin by recognising two facts. The first was not only that the ordination of women had actually taken place but also that no church in the Anglican Communion had yet declared the ordination of women to be impossible. The second fact was the official Roman Catholic position.

Fr. Doyle then saw both Churches as in the midst of a development of doctrine.

Miss Howard cautioned the group on the simple equation of the structures of the two Churches and she drew attention to the tentative way in which Anglicans reached decisions. There were growing signs of a characteristic Anglican position. On whether the Anglican Communion could reverse its decision she found Archbishop Scott's comments helpful. Anglicans submitted their decision to the experience of the Church, though experiment was the wrong word.

Bishop Valentine intervened on the Canadian situation. There had been a formal Episcopal Consultation in which it was stated from the Roman Catholic side that there was no theological objection and that if the Canadian Church proceeded this would not halt dialogue. A majority of Roman Catholic bishops still felt that in spite of the Declaration the Roman Catholic Church would follow suit in the foreseeable future, though local action would be dependent upon a universal decision.

Professor Fashole-Luke thought that "no theological objections" was not enough. Positive reasons were required. He again stressed the cultural context to decisions.

Bishop Valentine recalled the Canadian General Synod decision at Quebec. There had been massive exchange with the Roman Catholic community including episcopal concelebration (1975). At the 1977 Synod a bishop-observer had openly received Communion. He asked what this outward sign indicated.

Revd. C. Hill asked whether it was time to think of drafting.

Fr. Hotchkin thought that the Group might then give instructions to a drafting team.

Miss Howard asked whether the Roman Catholic Church was committed to the radical non-capacity of a woman to be ordained.

Fr. Congar was not sure of the character of the decision that had been made. It was based on Canon Law and a certain tradition. It was very important to keep a distance between the Roman statement and the concept of de jure divino. The Church

had not decided definitively but it was bound for the present. Orthodox relations were important but unlike the Orthodox the Roman Catholic Church had not suggested that the Anglican Communion had lost its apostolic succession.

Miss Howard asked whether the Orthodox felt that Anglican action had radically vitiated the apostolic ministry.

Fr. Duprey spoke of his encouragement of the Orthodox to continue in dialogue with Anglicans (Istanbul). The Orthodox felt that the Anglican Communion had lost its specificity compared with the Protestant Churches. They were over expectant of Lambeth '78.

Fr. Congar agreed that tradition meant movement but none-the-less it could not be broken. Only an ecumenical council could determine whether the matter was of divine tradition.

Fr. Doyle asked who constituted an ecumenical council.

Fr. Congar replied in terms of all Churches with an apostolic tradition. Not all Churches had a sense of the Church as sacramental.

Miss Howard had some problems here. The Scandinavian Lutherans were rather different from the Baptists. She did not want a line drawn immediately below the Anglican Communion.

Professor Griffiss noted that the ecclesiology of many Protestant churches was moving in a sacramental direction. He drew a distinction between the apostolic ministry and its particular three-fold expression. He wondered what diversity could be allowed, and again stressed that the non-episcopal ministerial tradition was relevant to the Consultation.

Fr. Congar agreed but considered the received form the only certain way historically.

Professor Griffiss thought that it was the clearest and most obvious but did not wish to be exclusive.

Revd. C. Hill reminded the Group of the ARCIC Statement on Ministry which had seen episcopate as central rather than its historical expression.

Bishop Valentine felt that a tradition which was locked in the past came close to heresy. He felt some Orthodox were almost in this category. He wondered what explanation should be given to the divergence of Roman practice (e.g. Eucharistic sharing) from the ruling of the Magisterium. Could this be relevant to the ordination of women.

Fr. Duprey suggested the following beginnings for a document: "A substantial majority in each Anglican church accepts that it is possible to ordain women to the priesthood and some churches have already proceeded to such ordinations. No Anglican church has affirmatively stated that such an ordination is impossible but some churches have not yet considered the question. The Roman Catholic Church believes that she has not the right to change an unbroken tradition throughout the history of the Church universal in the East and in the West, because it is considered to conform to God's plan for his Church. In front of the two positions the question is is it at all possible for our two churches to re-establish full communion between them and if so how as full communion pre-supposes the mutual recognition of ministries. In other words can the Roman

Catholic Church who judges it impossible for theological motivation to ordain women, recognise the legitimacy of such an ordination for Anglicans? How can she think that such an ordination could be impossible for her and possible for the Anglican Communion."

Fr. Doyle asked for four points to be taken into consideration: 1. That there be an expression of mutual respect for the faith of each Church; 2. That tradition is a living reality and that there is a development of doctrine; 3. That the question be seen in a wider context; 4. That there are certain facts to be recognised and to be discovered.

Miss Howard noted that there was a predisposition not to break an existing communion. To enter communion was another problem.

Bishop Cameron wondered how a final negative decision could be given in the Roman Catholic Church.

Fr. Hotchkin asked whether an ecumenical council would be needed to exclude ordination of women de jure divino.

Fr. Duprey thought even this might be difficult.

Bishop Valentine reported that a number of Canadian bishops wanted to go ahead but were not sure because the majority of Roman Catholic bishops were against.

Fr. Duprey saw the relevance of jure communionis as one local church could not decide without the others.

Professor Griffiss asked of the influence of the number of Roman Catholic theologians in favour.

Fr. Congar thought academic influence to be little.

Professor Griffiss said that many positions thought to be academic before Vatican II were now pastoral practice.

Fr. Congar agreed and said there had been a deep underground movement.

Revd. C. Hill said this was precisely the case in the Anglican Communion in the last 30 years, especially with respect to the order of deaconesses.

Miss Howard agreed and pointed out that deaconesses did all but preside and absolve.

Fr. Congar thought that this is the way the question might mature for the Church in France.

Bishop Cameron said that Vatican II had been accepted in Australia not on its merits but on the dictum of Rome.

Professor Fashole-Luke insisted that some provinces had not yet considered the ordination of women and he noted the ambiguity of the Church of England legal bar on women priests.

Mgr. Purdy said the Catholic position was that the ordination of women could not be seen to be reconcilable to the will of Christ, but it was impossible to say that it was absolutely out of the question. It was logically possible to take a step further in saying that the Holy Spirit might reveal a way of modifying both positions. He wondered if this would be tactically possible.

Miss Howard said that even churches which ordained women priests would still hope to be guided by the Holy Spirit. Time would tell. Perhaps this was a kind of Anglican quid pro quo.

Professor Griffiss then proposed two separate groups to clarify internal Anglican and Roman Catholic problems.

Revd. C. Hill proposed rather that there should be two drafters to produce chapter headings. This was accepted.

There was then some discussion on the nature of the document. It would be submitted to the SPCU and the ACC and perhaps eventually to the churches. It was finally agreed after lunch that Bishop Valentine and Fr. Duprey should be the joint drafters.

Wednesday, 1st March: Evening Session

Fr. Hotchkin was in the chair.

Bishop Valentine presented the draft A/RCCOW 8A which he and Fr. Duprey had prepared. It posed the question facing the churches and pointed to the way forward, though not offering a precise solution.

Fr. Doyle was unhappy at the phrase "Even if remote".

Miss Howard wanted an expansion of the last two paragraphs. She was also unhappy at "universal in the East and the West". She did not understand the last sentence of paragraph 3.

Bishop Cameron wanted to see a statement of the immediate and ultimate Anglican/Roman Catholic goal.

Professor Griffiss also wanted to see something on the meaning of unity. He hoped that something could be said to give ground for members of his church who were unhappy at the ordination of women.

Bishop Valentine alluded to the danger of a stronger response from Rome.

Fr. Duprey confirmed this.

Fr. Doyle thought that if there was to be expansion, there might be more on the Declaration.

Miss Howard was worried that the draft could be read as if the only hope were if Rome ordained women or Anglicans gave up the practice. How far could there be a relationship with a church with a differing practice. She also wanted to know the end to which the dialogue was moving, not a uniat status. But could there be communio in sacris as a stage. Would the ordination of women prevent this?

Fr. Duprey said the ordination of women would be an obstacle to the mutual recognition of ministries.

Mgr. Purdy was unhappy at the last sentence of paragraph 3.

Bishop Cameron agreed.

Professor Fashole-Luke repeated that though there was no unanimity in the Anglican Communion, this did not destroy communion.

Miss Howard hoped for a little speculation at the end of the document. It was too easy to say that the churches must go on doing things together.

Fr. Duprey thought that even if a solution could not be found immediately, nevertheless the road to reconciliation was not blocked.

Bishop Valentine noted mutual commitment to new forms of ministry.

There followed discussion on the second and third paragraphs of A/RCCOW8A. There was some lack of balance noted by Fr. Doyle and Professor Griffiss. Mgr. Purdy thought the phraseology sybiline.

Bishop Cameron hoped there was no suggestion that the Church had lacked the fulness of priesthood for twenty centuries.

Professor Fashole-Luke saw contextualisation as the problem. The Holy Spirit might be leading some churches not to the ordination of women in some areas.

Miss Howard also saw the prompting of the Spirit as indicating some plurality of practice.

Professor Griffiss asked for the inclusion of a paragraph on Anglican difficulties with the official Roman Catholic stance.

Bishop Valentine agreed and wanted something on the existing Anglican diversity.

Fr. Duprey did not dispute the importance of diversity but queried whether one church could ask another to go against the will of Christ as that church saw it.

Mgr. Purdy asked how absolute that conviction was.

Miss Howard asked whether Anglicans and Roman Catholics could respect each other's differing ways of handling the question.

Fr. Doyle noted that Roman Catholics have the same problem, for some Roman Catholic women wanted to be ordained.

Professor Fashole-Luke saw Anglican diversity as a witness.

Fr. Duprey saw this but thought that the tension within a communion ^{to} be distinguished from that of establishing Anglican/Roman Catholic communion. If Roman Catholics recognised the Anglican ordination of women, they they must themselves be open to the ordination of women.

Fr. Hotchkin asked whether any church had said the ordination of women was impossible.

Miss Howard noted that some churches had declined to act as it was not urgent.

Professor Fashole-Luke said that some Anglicans saw no theological impossibility but did see a cultural impossibility.

Professor Griffiss insisted on the importance of some discussion of the meaning of unity in diversity, otherwise there was little point in their meeting.

Mgr. Purdy said there was some significance in certain things being said together.

Revd. C.Hill noted that the document would be important because of its origin. There was a difference between a private theological paper and a joint public document.

Fr. Hotchkin agreed.

Mgr. Purdy felt that "authenticity" in paragraph 4 could be misunderstood. It suggested an absolute.

Revd. C.Hill asked for an expanded draft and it was agreed that Professor Griffiss and Bishop Cameron should do this, assisted by other members of the Consultation.

Thursday, 2nd March: Morning Session

Bishop Valentine being in the chair, discussion opened on A/RCCOW8B, A/RCCOW8C, and A/RCCOW8D.

Revd. C.Hill began by pointing out where the "scissors and paste" work had been done. A/RCCOW8B was an expansion and redrafted version of A. A/RCCOW8C was a rewritten version by Professor Fashole-Luke. A/RCCOW8D was a preamble by Miss Howard.

Fr. Doyle and Bishop Cameron preferred 8B to 8C.

Miss Howard liked the emphasis on man and creation in 8C and also the stress on the importance of culture.

Bishop Valentine agreed but said that cultural and sociological considerations were distinct from theological ones.

Professor Fashole-Luke saw tradition and culture on the same level.

Bishop Valentine thought the cultural and sociological factors might be added to the 8B draft. He saw the point that African theology understood culture in a more absolute sense.

Fr. Duprey and Fr. Doyle saw a distinction between tradition and Tradition. The Roman Declaration saw the matter as of Tradition.

Professor Griffiss noted that paragraph 2 etc. ought to follow the opening paragraph of page 2, and it was agreed that this order made sense. Paragraphs were numbered accordingly.

Fr. Hotchkin hoped the draft paragraph 3 would not read as if Roman Catholics were deliberating on the future of the Anglican Communion.

Professor Griffiss felt it showed a recognition that some Anglicans accepted the official Roman Catholic position.

Fr. Duprey wondered whether paragraph 3C was required.

Revd.C.Hill thought the reference to diversity relevant, but thought 3D could be omitted.

Miss Howard added that a belief in the legitimacy of diversity was important.

Professor Griffiss saw a balance in paragraph 3 as against paragraph 2.

Fr. Duprey insisted that paragraph 2 was not saying that the Roman Catholic Church could not accept women priests. It was saying that it could not accept a different ministerial standard because of its ecclesial respect for the Anglican Communion.

Fr. Doyle asked for some redrafting of this paragraph.

Mgr. Purdy insisted that there was no one Roman Catholic position as suggested in 3D.

It was agreed that Fr.Duprey and Professor Griffiss should redraft.

Fr. Doyle also felt paragraph 4 might be redrafted for the sake of clarity.

Mgr. Purdy stressed the necessity for expressing the reciprocal loyalty and trust involved in dialogue.

Fr. Duprey saw a pneumatological and Christological stress in the last sentence of paragraph 4.

Fr.Hotchkin and Miss Howard appreciated its dialectical form.

Bishop Cameron approved of the reference to ARCIC and the statement of the two possible errors.

Fr.Hotchkin proposed the addition of "Because of their mutual esteem.....".

Fr.Duprey asked for the final sentence of paragraph 5 to be expressed negatively. Drafting points from other members were accepted.

Thursday, 2nd March: Evening Session

Bishop Valentine was in the chair, and introduced A/RCCOW8E (the re-drafted paras. 2 and 3 of the re-numbered A/RCCOW8B) as prepared by Fr. Doyle and Professor Griffiss. Drafting amendments were accepted.

Bishop Valentine then asked for comment upon paragraph 6 of A/RCCOW8B. Bishop Valentine suggested the addition of: "How this is to be achieved in fidelity to our tradition is one of the challenges which face the Church in our time."

Fr. Duprey wondered whether this was the point to make specific references.

Fr. Hotchkin and Professor Griffiss suggested that there should be some reference to faithfulness.

Mgr. Purdy thought there should be reference to areas not immediately thought of which were heightened by the present debate. He offered to draft something to this effect.

Bishop Valentine then moved the discussion to paragraph 7.

Fr. Hotchkin thought the style exhortatory: he questioned where it added to the argument.

Bishop Cameron also asked what it added.

Miss Howard wondered whether 7 and 8 were now necessary.

Bishop Valentine also thought the material was found elsewhere.

Revd. C. Hill thought the idea of an exchange of ecclesial gifts important.

Professor Griffiss insisted that the question of the kind of unity sought was of fundamental importance.

Fr. Hotchkin thought the paragraphs (7 and 8) were too eschatological and Fr. Duprey thought they could be misleading.

Bishop Valentine then asked for a re-consideration of paragraph 1 in the light of Miss Howard's draft A/RCCOW8D.

Then followed some discussion as to whether specific Anglican churches (Asian or African) should be mentioned; it was decided not to do this. There followed a discussion on the reference to "tradition" found in A/RCCOW8A paragraph 1.

Fr. Duprey noted that this was in fact a quote from the Declaration Inter insigniores, but that "a tradition" had become "the tradition".

Bishop Cameron was unhappy with "a tradition" as this could be misunderstood. Was a cultural tradition being referred to or Apostolic Tradition?

Revd. C. Hill proposed that quotation marks should be inserted from "unbroken" to "West".

Professor Fashole-Luke insisted on the parity of African Tradition and Apostolic Tradition for Africans.

Professor Griffiss saw this point but wondered how it could be included in the document.

There followed a more general discussion on the question of tradition and culture and an addition by Bishop Valentine was finally accepted: "and the growing characteristic contribution of the Third World to theology" for paragraph 6.

Discussion was then resumed on paragraphs 7 and 8.

Professor Griffiss suggested redrafting but Fr. Duprey and Fr. Doyle were still unhappy with the general content.

Professor Griffiss insisted that unity was a pilgrimage. He was very unhappy with the concept of organic unity.

Miss Howard thought this was another issue.

Mgr. Purdy wanted the document to end on a note of confidence. This required something crisp.

Revd. C. Hill noted that there was some reference to unity in the final paragraph (9).

Bishop Cameron felt the last sentence of 7 was important.

Fr. Duprey thought 7 and 8 should be omitted.

Professor Fashole-Luke felt the mention of mutual trust should not be left out.

Revd. C. Hill suggested a redrafting of paragraph 9 to include the givenness of unity.

Fr. Duprey and Bishop Cameron did not think the scope of the document was to speak about the nature of unity, important though this was.

After redrafting had been completed Bishop Valentine opened discussion on A/RCCOW8F.

Revd. C. Hill noted the numeration of the paragraphs was different to that of A/RCCOW8B due to a new initial paragraph and various other changes.

After Professor Griffiss had recorded his continued dissatisfaction at the omission of the eschatological dimension of unity and after drafting points had been accepted (including more substantial changes to paragraph 8) A/RCCOW3F was accepted as the agreed text, with the request that the secretaries produce a final version for publication.

All agreed that the aim was the joint publication of the document, Fr. Duprey noting there might be Vatican difficulties to be overcome. Till then the document would be confidential. There would be no press release, but members of the Consultation could speak about it confidentially "off the record".