

ARCIC: 29th August - 5th September 1975

MINUTES

Friday, 29th August: OPENING SESSION - DISCUSSION ON PROGRAMME

Bishop Clark, being in the chair, opened the session with prayer. He then went on to discuss the programme for the meeting. There would be an initial discussion on the St. Katharine's paper which had been commissioned by ARCIC at Grottaferrata. This would then lead on naturally to Fr. Tillard's paper and the Dean's paper. He also hoped that the Alberigo paper would be discussed, together with Professor Dunstan's comment. The Bishop said that ARCIC must not be afraid to go out ahead alone.

The Bishop of Ripon asked whether the Statement on Authority would be issued in 1975.

Bishop Clark replied that he hoped a Statement of some sort might be produced. The substance at least of papers might be open to release.

The Bishop of Ossory said that a total Statement would be better.

Bishop Clark felt that it would not be possible to answer the Bishop of Ripon at this stage.

There followed some discussion on the question of Sub-Commissions and group discussion. It was agreed that this practice would continue but that as yet the exact topic for each group could not be decided.

Bishop Butler strongly felt that the ecclesiological question had not yet been faced.

Dr. Halliburton noted that some ecclesiological questions were raised in the St. Katharine's paper and these had been sparked off by the Oxford paper on the ecclesiology of Vatican II.

Bishop Clark also felt that the St. Katharine's theology of koinonia was helpful on this question.

Bishop Vogel found the substance of the St. Katharine's paper helpful and was hopeful of the outcome, but

Bishop Butler was sceptical about this meeting - a half baked document would be counter productive. To this several other people assented.

Bishop McAdoo felt that this could not be known until Wednesday or Thursday.

Archbishop Arnott proposed an Interim Statement, but Fr. Barnabas Ahern commenting on the Roman Catholic /Lutheran Statement felt that unless the Commission got down to the "nitty-gritty", many people would be disappointed. They expected something more mature from ARCIC.

Fr. Ryan made three points. 1. He wanted a full Statement, 2. St. Katharine's led up to the real issues - up to the local Church of Rome and its bishop vis a vis the proclamation of the Word. 3. A delay would not be misunderstood in the U.S.A., rather a well-thought out Statement would contribute to the situation. He insisted that an ideal approach should be taken.

Fr. Yarnold noted that this area was radically different from that of the previous Statements. Here was not question of words but real divergence. The Commission would have to wait

a long time for agreement on papal infallibility. Perhaps agreement on the infallibility of the Church was a different matter.

Fr. Tillard agreed that it was impossible to have the same kind of agreement. Nevertheless he felt an Interim Statement would destroy the assurance of the Church in the work of ARCIQ. He hoped that the Commission could say enough together for a consensus agreement.

Bishop McAdoo wanted to see how far the Commission could go in honesty and truth. He was thinking of "the rich notion of partial communion".

Professor Fairweather claimed that it would be misleading to issue a statement without touching the serious issues.

Fr. Tillard and Professor Root agreed with Bishop Butler that ecclesiology must be faced.

Fr. Ahern claimed that the present work was not separate from the previous work of the Commission and overflowed from the Ministry document

Fr. Duprey noted that at the beginning at Canterbury he did not expect a statement.

The Dean of Christ Church noted that for him all meetings started in gloom. He felt that in this area the "internal combustion engine" needed to be dismantled. He wondered whether the parts would work if put together in a different way.

Mgr. Purdy agreed strongly with the Dean and noted that a real examination would clarify minds in both Churches and that this was sorely needed. There was widespread agreement to this.

Bishop Clark wanted to know what reality infallibility and primacy described. He believed the reality was present in both Churches but that there was a difficulty in that the concepts were peculiarly Roman Catholic.

Fr. Duprey noted that transubstantiation had been reduced to a footnote. There must be new ways of expressing the reality of infallibility and primacy.

Bishop Butler also argued for the task of demethologising these concepts.

The Bishop of Ripon wanted more than a press statement but something substantial for people to discuss.

The Revd. Julian Charley agreed with previous speakers that certain words were heavily loaded. An interim statement would leave people with a question - what is going to happen now? He believed the Commission had a duty to point the way.

Bishop Clark closed the Opening Session with thanks to members of the Commission for airing discussion.

Saturday, 30th August: SESSION I

Bishop McAdoo being in the chair Fr. Tavad was invited to present the St. Katharine's Schema (ARCIC 136/11). Fr. Tavad began his presentation of the St. Katharine's Schema with an introduction and summary of the document (ARCIC 141). At the end Bishop McAdoo invited general comment.

Fr. Ahern began by asking whether a more historical/existential approach would have had more thrust.

Fr. Tavad replied that as before the document began where the Churches were. Paragraph 2 covered just such an historical/existential approach.

Fr. Ahern found this section rather general and wanted it expanded.

Fr. Tavad agreed that it could be made more explicit.

Bishop Butler was unclear as to the contrast referred to in paragraph 4. "But the Holy Spirit....." and to the second kind of authority referred to.

Fr. Tavad replied that perhaps it ought to be "but in addition.....".

The Revd. Julian Charley noted that the contrast here referred to personal holiness and then moved on to be more specific.

Bishop Butler asked if it was the contrast between the saint and the eminent theologian. He offered "moreover" rather than "but". He further asked whether there was sufficient distinction between charismatic authority and official authority.

Bishop McAdoo replied that paragraph 5 made the reference clear in the phrase "This is a third form of authority".

Fr. Ryan felt this was a good piece of work but asked if in paragraph 5 it was intended that only some have episcopate

Bishop Vogel asked whether paragraph 6 ought not to read "must be" rather than "are" responsive.

Dr. Halliburton asked if the three kinds of authority were all on a level and that therefore the document was too egalitarian.

Bishop Butler did not feel this, though he said that official authority was crucial for unity.

Bishop McAdoo drew attention to "can require the compliance... .." with regard to this.

Archbishop Arnott felt that paragraph 2 was over compressed and implied a judgment on the nature of biblical inspiration. He was unhappy with "inspired documents". He also wanted a reference to the Canterbury Statement at paragraph 8.

Bishop McAdoo noted that this had in fact been discussed at St. Katharine's.

Archbishop Arnott was uncertain as to the meaning of discernment in paragraph 6.

Fr. Yarnold felt that the document was too essentialist and that it described an ideal rather than what was. One of the problems was that the Churches do not recognise essential features in others. However he liked the general shape of the document. Nevertheless he was unclear as to what the 'common mind' added in paragraph 2. In paragraph 9 he wanted to know whether conciliar decisions were simply working hypotheses or carried weight intrinsically.

Fr. Ryan replying to Archbishop Arnott was very happy with discernment. It had a rich medieval background stemming from St. Bernard and had parallels in the Ministry and Ordination Statement.

Bishop Vogel noted an inconsistency in paragraph 9 where there were bishops, clergy and laity and then just bishops.

Fr. Tillard said that the St. Katharine's group had deliberately used the same vocabulary as the Canterbury Statement. On the prescriptive/descriptive problem he noted paragraph 7 with its insistence on human sinfulness.

Professor Root felt paragraph 2 fell under the same condemnation and that the document was also too idealistic on councils.

Bishop Clark replied that the Commission was always trying to describe the revelation of Christ and that this was sometimes in contrast with actual facts.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought the Schema admirable but asked for the Trinitarian opening in paragraph 1 to be expanded. He was not happy with the term "bestow" for the Holy Spirit and much preferred a personal term such as "sends".

Bishop Butler defended the Schema on the grounds that the New Testament also suffers from the descriptive/prescriptive problem.

The Revd. Julian Charley wondered whether an introductory note would solve this problem.

Bishop Moorman noted that at Vatican II Lumen Gentium had been felt to lack a note of the Church under judgment and he felt the same about the Schema.

Bishop McAdoo wondered whether in paragraph 9 the statement that "Councils may err" would rectify this.

Dr. Yarnold sympathised here.

Professor Scarisbrick commented that subsequent acceptance of Councils was extremely important. He also asked what the force of "common faith" was in paragraph 9. A common faith had indeed been expressed at the Fifth Lateran Council and yet this was subsequently deemed to be in error.

Fr. Duprey noted that Lateran Five only concerned part of the Western Church. He wanted a fuller understanding of the ecumenical council. He noted that Pope Paul VI had written to Cardinal Willebrands on the anniversary of the Second Council of Lyons describing it as the Sixth General Council of the Western Church. There was no authoritative list of ecumenical councils in the Catholic Church. The traditional list was only three centuries old and came from Bellarmine.

Fr. Ryan defined ecumenical councils as when a council did not err. Western synods were not ecumenical.

Fr. Duprey asked the fundamental question as to whether there was an authority capable of speaking the truth to the Church even in times outside a crisis.

Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission whether the St. Katharine's group should revise its document on the basis of the Commission's emendations. The Dean felt this was too soon, and others agreed. Bishop McAdoo himself felt that nothing specific should be done until the Commission had heard the Tillard and Chadwick papers.

Bishop Clark felt that the St. Katharine's Schema was already leading on to the topics to be dealt with by the remaining papers.

After coffee Bishop Knapp-Fisher wanted paragraph 7 strengthening. The authority of Christ could actually be distorted. There was a continual summons to penitence and reform. More seriously for Anglicans there was the primary problem where authority was seen in a divided Church. The whole Church was in schism according to the Anglican view. Traditionally the Roman Catholic Church necessarily viewed the question in a rather different way stemming from its conception of its own uniqueness.

Fr. Ahern wanted a distinction in paragraph 7 where sinfulness was less of a problem in a communitarian form of authority. The three kinds of authority needed differentiating.

Bishop Butler took a realistic view of the metaphor "the Body of Christ" and did not wish to see a too strong disjunction between the Holy Spirit and the community on the one hand and Christ on the other.

Bishop Vogel on paragraph 4 asked if his own version was a genuine clarification

"...Faithful to the revelation of Jesus Christ. Some, because of the work of God in them, win a respect within the community that qualifies them to speak in the name of Christ with a certain kind of authority to their fellow members. This is the authority of holiness. The Holy Spirit also gives to some individuals or communities special gifts for the benefit of the Church. This second kind of authority also concerns the right to speak within the Christian community and to be heeded because of a special endowment of the Spirit. (This would be followed by examples of the second type.)

Dean Chadwick asked for paragraph 1 to be expanded, though he was unhappy with "This Lordship of Christ...." Something less requiring demythologisation was needed here. A less metaphorical treatment of the Lordship of Christ would be valuable. The transcendence of Christ as Lord over the Church would be valuable here.

The Revd. Julian Charley in clarification of paragraph 4 said that the second major category referred to the whole paragraph.

Bishop Clark <sup>agreed</sup> that there was a lack of clarity at this point and asked what personal holiness does in the Church.

Prof. Root suggested the term "self-authentication". He felt that paragraph 1 could be very strong though God, Christ and the Spirit were used in a way which might cause confusion to the unsophisticated reader.

Bishop Vogel at paragraph 2 offered "..... as the record of the authentic foundation of the faith".

Fr. Ryan complained that we did not have the inspired text and Fr. Tillard echoed the problem of the Canon of Scripture.

Dr. Halliburton preferred inspired authors to documents and "authentic apostolic faith" to "authentic foundation of the faith".

Fr. Ahern asked what prompted the section on the Scriptures.

Fr. Tillard replied that they were now the way to the Word of God.

Fr. Ahern still asked why they were specially singled out.

Fr. Tillard answered that they were the objective root of the living tradition of the Church.

Bishop McAdoo commented that for the living Word to be authentic scripture is normative. Scripture has a primary role in keeping the Church in the truth of the Gospel.

Bishop Butler was unhappy with the phrase "authentic foundation" - better "an authentic norm".

Fr Tillard agreed, for Christ is the foundation.

Dr. Halliburton noted that the term transmission had been used and this referred to the living tradition.

Prof. Fairweather felt that the problem was caused by "consequently". An insertion was needed at this point.

Bishop Clark was also worried at this point.

Archbishop Arnott found "shared commitment....." a problem.

Bishop Moorman said that Jehovah's Witnesses had shared commitment.

Fr. Tavard felt that Sub.-commission I at Grottaferrata had some useful material here (para. 9)

Fr. Tillard felt the subject was vast. The hoped for document was not to be on Scripture and Tradition.

Prof. Fairweather felt there was an unbalanced emphasis upon the Scriptures.

Bishop Vogel felt that all that was needed was a continuous development but Archbishop Arnott felt that over-compression was a danger

Bishop Butler felt that the term "norm" was all that was needed.

Fr. Ryan found that paragraph 7 raised serious problems. It was the sacramental life which in practice kept people under the Lordship of Christ. There was not just a question of weakness but sin. Human beings were in question not simply fallen human nature. It was because he was a sinner that there was division in the Church and yet the Lordship of Christ could be seen even in sinners.

The Revd. Julian Charley stressed that there was true submission to the Lordship of Christ even in a divided Church.

Prof. Scarisbrick enquired as to the meaning of the words "Christ takes full account of...."

Bishop Clark replied that the Lordship of Christ was seen even in sinners. A self-imitation had to be accepted in a document of this kind. He asked if Fr. Ryan felt that his point had to be included.

Fr. Ryan replied that the commission would be missing an essential connection with the previous documents otherwise as they began with the Eucharistic community.

Bishop McAdoo pointed out that paragraph 5 balanced the document and Dr. Halliburton referred to paragraph 6. Even so

Fr. Ryan wished the schema to be more specific.

Fr. Tillard pointed out that paragraph 7 was a conclusion and that there was human weakness even in the sacraments.

Bishop Clark requested Fr. Ryan to draft something appropriate.

Prof. Fairweather felt that the descriptive/prescriptive question was acute in paragraph 5 - "at...." "he can require...." Bishops unfortunately did act in isolation.

Dean Chadwick offered "he has the moral and spiritual authority to require ...."

Bishop McAdoo felt that the schema was alright as it stood as did Bishop Butler.

The Revd. Julian Charley wondered whether "may require" would be better.

Prof. Fairweather also suggested "should not" in reference to the bishop acting in isolation.

Mgr. Purdy agreed that there was an ambiguity in the document. Nevertheless the commission must say what it believed the faith to be as well as recognizing what happens in fact.

Bishop McAdoo then asked if the general shape of the schema was acceptable.

Dean Chadwick felt that the document was a good one but suffered from excessive serenity. It was a description of the Church in the heavenly places, and Prof. Scarisbrick felt that paragraph 9 in particular was too bland and needed 'hotting up'.

Bishop McAdoo did not wish to be didactic to the world episcopate.

Bishop Clark commented that a bishop simply could not act in isolation.

Fr. Duprey noted that in the tradition of the Church councils and canons frequently and repeatedly urged compliance. No one was universally faithful to their prescriptions.

It was agreed at Fr. Yarnold's suggestion that there should be others in addition to the St. Katherine's group when the time for revision came.

The Commission further agreed that the Dean should next present his paper (ARCIC 139).



Saturday, 30th August: SESSION II

Bishop Clark invited the Dean to present his paper ARCIC 139. The Dean drew attention to the fact that on the question of papal infallibility Catholics were generally held to affirm this reality whereas Anglicans were generally believed to deny it. The concept of right belief was involved here. There was the question as to where truth was located and the further question as to whether this quest related to Catholic language on infallibility in some way. The Dean then went on to outline the various sections in his paper "Truth and Authority". Paragraph 1 was a synopsis of the New Testament on Truth and Authority. Paragraph 2 defined heresy. Paragraph 3 looked at the organs or criteria to be found within the Christian community for the judgment of truth. Paragraph 4 was concerned with councils and no essential difference was discerned between a Roman Catholic and Anglican viewpoint. Paragraph 5 concerned the problem of language. Paragraph 6 reflected the problem of ecumenical councils and their definition. Paragraph 7 noted the point that there was nothing new in the particular doctrinal authority of special sees, in particular Rome. Paragraph 8 concerned Augustine and North African tradition. Paragraph 9 suggested that once the term "infallibility" had been coined, a real difference of approach was to be seen. Paragraph 10 concerned the 1870 definition. Paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 looked at 1870 through Anglican eyes (it being maintained that Newman's outlook was still theologically Anglican). Paragraph 14 concerned the consequent diminution of papal encyclicals. Paragraph 15 looked at views of Laud and Chillingworth. Paragraph 16 reflected the dispersed view of authority. Paragraph 17 concerned the living tradition of the Church today. Paragraph 18 reflected confidence in the preservation of truth. Paragraph 19 concerned the problem of the demythologisation of the language of infallibility with two propositions which the Dean himself found acceptable (1) being non-controversial, (2) being a highly-qualified acceptance of a special place for the see of Rome.

The Dean asked that his Notes on the paper (139/A) should be considered with the original document. He was concerned that the original document should not be considered over simplistic.

Bishop Clark then opened the plenary for discussion.

Professor Fairweather asked the Dean to elucidate his Note on the Enlightenment.

The Dean replied that since the Enlightenment the Christian attitude to Revelation had been considerably modified. He instanced miracles. He also referred to the less desirable view of man as an atomic isolated unit and the notion of private judgment on belief.

Dr. Yarnold referring to paragraph 4 asked whether the operation of the Holy Spirit was to be seen in the promulgation of a conciliar definition or in its acceptance. Was acceptance a sign of infallibility?

The Dean replied that the Holy Spirit worked before acceptance, but definitions of orthodoxy or heresy were retrospective. The ultimate acceptance of a council was not the locus of infallibility in any way which excluded the work of the council. As a definition became accepted so the work of the Holy Spirit became the more clear.

Bishop Butler thought that Acceptance had got to be thought through. 1870 was grotesquely objective. There was the consequent problem of when appropriate conditions had been fulfilled. Theologians were looked to for this question and had given themselves this position. The only test which made sense was reception by the faithful. According to Canon Law no obligation of faith could be imposed unless it had been defined.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked whether definitions which at present seemed to be ex-cathedra might not be seen to be so at the end of the century.

Bishop Butler responded that there was no rule of thumb way of telling infallible statements. He would however have expected an alleged infallible statement to have been objected to promptly.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked further whether it was the theologian who decided which were infallible statements.

Bishop Butler cited Humanae Generis where there was disquiet amongst many. Further 1870 could not be repeated in 1970.

Mgr. Purdy asked how far acceptance was now conditioned by definition itself (since 1870). Cultural environment could determine acceptance, but subsequent thought could induce a withdrawal of such acceptance.

Bishop McAdoo felt that it was impossible to separate consent from acceptance. He cited Lumen Gentium. The problem was that accepted decisions did not appear to cling to "the faith once for all delivered".

Fr. Tillard noted that the commentaries on Vatican I were more ultra montane than the Council which was itself open to evolution. Progress was only seen as an addition, but it could be a precision or a subtraction. It was here that ecumenical confrontation was important in the judgment and study of definitions.

Fr. Ryan believed that non autem ex consensu ecclesiae applied to whether right procedures had been gone through and that this was in the minds of the drafters of Pastor Eternus with reference to the formula of Hormisdas. The Immaculate Conception was a case in point. There had been 200 years of Roman opposition. Infallibility related to the final Court of Appeal.

Fr. Tavard felt that truth as salvation in Christ was no problem. The problem of authority in doctrine was of truth at another level. It was not enough to say that there were organs of this truth, it was also necessary to explain criteria.

Dean Chadwick agreed that truth was not simply a matter of feeling.

Bishop Vogel asked if the problem of conciliar definition was essentially different from that of the Scriptures.

Fr. Ahern noted the tension of acceptance and development. Acceptance could not be narrowed simply to theologians.

Fr. Ryan drew attention to popular piety in the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Spanish piety had been translated into a system of theology to explain the devotion but the resultant doctrine had no pastoral content.

Bishop Butler asked if the 1870 definition referred to the exercise of infallibility with regard to words or the reality behind them. Was it a question of the Pope's judgment or inerrant formulae?

Bishop Vogel felt this did not solve the problem. One was still left with an infallible judgment.

Bishop Butler responded that he did not want a conceptualistic approach. The heart of the judgment could be theoretically distinguished from its conceptualisation.

Fr. Yarnold disagreed in that the definition was for the help of the Church.

Bishop Butler felt strongly that the word "infallible" was the problem.

Fr. Tavard on the question of devotion said that the 1854 definition simply confirmed that the insight was true. The definition could be changed in the future but the insight was valid.

Bishop Butler paralleled Consubstantial.

Bishop Vogel asked whether truth was a function of infallibility or rather whether infallibility was a function of truth.

Fr. Duprey asked whether there was a ministry to discern 'not created' a consensus. He commented that reception was before definition. The Assumption was not something new, but the conceptualisation was different now as from 1950. The Immaculate Conception was refused by the Orthodox Church, but Mary's holiness had never been in question. There was not the same theology of original sin. Infallibility was a negative assistance to avoid positive error. He asked of the Dean his view of Irenaeus and the Church of Rome.

The Dean noted that Irenaeus was not concerned with the universal church but the Roman primacy. Ephesus would have done but the Roman succession list was more easily available. A maxima antiquissima ecclesia. It was also a cosmopolitan Christian community (rather than the Bishop alone). It was disputed whether Rome was viewed as a touchstone of catholicity or whether Catholic communion was impossible a priori outside the Communion of the Roman see.

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy at too sharp a distinction between act and word. Scripture could be revelation for one person but a dead letter for another. When the Scriptures were looked at it was a question of understanding but not re-writing..

Bishop Butler agreed that Scripture was inspired and that conciliar definitions had never been claimed to be such. CK Laedon was not on the same level as Philipians 2. Yet every sermon or homily "re-wrote" the Scriptures.

Fr. Tillard stressed that there were two different levels. He then quoted Pastor Eternus (IV)

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei nunquam deficientis charisma Petro eiusque in hac cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, caelestis doctrinae pabulo nutriretur, ut sublata schismatis occasione ecclesia tota una conservaretur, atque suo fundamento innixa, firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

Fr. Ryan made the comment that definitions were pastoral adaptations of scripture in a given situation.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked why definitions were infallible if they were not in fact inspired.

+\*\*\*\*\*+

Sunday 31st August SESSION III

Bishop McAdoo being in the chair Fr. Ahern opened discussion with two points: -

1) He took up The Revd. Julian Charley's point on a too sharp distinction between the word and act. He stressed the fact of development in conformity with the Vincentian Canon. This development was not only by theologians but by the faithful also. He instanced the Immaculate Conception which did not come out of the blue.

2) The process of reception was no less critical. But there was a problem as to whether this Sensus Fidelium concerned the merely baptised or those who lived the christian life dynamically. Who determined the subjects of discernment? Many of the faithful were not fideles in the biblical sense.

Dean Chadwick felt that somewhere in this area a genuine control was exercised by the faithful who were not just nominal Christians. He used Origen's phrase "the camp followers who save the real soldiers the bother of cooking".

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy at the emphasis on development with regard to the New Testament. The New Testament displayed rather a diversity. He agreed that words can never adequately express the ineffable but he still wanted an anchor in the apostolic age.

Fr. Ahern felt that there was a genuine development, at least of expression, in the Pauline writings and instanced the cosmic Christ of Colossians. The doctrine of original sin was found in the New Testament but reached its full expression at Orange.

Bishop McAdoo insisted that the living tradition of the Church was different after the formation of the Canon.

Fr. Ryan agreed with The Revd. Julian Charley that scripture could not be re-written but councils might be. Following this he made three points: -

i) He stressed the importance of the reception of a doctrine. The procedure for discernment was very important.

ii) He argued that it was necessary to define the Immaculate Conception. There was a threat of schism on the part of Spain and therefore enormous pressure. He cited Doyle who claimed that even so the correct procedures for discernment had not been followed.

iii) He felt that not enough attention had been paid in either communion to the living truth embodied in the liturgy - the communal celebration of the faith. What was the meaning of worship? The phenomenological approach was an under-developed science. He did not wish to stress the noetic side of the problem of authority.

Fr. Duprey felt that the Grottaferrata paper and discussion on the Sensus Fidelium were valuable here.

Fr. Tavard was unhappy with the parallel made between Pauline Christology and the development of the doctrine of original sin. It implied that Paul and Augustine were similarly inspired. The doctrine of development had to be very carefully defined. The apostolic witness developed and resulted in the Canon of Scripture but since then there was only reflection on this witness. Unless this was maintained there were no criteria for the discernment of truth.

Prof. Root taking up Fr. Ryan's description of the Roman See as a final court of appeal on the prior procedure for discernment asked what kind of a court it was that bowed to a temporal power.

Bishop Clark wished the commission to keep before it the question as to whether the doctrine of episcopate required a further development of episcopate for the universal Church or was such development simply useful but non-scriptural.

Fr. Ryan noted that there had been a pastoral application from a national church to the centre in the case of the Immaculate Conception. Rome consequently asked other national hierarchies. The definition was to save schism. In the case of the Assumption there was much pressure for definition in 1870.

Bishop McAdoo stressed the Anglican anxiety that consensus should be controlled by criteria.

Bishop Butler affirmed that one was not bound to concede that a magisterial definition was opportune. Infallibility certainly meant that the Church would not fail utterly in the end. There was a quite clear distinction between Canonical Scripture and all else. But for the historian there was no difference. Certain documents indeed antedated the New Testament. Some New Testament documents in all probability were compiled after the death of the last apostle (whatever was meant by that term). The appeal to Scripture was a pure appeal to authority. The first recipient of revelation was Jesus himself and as perfect man he was the recipient of perfect revelation. The distinction was not really between the Scriptures and all else but between Jesus and the disciples. He agreed that the problem of the Canon was a difficult one.

Bishop McAdoo stated that if some documents in the New Testament were not as authoritative as one might like it did not follow that later ones were more so. In answer to Bishop Butler he saw the New Testament as recording Jesus as the revelation of God.

Dean Chadwick noted that at times in its history the Anglican Church had been as much in the control of the laity as the church in Carolingian times. In answer to Bishop Butler he saw Jesus as the revelation of God calling into being a community. It was through this community that we knew Him. The origin and role of the Canon was complicated. There had been many disagreements during its compilation. The community eventually treated it as without parallel as a witness to the Gospel. The Canon discouraged the idea that truth could be mediated in any other way and the Church took a long time to qualify this. The Canon could not be set aside. It was part of church history. It was crucial because of what it attested. It was much less impressive than Concilium Oecumenicorum Decreta!

Fr. Ahern insisted that we recognized living tradition today as well as in New Testament times. The difference between the Canonical books and the decisions of the Church later was that of principium principians and principium principiatum. Undoubtedly the Scriptures reflected a privileged period.

Fr. Yarnold asked a question of Roman Catholic members of the commission: There were only two generally accepted infallible definitions in recent years. As all truth in doctrine was saving truth, he urged that Anglicans should insist on asking what was the point of this doctrine. Papal infallibility was the tip of the iceberg of the infallibility of the Church. It was an extreme case as a particular application of papal primacy.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that for Anglicans there was the question of why there had to be a court of final appeal and more importantly why there was necessity for de fidei definition in areas which appeared to Anglicans to be subsidiary. It was not immediately apparent that the Immaculate Conception and Assumption were de fidei.

Bishop Butler felt that there was a serious question here. There was a need in the Church for an ultimate tribunal which could pass from conjecture to affirmation. The Fitzpatrick paper had left him like a mouse in a treadmill but papal infallibility must be extensively demythologised. The real point was seen in a situation such as the 4th century where there was anarchy on central issues concerning the Incarnation. The Assumption definition was the last bout of euphoric triumphalism.

Prof. Scarisbrick said that he held the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption to be more than mere devotional truths and asked if he did not have the right to ask for a decision.

Dean Chadwick felt that the problem was acute if this was the only way that we could be sure of anything. There were other norms too.

Fr. Ryan replied to Prof. Scarisbrick in the affirmative. The doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption were important but not in relation to the prior debate. From the 13th century there had been a consensus on the primacy in the Roman Catholic communion but the model of the primacy differed from the Patristic age. This was reflected in the fact that there was no mention of communio in the diplomatic concordats. Vatican II had recovered this primitive insight. He asked whether the exercises of the power of definition were in accord of this theology of communio. In a divided church this was an important point especially where the Roman Catholic Church had had an exclusivist ecclesiology.

After coffee Bishop Vogel asked Prof. Scarisbrick whether the church really needed an agency to answer individual quandaries. In order to locate the Marian dogmas in Christ no more was needed than the source from which subordinate truth was derived.

Prof. Root agreed that Prof. Scarisbrick had the right to ask this question. The problem was that of an answer binding on all Christians. At Vatican II Orthodox observers had felt the profanity of over-definition.

said that

Fr. Tillard for the Roman Catholic mentality infallibility was an expression of the indefectible nature of the Church, amongst other expressions such as the Sensus Fidelium. Because infallibility was an expression of indefectibility it was grounded in the ultimate norm of Christian faith, the Apostolic tradition transmitted in the Holy Scriptures. Infallibility was thus a prophetic aspect of the primacy and was impossible to understand without relation to the primacy and the conspiratio of the Sensus Fidelium and the collegiality of bishops. Under the iceberg was indefectibility and below that faithfulness to the Scriptures. Infallibility was a ministry of indefectibility.

Fr. Ahern asked for an explanation of infallibility as an aspect of indefectibility.

Fr. Tillard described infallibility as the ministry of one bishop to serve the faith of the whole Church. He asked Anglicans how the koinonia of the faithful had the instruments to see where truth was to be found, for example, in the fourth century.

Bishop McAdoo asked how the Church maintained itself in the truth before 1870.

Fr. Tillard replied that infallibility was exercised before its definition.

Dean Chadwick said that Anglicans commonly drew a distinction between infallibility and indefectibility. Things might go wrong but in the providence of God the truth would prevail. The Anglican usage of indefectibility might be artificial but it was distinct even though it might be that Anglicans should abandon it.

Fr. Tillard said that the infallibility of one of the Bishops was a service of indefectibility. Indefectibility was for the life of the Church with Christ. Infallibility was the office of one of the bishops to clarify doctrinal aspects of the faith.

Archbishop Arnott agreed that demythologisation was needed for Anglicans. He wanted to know how the two recent definitions fitted into the Hierarchy of Truths and whether infallibility could be linked with collegiality in a form of parliamentary absolutism.

Bishop Clark was unhappy that Roman Catholic members of the Commission should simply discuss infallibility. The problem of truth was one for the whole Church. He asked for an exegesis of anathema; the blocking off of an unfruitful way. This function must find some kind of instrument.

Fr. Duprey insisted that the Church was semper reformanda. This significantly qualified indefectibility.

Fr. Tillard commented that indefectibility was an eschatological quality - even in the Pope!

Fr. Ryan asked what the Commission could articulate as to the Roman Catholic Church's contribution to the whole Church since the division. The Spirit was in both Churches and He could not contradict himself. There was no language to express the gift of the Spirit in the new context since Vatican II.

Mgr. Purdy drew attention to the last paragraph of the Dean's paper: He felt the adverb permanently to be significant. Here was the core of the doctrine of indefectibility. He further commented that the demythologisation of infallibility was of benefit to both Churches not only now but for the future. Anglicans were concerned with the style of the exercise of authority at Rome but what was the Roman Church? The local church in Rome under the Vicar of Rome or the Curia?

Fr. Duprey cited Professor Alberigo who held that the real Church of Rome was not the Curia.

Fr. Tillard noted that an infallible Pope was not on the same level as an ecumenical council. The Marian dogmas were defined by papal decree. The main dogmas of salvation came from councils. The authority of the papal declaration was lower than that of an ecumenical council.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked if there were degrees of infallibility.

Fr. Tillard replied "ranges".

The Bishop of Ripon said that if the Pope had the power of infallibility, it ought to be more clear when that power had been exercised. For some people the attribution of infallibility savoured of profanity or even blasphemy.

Dr. Halliburton considered it unfortunate that both the recently defined dogmas concerned Our Lady. They were a serious worry for a number of Anglicans. He asked if there would be a place in communion with Rome for those who in conscience could not accept the two definitions.

Fr. Duprey said that there were two views as to the subject of the prime authority. The ecumenical council and the Roman Pontiff. The College of Bishops was the supreme authority, but there were two ways of exercising this one authority, collective and individual.

Fr. Tillard noted that there had been consultation before the definition of the Assumption and that this had been described as a council in diaspora.

Bishop Vogel noted that the dynamics of a dispersed council were somewhat different.

Fr. Duprey in answer to Dr. Halliburton's question said that for the Orthodox the non-acceptance of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was not an obstacle to communion but there must be no negation of the doctrine and no mistrust of the intention of faith of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mgr. Purdy noted that he had understood an authoritative person to have said that the definition was a result of continuous development in which Anglicans had had no part. For communion an acknowledgement of the good faith of the Roman Catholic Church would be needed.

The Revd. Julian Charley found the curbing of his liberty to state an error cramping. The Dean of Christ Church asked him whether by error he meant heresy or mistake.



The Revd. Julian Charley replied that he meant a mistake. Nevertheless this was important as what one believed affected the moral life.

Dr. Halliburton stated that there was an Anglican tradition of piety to the Blessed Virgin Mary reflected both in the Caroline Divines and in the Book of Common Prayer. He felt that it was good that Anglicans should be allowed to rest with this.

Bishop Butler noted that the minimum obligation on a Roman Catholic in England was the Feast of the Assumption as a day of Obligation. Psychologically it had taken 700 years for the Immaculate Conception to come to be accepted, one could not expect others to come to this any less quickly. However a person who may reject the Marian Dogmas may also reject the infallibility of the Pope.

Fr. Ryan commented on the type of piety fostered by the Chalcedonian party and the importance this had had during the Iconoclastic Controversy. This piety was totally different from that in the West. He paralleled this with the Marian devotion which was fostered for the purpose of teaching the incarnation.

Fr. Duprey said that it was not necessary to link the definition of the Marian Dogmas and that of Papal Infallibility.

Bishop Butler responded by asking whether the Church could make decisions. His Anglo-Catholic preceptors had taught him that the Church could not make a decision without an ecumenical council and that this was impossible in a divided church.

Sunday 31st August, 4.30 p.m.: SESSION IV

From the chair Bishop Clark invited Fr. Tillard to speak to his paper (ARCIC 133) "The Horizon of the 'Primacy' of the Bishop of Rome".

Fr. Tillard prefaced the presentation of his paper with the remark that it described what the Roman Catholic Church proclaimed and how an Anglican might react. He stressed the difficulty of the discussion at Vatican I and the important influence the minority had upon the final Decree. The Commentaries after Vatican I were considerably more Ultramontane than Pastor Eternus. He asked how Vatican I could be understood in the light of Vatican II.

Fr. Tillard then proceeded to read his paper. He laid particular stress on the different meaning of the term potestas ordinaria as applied to the episcopate and the Pope. He also stressed the episcopal nature of the Primacy. This was reinforced by Professor Dunstan's Note on the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of Canon Law (ARCIC 134/A). He insisted that to hold otherwise would change the nature of the Church. There was a vertical and horizontal dimension to catholicity. The Bishops' episcopate stood at the crossroads of both Communions.

At the end of Fr. Tillard's presentation Bishop Clark invited comment.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked if he might make an extended intervention. He said that this was not a criticism of the paper but of the brief. Whilst the reinterpretation offered was of great help, he felt the matter was still peripheral. He asked that seven questions be considered:

1. By what evidence and authority was there held to be a Vicar of Christ?

2. Was a centrum unitatis de iure divino, providential or of a human organizational origin? Was it a settled matter or open to change and could it be located elsewhere (with Karl Rahner).

3. By what means is a centrum unitatis arrived at - revelation or logical deduction? There was a danger of extrapolating from certain theological starting points. There was a danger of taking episcopate this far. The New Testament emphasis was on a group or college.

4. It was an open question as to whether the papacy had always been conducive of unity, for example the division between East and West, Catholic and Protestant and the recent dogmas. Could the centrum unitatis be radically different in the future?

5. Did the papacy maintain the Churches' openness to one another? Exclusivist claims had done the opposite.

6. Was an Apostolic Succession in a centrum unitatis the only way to secure unity?

7. Did a protos not create something new? There should be nothing new beyond Scripture.

He concluded by saying that the primacy had been assumed to be the easier problem. The logic of it was acceptable but its practice was otherwise.

Bishop McAdoo commented that he found the paper of great help in the interpretation of Vatican I. However it was rather like looking at the small print of a document when one disagreed with the main text. The whole idea of a centrum unitatis as constitutive of the Church was difficult. Other kinds of primacy were not inimicable to Anglican thought (Bramhall and Field were matched by Lambeth '68).

Professor Root asked in relation to Julian Charley's first point what he would consider as evidence.

The Revd. Julian Charley replied that he would expect something more explicit if it was fundamental to the Church.

Mgr. Purdy made the point that the brief did not come simply from the Roman Catholics but from the whole Commission.

Dean Chadwick wondered whether the greater part of the difficulty was reducible to whether the primacy was of the esse of the Church. The question was whether a church without the primacy would cease to be that which Christ intended it to be. Anglicans thought catholicity possible without a primacy.

The Revd. Julian Charley agreed that this was the heart of the matter.

Fr. Duprey said that the whole Roman Catholic tradition recognized the Orthodox as a Church. He also noted the present Pope's description of the Anglican Church as a sister church.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher was happy that the primacy was ascending rather than descending - a primus inter pares. Yet in practice diocesans had become suffragans. Vatican II was greatly encouraging but collegiality had been disappointing in its practice.

Fr. Ryan put two questions. 1. Given a vertical and horizontal exegesis, was any ecclesial reality to be seen in a group of bishops outside the Roman college. 2. Granted the existence of such a college of bishops, was communion possible.

Fr. Tillard replied that there was a model in the recognition of Orthodox ecclesial reality. Yet the full mystery of the Church was not realised in separation. The will of Christ had to be considered ut unum sint.

Fr. Ryan asked if other colleges had a protos.

Fr. Tillard replied in the affirmative with the Patriarchs.

Fr. Ryan noted that they would also be open to the seven objections.

Fr. Duprey insisted that primatial and patriarchal functions be distinguished. Congar and Ratzinger were agreed that all administrative aspects belonged to the patriarchal function. Autocephaly in the Eastern Churches was fully compatible with full communion. Evolution to autocephaly had always caused a crisis.

Monday, 1st September SESSION V

Bishop McAdoo being in the chair, invited further discussion on Fr. Tillard's paper.

Bishop Butler said that the paper expressed his mind exactly, but a reformation was still needed for historical reunion. One could not expect others to accept still remaining ultramontaniam. He asked the Dean whether unity was of the esse of the church.

Dean Chadwick agreed that unity was of the esse of the church. He cited the Epistle to the Ephesians as evidence and yet that was clearly written in a divided situation.

Bishop Butler addressed himself to the Revd. Julian Charley's question as to how the primacy was to be proved from the inspired documents. The first Epistle of John proved the wrongness of the heretics simply by the fact that they had left the koinonia.

The implication was that unity was essential. Existentially the Church was the outcome of the Incarnation. This must be taken seriously under the providence of God. The documents of the New Testament were not only statement but prophecy and the Petrine texts were thus a sufficient base for a centrum unitatis. Christ had provided the Church with apostles and Peter as their protos. From the time of Optatus it had been held that the twelve apostles were not to be the founders of twelve churches.

Fr. Ryan agreed that unity was of the esse of the Church. At the level of the sacramental life the Roman Catholic had a profound and mystical vision of unity. Even so in the classical breaks there was no denial that unity was of the esse of the Church. By the 16th century patriarchal and primatial functions had been confused. It was impossible then to affirm the primatial functions because of patriarchal associations. Jewel did not deny unity as of the esse of the Church. Even from the time of Optatus the two functions had been merged and, significantly, Congar and Ratzinger had not been able to say what was the simple primatial function. He asked how the Anglican Communion kept its unity of sacramental life and urged study of those elements which were held in common by means of which both churches guarded their unity.

Fr. Ahern affirmed that the Pauline letters indicated the manner by which the unity of the Pauline churches was maintained. Paul indeed was their protos. There was here a paradigm of the centrum unitatis.

Bishop McAdoo granted that unity was of the esse but insisted that it did not follow that a centrum unitatis existed.

Dean Chadwick agreed that unity did not necessarily imply a centrum. He asked how the local church was kept in communion.

Bishop McAdoo affirmed that faith and praxis was the means.

Dean Chadwick felt that the two traditions were locked into history. Anglicans were trying to fit primacy into their ecclesiology and Roman Catholics were attempting a similar exercise with Anglican ecclesiology.

Dean Chadwick (continued) The main stream of Anglican ecclesiology had over the centuries maintained the same essentials. Catholicity was vital to the Anglican tradition. Faced with the fact of division Palmer's branch theory was now somewhat of an embarrassment. Earlier Field had tried to make sense of the Orthodox church and division in the West. He was not happy with the theory of universal schism. Anglicans had sometimes spoken as if they had not taken Catholic claims of unity seriously. Yet a local centre was not absolutely required. It was a matter of profound regret that the Church should be divided. He had certain qualms over Bishop Butler's view of the Bible. He saw the spectre of Tyrrell. He had the suspicion that historical argument was being made secondary to a priori reasoning. He concluded with the hope of corporate reconciliation between the churches.

Fr. Tavard queried the double use of the term potestas ordinaria suggested in Fr. Tillard's paper.

Fr. Tillard maintained that after the intervention of Mgr. David, Mgr. Zinelli had answered to this effect in the name of the deputatio de fidei. He agreed that the situation was confused but maintained the distinction.

Fr. Ryan noted that potestas ordinaria was to be contrasted with potestas delegata. According to Vatican I the local bishop possessed ordinary jurisdiction and the universal jurisdiction of the Pope was also ordinary. Fr. Tillard's solution to note 22 of Lumen Gentium was very acceptable.

Bishop McAdoo and The Revd. Julian Charley were unhappy at the notion of the Bishop of Rome creating unity.

Fr. Tillard insisted that it was the Holy Spirit and the Gospel which created unity.

Bishop Butler said that it was the function of episcopo to preserve guard and proclaim Christian truth and so by analogy this was the function of a centrum unitatis.

Dr. Halliburton asked if as a first stage it was possible to say that Anglicans and Roman Catholics held the essentials of the same faith. Permanence in the truth was maintained by the "vertical and horizontal" even if there was still uncertainty as to a centrum unitatis.

The Revd. Julian Charley felt that the New Testament was prophetic of diversity. Apostolic authority as witnessed in the Pauline Epistles was continued in the Scriptures. Communion with a centrum unitatis could not be de fide even if it was the best means available. He wanted reality and similarly criticized the 4th article of the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

Fr. Duprey noted an equivocal use of language in the term principium unitatis. It must be translated with the indefinite article. The reality of communio was maintained by one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism and the episcopo of this communio was a participation in this reality of which the bishop was a sign. He again stressed that the college of bishops was supreme but that for a Roman Catholic its authority was either exercised personally or collectively. Its personal exercise was not a delegated power

Bishop Butler noted that a Jew would criticize the Christian Church for its prophetic use of the Old Testament in a rather similar way to a criticism of using the New Testament as prophecy. He felt that the main gist of his argument was not from antecedent probability. Christ was the centre of history, the act of God and thus one would expect to see some consequence of this - the Church.

Archbishop Arnott warmly appreciated Fr. Tillard's paper. He wished to look ahead. Did God wish a centrum unitatis? Certainly one was needed in the modern world. He had certain doubts on Bishop Butler's reference to the prophecy of the New Testament. James had been a presiding figure. Was there divine authority for Rome? In Cyprian's Exordium a primacy was recognized for the sake of the unity of the Church but Peter was seen as representing the whole episcopate.

After coffee....

Fr. Yarnold noted that according to Vatican I it was de iure divino that there was a centrum unitatis but that this was not necessarily Rome. The final drafting had deliberately left open the question of Peter's succession as bishop of Rome. The Church had a ministry and therefore a centre of unity but there was no absolute necessity that the bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter.

Prof. Root said that the reason why some Anglicans were unhappy about the 4th Article of the Lambeth Quadrilateral was the style of episcopal government rather than its content. The Anglican/Methodist debate was in some sense parallel to the Anglican/Roman Catholic debate. The episcopate could equally be interpreted as being non-conducive to unity.

The Revd. Julian Charley reminded the commission that the Canterbury Statement had talked of episcopus not episcopoi.

Prof. Fairweather sympathized with the Revd. Julian Charley's demand for reality. Bishops too needed reform. He had had some success in Ottawa! He asked if bishops had an ongoing role as a focus of unity. Did the apostles have no successors but Scripture? The Church as an ongoing society was impossible without personal ministries. The United States Constitution proposed rule by law rather than man but this was not possible. He cited the Canadian catechism. He asked whether Anglicans who affirmed the episcopate as a corporate focus of unity should not be prepared to look at and consider a local church and its chief pastor as a focus of unity. Anglicans were not committed to Bramhall just as Roman Catholics were not committed to Bellarmine. Should Anglicans appeal to history or Anglican history?

Fr. Ahern felt an impasse had been reached and referred to the thought of unity by stages. A second or third stage was not easy to accept for some.

Bishop McAdoo referred to the Malta Report and asked if the two churches did not have the same object of preserving the Church in the truth but the two traditions had two different models, a Papal and an Anglican model. Both models worked. There were two ways of achieving this common aim.

Dr. Halliburton agreed with the bishop but noted that the models had the same constituent elements .

Mgr. Purdy appreciated the theology of a centrum unitatis but was unhappy about the picture of the papacy it suggested. He preferred to speak of a ministry of unity. The Commission must always tend towards the reform of actual institutions.

Professor Root in response to this quoted two sentences from "Unity and Comprehensiveness" (the Bishop of Ripon and Professor Root): "As dialogue proceeds we may all be in for surprises on the way to restoration of unity. Those who are most concerned to defend rightful diversity may find that only within an accepted visible unity can diversity be developed and defended against sectarian tyrannies."

Mgr. Purdy felt that this was now a more plausible claim for in spite of timidity and recession there had been reform. Rome now had a comprehensiveness. Equally Anglicans were beginning to think of comprehensiveness with an accent on persevering in the truth. There was now the task of presenting the truth to the world in an intelligible form whilst the Church was hindered by disunity.

Fr. Duprey noted that for the Orthodox the fact that the Bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter was important. The tombs of Peter and Paul were significant for the Orthodox.

Dr. Gassmann noted three approaches: 1. the New Testament did not offer a solution nor did subsequent history clarify the issue. 2. To start from the status quo of Vatican I and II was equally unhelpful for non-Roman Catholics. 3. Starting from the concept of unity might lead to basic agreement. Unity was essential. What then were the essentials of unity? What were the structures of unity? Was there a diversity of structures. The schema should be continued through to unity and its structures. After which there might be divergence but perhaps final convergence.

Bishop Vogel apologised for not being an American football cheer leader. This was the impasse, but the past was only known from the present and the present only known through the past. Awareness of this condition was a source of hope for if the past could be seen it could be changed.

Bishop McAdoo asked if the Commission would now turn to blocking out areas for group discussion.

Fr. Ryan assumed that the Commission would keep the thrust of the St. Katharine's Statement and continue with its next paragraphs. He wished to keep the Dean's starting point "Unity in Truth". This would keep in the notion of infallibility which would otherwise be inadequately dealt with.

Dr. Gassmann and Fr. Tillard jointly suggested that three groups should continue the work; a small drafting group to continue the St. Katharine's Statement and then an Anglican group and a Roman Catholic group.

Fr. Tillard continued by saying that the Anglican view was not sufficiently clear.

Professor Root felt strongly that it would be a regression to go back into confessional groups. It would also be impossible for a small group to continue the St. Katharine's document.

The Revd. Julian Charley wanted paragraph 3 of the Dean's paper expanded, that on convergent authorities. He clarified his position in that he held that there was an apostolic ministry. He commented on the variety and flexibility in Anglicanism on the particular question of authority.

Fr. Tillard asked if there was a place for the centrum unitatis.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked what kind of centrum?

Bishop Butler felt that if there were already divergent views in the Roman Catholic Church, then there should be room for Anglicans.

Fr. Yarnold asked the Commission to look at infallibility and indefectibility without using those terms. One Sub-Commission would do this whilst another would deal with centrum unitatis in a similar way. There was some agreement to this proposal.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked if groups would deal with this in the abstract or relate to the St. Katharine's document.

Prof. Root felt that Fr. Tavad's introduction had relevant matter and was a great help.

Bishop McAdoo felt that many people thought the St. Katharine's document should survive. He asked if it was largely acceptable.

Archbishop Arnott did not wish detailed work to go into the St. Katharine's document. Emendations could be put in writing to the secretaries or there could be a further meeting of the St. Katharine's group.

Bishop Clark insisted that there was no pressure to produce a statement. The churches had to be taken as they were, nevertheless the aim was to state in faith what the Church should be.

Bishop McAdoo agreed that there was no pressure.

Dean Chadwick noted that the commission was getting cross with itself. In dealing with primacy and infallibility one was dealing with concepts which in some respects were precise and in others vague on which not enough work had been done in either communion. There was nothing in Anglican principles against a leader amongst the bishops, the notion of a bishop as a symbol of the unity of the faith. Primacy carried overtones of power and needed disentangling. The Petrine texts also needed disentangling from issues other than Bishop Butler's mystical prophecy. What Roman Catholics could all defend might be just what Anglicans wanted them to say.



Monday 1st September: 4.30.p.m. SESSION VI

From the chair Bishop Clark asked the commission how it wished the work to be divided .

Fr. Ryan asked that division ought not to be too clear. He, too, was not happy with separate groups. He suggested a St Katharine's continuation paragraphs 10, 11 and 12. (ARCIC 143)

The Revd. Julian Charley asked for the theological principles of a continuation rather than an historical judgement.

Bishop Clark emphasised the danger of continuing the St Katharine's documents in full session.

Bishop Butler noted that although infallibility was perhaps a function of primacy it might be best to discuss them separately. There was an epistemological problem with infallibility as such. After that there was the question of whether it was located in an individual

Fr. Tillard felt that Fr. Ryan's material was valuable because it introduced history.

Bishop Butler paralleled Hanson on monepiscopacy.

Dean Chadwick proposed the theme 'Unity and Truth in the Church'; one group to discuss one aspect and another the other.

Fr Ahern urged that this be in continuation of St. Katharine's.

Fr. Ryan preferred context to continuation. He repeated that he did not want separate groups.

Fr. Ahern wanted to see the theme of 'Unity' which Fr Ryan had developed earlier in the paper.

Bishop McAdoo also did not want denominational division but felt that in a Statement there might have to be a differentiation of views.

Dean Chadwick hoped that the Statement would be highly critical of the necessity for this.

Bishop Moorman said that this would not then be an agreed statement.

Prof. Root urged that this was too premature.

Bishop McAdoo felt it was not premature.

The Revd. Julian Charley was uneasy at moving into historical considerations. Progress could be made on the discussion of theological principles and to this Fr. Yarnold agreed.

Archbishop Arnott insisted that the commission had to grasp history. He asked that one group look at infallibility and indefectibility and another a centrum unitatis.

Fr Ryan noted that <sup>the</sup> St Katharine's document made historical assertions (e.g. Councils)

Dr. Halliburton noted that there were some historical observations in the Ministry statement.

Bishop Vogel felt that if the work had historical shape, theological principles would follow naturally.

Dr. Gassman warned against the danger of turning historical facts into objects of faith. He paralleled nonconformist criticisms of monepiscopacy .

Bishop Butler urged two groups.

Prof. Root hoped that the recommendation not to use the terms "infallibility" and "primacy" was an ideal .

The commission divided into two groups : sub-commission I Truth; sub-commission II - Unity.

11.15 : 3rd September 1975. SESSION VII

Bishop McAdoo warmly welcomed the Archbishop of Canterbury to the session and briefly described the workings of ARCIC. The Archbishop of Canterbury replied that ARCIC was frequently in his thoughts and prayers, and that the Church was grateful for the two Agreed Statements. He commented on Bishop Clark's address to the Church of England General Synod, and looked forward to the Statement on Authority. He insisted that the documents should not be pigeon-holed and allowed to collect dust. The Church must be thinking of the consequences of ARCIC's work. He also hoped that ARCIC as a body would not disappear after the third statement.

Bishop McAdoo then asked for the presentation and reading of Sub-Commission II's paper on Unity (ARCIC/II/1).

The Rev. Julian Charley stated that the Sub-Commission had not wished to duplicate the St. Katharine's Schema. He then proceeded to outline the St. Katharine's document by way of reminder. The first paragraph (10) was to explain the origin of one bishop having the oversight of other bishops. The historical treatment had not been over-elaborated as this would have led to divergent historical interpretations. A need had been felt and met both then and now for oversight of the overseers; co-responsibility in the context of the collegiality of the episcopate. There was no authoritarian figure, rather this was a manner of exercising episcopate. Paragraph 11 elaborated the will of Christ for the unity of the Church to enable it to be effective in its mission. The Sub-Commission was anxious to stress that the bishop was not interfering but rather exercising collegial concern. The document stated a positive side to this but a negative function was also involved. The local churches did not tackle their problems in isolation. There followed a straight historical observation that in a world-wide sphere Rome acquired primacy. All these developments issued in both good and bad. There would follow a paragraph on papal primacy. He then read the document.

Bishop McAdoo opened the debate.

Bishop Clark noted that the Sub-Commission had worked quickly and felt that Sub-Commission members should feel free to make critical comment.

Dean Chadwick felt that this was a good document and responded to it in a friendly way. He noted that the ministry of a Metropolitan was an exercise of episcopate. He noted the parallel with vere episcopalis of Pastor Eternus. He had certain qualms about the following paragraph. On paragraph 10 he saw the justification for the Metropolitan system, but asked about the restraint on Metropolitans. He also asked in what sense there was validity in Cyprianic principle on each bishop's responsibility to God alone.

Fr. Tavard had a minor problem in paragraph 10. He felt that "came to be realised that it was necessary" was too strong. With this Bishop McAdoo agreed.

Rev. Julian Charley commented that the Sub-Commission had not wished to elaborate history.

Dr. Gassmann felt the same point as Fr. Tavard.

Professor Fairweather noted that it was not exclusive.

Dean Chadwick said that grave scandal in the early Church certainly gave rise to the Metropolitan system in order to preserve unity.

Bishop Butler offered "desirable".

Bishop Clark suggested "useful".

Dean Chadwick suggested "administer to edification".

Fr. Tillard noted that the sub-commission had said "It was recognised". For the two traditions here and now it was necessary.

Fr. Ahern noted that "necessary" was preceded by "also" and that it followed paragraph 9's treatment of Synods.

Fr. Ryan said that early in the history of the Church it was in fact recognised to be necessary.

Bishop Butler felt that one did not recognise something which was not there. He offered "came to be judged necessary", but Fr. Tillard was not happy with this.

Fr. Ryan noted that certain structures were given in the Church under the Holy Spirit.

Fr. Tavard felt that for him they were mistakenly thought to be necessary. Again Bishop McAdoo agreed.

The Revd. Julian Charley felt the sub-commission had carefully noted that in coming to recognise these structures as necessary, this did not pre-judge the issue as to the sometimes sordid political origin of these structures.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted Fr. Ryan's reference to the Holy Spirit but found it disturbing that there was no reference to this in the document.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that this was quite deliberate. To have done this would be to have stamped them with divine approval.

Fr. Tillard said that this was why he was unhappy with Bishop Butler's suggestion.

Bishop Butler in reply said that he was quite happy with things as they stood.

Bishop Clark said that "recognised" could mean "come to the conclusion that....".

Archbishop Arnott felt that the last section of paragraph 11 should help Fr. Tavard. There had been no mention of the development of patriarchates, but even in the time of Ignatius there was concern for other Churches in a time of crisis.

Bishop Vogel said that the Sub-Commission had not wished to stress the Holy Spirit. The work of the Holy Spirit was in ordination.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that he did not intend that all developments be endorsed. A Trinitarian emphasis would be maintained by reference to the Holy Spirit.

Fr. Ahern agreed with Bishop Knapp-Fisher; he did not want simple history in a humanistic way.

Fr. Tillard agreed that ordination was a gift of the Holy Spirit but asked why it was necessary to be explicit here.

The Revd. Julian Charley was concerned that mention of the Holy Spirit would put a seal of divine authority, de iure divino, and this would load the document.

Dean Chadwick felt the first sentence was true as it stood. The election of local bishops had frequently been chaotic. He cited the example of street fights in which 166 people lost their lives! At Saragossa the Valleri family held the see for 150 years. Metropolitan control had its value even if there was an obverse side to its development. The eventual rise of patriarchates in turn diminished the importance of metropolitans. It was fair to say that there was a pastoral necessity here.

Bishop McAdoo commented that his own election took five hours!

Bishop Butler suggested the phrase "for every bishop receives from the Holy Spirit at his ordination.....".

The Bishop of Ripon was unhappy with "fellowship of local churches".

Bishop Vogel suggested "found in...."

Bishop Clark recalled the sense of koinonia in that passage.

Fr. Tavard insisted that the local church was also the church of God.

Fr. Ahern felt oversight to be an ugly word.

Bishop Clark said that there was no alternative.

Bishop Butler suggested that oversight could be put into quotes with a footnote to the Canterbury Statement.

Fr. Ryan asked the Dean whether "co-responsibility" did not respect the local bishop.

Dean Chadwick promised to think of an alternative phrase.

Bishop McAdoo than asked the Commission to look at paragraph 11.

Dr. Halliburton disliked the word "should" in relation to the sentence "the bishop of this principal see....."

Bishop Clark said that again there was the problem of the real and ideal.

Fr. Yarnold felt that two things were missing in paragraph 11. 1. Patriarchs or metropolitans as a centre of eucharistic unity. 2. The authority of the presiding bishop seemed too weakly presented.

Fr. Ryan reminded the Commission that Fr. Duprey had steered it away from patriarchs. He insisted that metropolitans were not a centre of eucharistic unity.

Fr. Tillard said that the centre of eucharistic community was the local church. It was most important for the Eastern Churches as the first sign of eucharistic unity. He commented that a protos, even the Pope, had no more than the episcopate in regard to the sacraments.

Dr. Yarnold was not thinking of the Archbishop of Canterbury as a centre of eucharistic community for London but he must have a link outside his diocese.

Fr. Ryan commented that metropolitan structures were not de iure divino.

Bishop Butler was unhappy at the suggestion that the Bishop / of Rome acquired primacy, as this suggested a merely historical origin; it begged the theological question. He preferred the notion that a primacy was recognised.

Fr. Tavard wanted to see something about the bishop's teaching office.

Fr. Ryan noted that primacy had not been qualified.

Fr. Duprey felt that the end of paragraph 11 was acceptable as an antiphon to paragraph 12.

Bishop McAdoo felt this question could be kept in cold storage until paragraph 12 had been produced.

Archbishop Arnott agreed that the primacy had been reached too quickly. He felt that there were many other factors involved as well as the death of the apostles Peter and Paul. There was no definition of centrum.

The Dean of Christ Church felt that the sentence "in matters ....." required reworking. He offered "It was believed that.....". It was believed with good reasons. Since the Waldensians there had been the theory that Peter had no connection with Rome. Competent historians had discredited this view, the first of which was the Anglican Bishop of Chester, Pearson. There was a problem in the last clause; a transition from church to bishops. He felt that "exercised" would be better than "acquired".

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy at this suggestion. The whole layout was a build up for the "crunch". There was the world-wide problem of unity and the see of Rome. The document was careful not to say that it was because Peter and Paul had died there that Rome became the centrum. It was one factor. It was important that it was not just Peter but Peter and Paul. The documents began with the see and then moved on to its occupant.

Bishop McAdoo felt that he would regret seeing the word "Acquire" disappear.

Professor Fairweather said that the reference was not intended as an exclusive explanation. The "and so" referred not to Peter and Paul but to the fact that the see came to be seen as centrum.

Bishop Vogel consequently suggested "came to be seen".

Fr. Ahern felt that the last sentence but one would have been better as an introduction to the following paragraph.

Fr. Tillard preferred the Dean's term "exercise". He stressed that there were two quite distinct problems. In Rome and Peter. Roman Catholics sometimes put the two together in a way unfortunate for history.

Bishop McAdoo recalled Hans Küng's Petritas, Romanitas, and Perpetuitas.

SESSION VIII: 3rd September: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark invited a continuation of discussion on 144/II/1.

Bishop Butler repeated his request for "exercised".

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked for an explanation of the three qualifications made on the possibility of intervention by a presiding bishop.

Fr. Ryan answered that this was to protect the integrity of the local bishop in his diocese.

Fr. Tillard stated that this was the principle of subsidiarity.

Bishop Butler asked who did the "requiring".

Professor Scarisbrick taking up Bishop Knapp-Fisher's point felt that there was a redundancy of language.

Fr. Yarnold again pleaded for the Eucharist. Members of a patriarch's church were in communion with him.

Fr. Ryan saw no liturgical reflection of this.

Dr. Halliburton noted communion as a sign of unity between churches.

Bishop McAdoo insisted that the Eucharist did not constitute the totality of the koinonia.

Fr. Duprey agreed that in concelebration the episcopate manifested its unity. This was not, however, at the same level as this discussion.

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy at "exercised". If that was said more would be read into the document than was meant. He offered "but the see came to be seen as the centrum and so its bishop came to exercise primacy".

Bishop McAdoo recalled von Kampenhausen.

Dean Chadwick cast doubts on his veracity.

Bishop Vogel said that the document simply attempted to express objective fact.

Bishop Butler noted that the term "exercise" had come from an Anglican. He would be happy with "came to exercise".

Fr. Ryan said that "acquire" had originated with him.

The Bishop of Ripon suggested the deletion of "so".

Bishop Vogel suggested "for this and other reasons".

Professor Fairweather suggested "came to be seen as centrum".

Fr. Ahern repeated his suggestion of the removal of the reference to Rome till paragraph 12.

Fr. Duprey said that there were many primacies and that it was good to put Rome in this context. The local church was the fundamental level.

Fr. Ryan said that the primacy was as yet unspecified.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that it would have been wasted space to spell out the different ways in which primacy had been exercised but the document was intended to show the principle on which primacy was based. The papal primacy must be in that context.

Bishop Butler asked if Fr. Ryan was predicating two kinds of primacy; a patriarchal primacy and another more theological based primacy.

Fr. Ryan replied that a difference had come to be realised.

Fr. Tillard said that there were many primacies but one primacy which was the centrum.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that the Sub-Commission had avoided a historical judgment.

Dean Chadwick felt that Paul had more to do with the primacy than Peter and could be seen to have done so in the Epistle to the Romans. John Chrysostom had a warm regard for Rome, but the missionaries had gone from Antioch to Rome. Rome was a vital centre of unity but for the Eastern Church there were several circles with several centres. Augustine had said that the Donatists were not in the unity of the Church because they were out of communion with Rome but he also added Jerusalem. He did not wish to smuggle in Gallicanism. Nevertheless it was a fact that for the Eastern Church though communion with Rome had been thought vital it was not the only centrum.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked if the Dean could find a phrase for centrum.

Fr. Tillard felt that the Dean's comments were most important for a future paragraph 12, but that it was good to keep the word centrum and then explain it.

Bishop McAadoo offered "a focus of unity" for the Dean.

Dean Chadwick replied that there were other focal points of unity. Alexandria and Antioch undoubtedly exercised authority outside the civil boundaries of their province. "Principal centre" would express it.

Fr. Ryan asked at what time this took place. He wanted a theological statement on the primacy.

Dean Chadwick concluded by reminding the Commission that Clement had interfered in the church in Corinth and had not apologised for it; he had only apologised for not doing it sooner.



Bishop Clark asked Bishop Knapp-Fisher to introduce the Sub-Commission I document on Truth (144/I/1.)

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that the problem of later councils and definitions had yet to be dealt with. He said that the document had been intended to continue from Sub-Commission II's eventual treatment of the primacy in continuation of the St. Katharine's document. As the treatment of primacy was not yet available, this meant that the connection was undefined as yet. The document was greatly indebted to the Dean's paper.

Fr. Ryan was very impressed by the work of the drafters. He had one problem with the meaning of the word "central" in paragraph 1. He was unhappy that the redemption should be at the top of the Hierarchy of Truths. Not all theologies reflected this position.

Bishop Butler noted that St. Thomas taught that doctrine was not an extension of philosophical theology. Revelation was apprehended by faith and came to its culmination in Jesus.

Fr. Tillard noted the emphasis on the function of the Church as guardian of the Gospel. Yet the Gospel had not always been the same and so <sup>he</sup> disagreed with paragraph 4.

Fr. Ahern felt that the notion of the Church guarding the Gospel was an essential element.

Fr. Tillard did not disagree but criticised the internal logic of the document.

Dr. Gassmann felt that the transition from truth to the Church was too immediate. He noted a lack of judgment and felt there was ambiguity in the use of the terms "truth", "gospel", "proclamation" and "doctrine".

The Bishop of Ossory noted the dual function of proclaiming and guarding.

Bishop Vogel asked the meaning of "dispite the frailty...." in paragraph 4.

Fr. Tavard said that this sentence was a partial description of indefectibility; there was the certainty that the Gospel remained.

Bishop Vogel asked if the following sentence said the same thing.

Bishop McAdoo said that this was on the different point of the inadequacy of human language.

Bishop Vogel asked if this meant that the Church was a kind of platonic essence. What proof was there of continuity?

Dean Chadwick said that the Bishop was asking for proof that could not be had. It was only in faith that we affirmed that Jesus was the same yesterday, today and tomorrow.

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy about the shape of the first part of the document. Paragraph 1 was too man centred.

Bishop Butler in reference to the central sentence of paragraph 4 felt that "through" was being taken as instrumental. This was not correct. He hoped this point would survive.

Archbishop Arnott felt that the document jumped from point to point without its links being made clear. With reference to the sensus fidelium he doubted whether statements of the church originated in the sensus fidelium. At this point Fr. Ahern suggested that the document be dealt with paragraph by paragraph.

The Revd. Julian Charley felt unease not so much at details but on the focussing on the activity of the Church in history. The document lacked rooting and he was left groping.

Bishop McAdoo asked if he would write out his views.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that the Sub-Commission had not known where to start or connect with the other Sub-Commission.

The Bishop of Ripon felt that it was better not to debate the document in detail but that suggestions should be made in writing.

Bishop Clark felt that it was better to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

Dean Chadwick suggested an opening to meet Fr. Ryan's point: "The Church's task (and obligation) is to be witness and faithful teacher of the body of doctrine which the apostles proclaimed as the gospel of the salvation of men in Christ."

Fr. Ahern felt "redeeming presence of God" to be weak.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked for the removal of the example of heresy.

Dr. Gassmann pleaded for a more systematic logic.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to turn to paragraph 2.

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy with "Christ has sent".

Fr. Tillard asked if paragraph 2 was necessary.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that this had been voiced in the Sub-Commission.

Fr. Ahern felt that the mixed metaphors were unhelpful.

Bishop Butler noted that this went back to Scripture.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to look at paragraph 3.

Bishop Vogel suggested that the order of the first two sentences should be reversed and this was endorsed by the Revd. Julian Charley.

The Revd. Julian Charley was unhappy at the lumping together of formulas as instrumental.

9.30.a.m. September 4th. SESSION IX

Bishop Clark invited discussion on 144/II/1 sentence by sentence.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that he found the document expansive and that this procedure would be fruitful.

Fr. Ahern asked if anything was lost if the second paragraph were put first. He felt this would be a better link with the other document.

Prof. Root reminded the commission that its brief was to deal with Infallibility and Indefectibility. He felt that anything less would be impossible.

Bishop McAdoo agreed that brevity could become <sup>an</sup> idol.

Fr. Duprey reminded the commission that first drafts were always longer.

Fr. Ryan also felt that a more prolix statement gave more options for its continuation from the other document.

Bishop Clark said that the logic led from Primacy to the charisma of Infallibility.

Fr. Yarnold made the interjection that this was also of the whole Church. There was general agreement to this.

Fr. Ryan felt that there was not an immediate link and noted that the previous document was dealing with Primacies in the plural.

Fr. Tavad noted that there was a focussing on Truth in paragraphs 1,2 and 3 but that there was a focussing on Faith in paragraphs 4,5 and 6. This gave a different approach.

Fr. Tillard noted that the Church was the guardian of truth and that this was on two levels and had been mixed.  
1) the Church had to keep the truth  
2) the Church had to defend the truth.

Bishop Butler understood 'guard' to have the meaning of custodire. He cited the example of the medieval defence of God as creator against cyclic views of the universe.

Fr. Tillard felt that there was no clear link between the functions of keeping the faith and defending the truth.

Bishop Butler felt that faith and truth were strictly correlative notions.

Bishop McAdoo felt that the logic of the first paragraph was clear.

Fr. Yarnold felt that the contrast was between proclaiming the truth and guarding it. There was agreement to this

Dean Chadwick did not understand the objections. The question was simply whether there was such a thing as authentic Christianity and concern with the criteria by which this was to be recognized.

Fr. Ryan insisted that truth was self-authenticating and not conceptual. He very much liked the sentence in paragraph 4 which began "despite the frailty....."

Bishop Butler said that there had to be some conceptualisation.

Dr. Gassman criticized the logic of the text. He wanted more light in leading up to indefectibility and infallibility: paragraph 4 ought to be the final one.

Prof. Root insisted that conceptual formulas were held to be necessary.

Fr. Ahern agreed with Dr. Gassman.

Bishop. Knapp-Fisher noted this point

Fr. Yarnold said that paragraph 4 could not be the final one. There was a need to go on to the necessity of permanent statements.

Bishop Clark asked if he would like to state the logic of the paper.

Fr. Yarnold said that paragraphs 1 to 4 treated of indefectibility but/that paragraph 5 turned to particular statements and that paragraphs 6 & 7 treated of statements of permanent value.

Fr. Ryan noted an ambiguity in the words "certain" in paragraph 5. He asked what the distinction was between practice and behaviour.

Fr. Tavard stated that behaviour meant the moral life but that practice meant the liturgy.

Archbishop Arnott could not see the logic in paragraph 5 where Scriptures, creeds and councils were dealt with and after that a further treatment of Scripture.

Dr. Halliburton indicated that there was an emphasis here on testing new formulations against the Scriptures.

Dr. Yarnold said that the paragraph was about sources and their norms.

Fr. Ryan felt that the reference to baptism and the creeds was too cryptic.

Bishop Clark then asked the commission to comment on paragraph 6

Bishop Butler was not happy at the way the sub-commission had stopped at the Scriptures. Christianity was the religion of a person.

Fr. Ryan noted that not every statement was in fact made according to the needs of the times.

The Revd. Julian Charley now saw more of the logic of the document but felt that it started on the wrong tack. He wanted to see the logic come out more clearly. The truth was Christ not something in the abstract, not a past figure but the living Christ within the Church. The lynch-pin was paragraph 4. The Gospel was everlasting because it was the Gospel of Christ. The document then moved on to the formulation of truth and he liked paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.

Fr. Ahern said that one did not come to Christ simply through exegesis though the primary witness was in Scripture.

Fr. Tavad said that this sentence expressed the purpose of the Church in interpreting the Gospel for its own renewal. There was a twofold movement back to Scripture via tradition, the norm. A deeper understanding of Christ was renewal.

Fr. Ahern felt that a deeper understanding was a means of renewal.

Fr. Tavad said that the primary witness was not identical with the text of the New Testament.

Bishop Butler was again unhappy that everything had been channelled back to Scripture exclusively. Scripture was a test but not the only channel. He cited baptism and the eucharist as examples.

The Revd. Julian Charley stressed that fidelity to Christ was not to be equated with textual knowledge.

Fr. Ryan felt that that was what the document said.

Fr. Yarnold asked if the omission of "the primary witness to" would help.

Bishop Clark moved the Commission on to paragraph 7.

Fr. Tillard said that the first level he was concerned with was that the Church had to keep its faith. This was to be equated with indefectibility and concerned the whole life of the Church. The second level was for the service of this indefectibility. The Church had to defend and express its faith in doctrine, in formulations and propositions. What is called the infallibility of councils, bishops and popes is to serve this end. He urged the avoidance of a confusion between faith and truth and apologised to Bishop Butler.

Bishop Butler still felt that they were correlative, and said that truth for Fr. Tillard had become propositional.

Fr. Tillard agreed and argued that for the document this must be the case if infallibility was to be spoken of.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that the sub-commission had not yet reached infallibility.

Bishop Vogel was unhappy at an over-propositional definition of the nature of truth in order to arrive at infallibility.

Fr. Yarnold also felt this was a false dichotomy.

Dean Chadwick now understood what Fr. Tillard was wishing to say. The act of faith was more than assent on the part of the logical faculty but it included it. Did this correspond with the distinction between indefectibility and infallibility? He was not clear that faith was represented by indefectibility and truth by infallibility.

Fr. Tillard said <sup>that</sup>/this was not what he had said.

Bishop McAdoo asked if all definitions were infallible.

Fr. Tillard answered in the negative. Indefectibility was broader than mere definition.

Bishop McAdoo asked for an example.

Fr. Tillard said that the definition of the two natures was an infallible one. It had attempted a doctrinal explanation of the ground of our life in Christ.

Bishop Butler felt it fair to warn the Commission that the last sentences of paragraph 6 and 7 introduced for him the idea of infallibility. The Church had committed itself so unreservedly that a definition became part of the Church's witness to Christ. Von Hügel committed himself to that which the Church had irrevocably committed itself.

Fr. Ahern did not understand the beginning of paragraph 7.

Bishop Butler said that questions could be quite unreal. Medieval disputes on angels might be irrelevant to another age.

Fr. Ahern still criticised the word "valid".

Fr. Duprey was uneasy at the distinction between propositional and non-propositional truth. St. Thomas held that behind propositions one reached to the mystery of faith. It was necessary to have propositional and conceptual knowledge. When infallibility was spoken about it was important to remember that it was the act of definition not the proposition which was infallible.

Bishop Butler drew attention to paragraph 3 in answer to Fr. Duprey.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that the word infallible seemed to reduce truth to propositional truth. This was in contrast to Johannine truth. If this distinction were persisted in, there was a danger of presupposing something disagreed.

Bishop Butler hoped that in the end the Commission would be able to reduce the concept of infallibility to a footnote in much the same way as transubstantiation.

Archbishop Arnott felt that Nicea and Chalcedon did not quite fit into the last paragraph.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that later definitions were in mind.

Archbishop Arnott said that "do not originate" was the problem.

Professor Root said that it was not a question of the hierarchy imposing new doctrines.

Bishop Vogel said that more discussion was needed on infallibility.

Bishop McAdoo said that in view of Bishop Butler's point, what the Church had unreservedly committed itself to were matters internally connected to faith in Christ and the Scriptures. This was true of the early councils but not true of the later definitions.

Fr. Ahern said that in paragraph 3 there was no clear statement as to in what sense "truth" was being used.

Fr. Yarnold said that originally the drafters had delineated four senses of truth.

Fr. Tillard said that the argument would be clearer if the last part of paragraph 6 became the first part of paragraph 7. He felt the juxtaposition of these two paragraphs needed some attention.

Dr. Gassmann asked if a formulation could be saving truth; rather an expression pointing to saving truth.

Fr. Ryan found the sentence in paragraph 2 most valuable "The presence of Christ....." This built upon the Canterbury Statement with regard to the realm of the gifts of the spirit in episcopate. This related to the criteria that were to be used in discerning what exercises of episcopate were infallible.

Fr. Tillard agreed with the point made by Fr. Ryan. He noted a repetition in paragraph 4.

Bishop Clark asked if the sub-commission would continue its self-denying audience in using the words "infallible" and "indefectible". He asked if they could reshape their document in the light of the general debate.

The Revd. Julian Charley made the final point by asking what in paragraph 2 was the reference to "spirit" and "gift".

Bishop Clark asked if the schema had been debated enough. It was generally agreed that it had been. The bishop then expressed his gratitude for the presence of Bishop Howe.

Bishop Howe replied by stating that the work of ARCIC was of supreme importance. He felt that the ecumenical movement was failing by much talk and little action. ARCIC was different. He saw in the future a confrontation between ~~athism~~ and the trinitarian churches. At times the debate in the Commission was the level of responsible speculation but from time to time it came nearer to revelation and this was what got through to the Statements. He insisted that this must have consequences in action.

Saturday, 6th September 11.15: SESSION X

Bishop McAdoo opened discussion on the nature of a press statement.

Fr. Duprey suggested that there was simply a mention of the themes which had been discussed but he warned of the danger of polarisation.

Bishop of Ripon felt that a press statement should convey a message of hope and progress.

Archbishop Arnott agreed with the Bishop of Ripon.

Bishop Clark urged that the Commission should have confidence in its press officers.

Dr. Gassmann suggested that papers commissioned might be mentioned.

Fr. Ahern did not wish to see the Commission commit itself too much.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked for a statement of hope balanced by a plan for future work.

Bishop Butler said that it was a measure of the Commission's hope that it planned to meet again.

Dean of Christ Church offered the phrase "not yet reached disagreement".

Revd. Julian Charley wished to avoid the term "hope". This would cause fear. He wanted a press statement to be as vague as possible.

Revd. Christopher Hill asked if the Commission wished for the occasions of its distinguished visitors to be mentioned.

Bishop Butler hoped that the Archbishop's visit would be mentioned, in correlation with the Commission's audience with the Pope in 1974.

Dean of Christ Church asked for something to indicate that the subjects of Primacy and Infallibility had been discussed. This was to be in the context of how the Church was kept in the truth of the Gospel. The two Churches had two traditions in talking about this operation which looked mutually exclusive. The Commission looked at the inward reality to see if there were areas of agreement at a deeper level. The Commission had not yet reached deadlock.

Bishop McAdoo said that clarification was progress and this at least could be mentioned.

Professor Scarisbrick wanted to see the suggestion of convergence.

Dean of Christ Church said that there had been astonishment at the agreement the Commission had already achieved in spite of accusations of selling the pass. While it was more than worth while to take things to pieces, clarity was not enough. The Commission had the duty of keeping up the spirits of those who prayed for unity. He reminded the Commission that truth pleases some people and astonishes the rest.



Bishop of Ripon urged that the Commission should err on the side of saying too much rather than too little.

Bishop Clark suggested that there might be a summary or outline of the St. Katharine's Schema.

Bishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to look at the two possible Schemas for future work.

Revd. Julian Charley commented that the document from Sub-Commission II followed on from the St. Katharine's document and its continuation in the work of Sub-Commission II during this meeting.

Professor Scarisbrick asked for an explanation of I(i).

The Revd. Julian Charley expanded that this concerned the underlying principles of primacy.

Bishop Clark commented that in many ways this had already been done.

Revd. Julian Charley agreed but said that this was to draw the strands together.

Fr. Tillard added that some conditions were required for the acceptance of a primacy and that these had not been alluded to earlier.

Fr. Tavard said that III(i) was not simply a question of other Churches but was a contemporary problem for the Roman Catholic Church too.

Fr. Tillard said that if both Churches recognised the need for a primacy, it was necessary to stress that the Anglican Communion had historically tried to be open to other Churches even without this primacy.

The Bishop of Ripon was disturbed to find three years work on the agenda.

Bishop Butler said that the Sub-Commission I Schema had also be be borne in mind.

Bishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to look at this.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher introduced Sub-Commission I's document. He said it was a rather different kind of document from the other Sub-Commission's. He hoped that with a finished document next year the Churches might enter into a sacramental relationship, after which other problems might be resolved.

Dr. Gassmann asked if there would be two documents.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher stressed that there would be one.

Bishop McAdoo suggested that two drafters might put together the work of both Sub-Commissions, after which their work would be sent to all members of the Commission, upon which a St. Katharine's-type Sub-Commission could meet and draft a Schema.

Professor Fairweather said that with two drafters there might be the danger of missing the logic of a further person's document.

Bishop McAdoo said that this was why their work would be sent to the whole Commission.

Professor Fairweather felt that the Unity Sub-Commission was on the threshold of most important work. Its schema for the future was basically a list of paragraph headings.

Bishop Clark said that primacy appeared to be consistent with an Anglican ecclesiology, but the question was, was it of necessity?

The Revd. Julian Charley agreed that this was the question, but the primacy had actually been deteriorious for unity, and had actually obscured the openness of Churches to one another.

Bishop McAdoo agreed that the de fide nature of the primacy was the question.

Archbishop Arnott asked for a paper on Anglican ecclesiology to this question.

Dean Chadwick also agreed that the question was whether on an Anglican view the position of the Bishop of Rome was to be regarded positively or negatively. He wanted to know whether a negative judgment was inherent in Anglican ecclesiology.

Bishop McAdoo reminded the Commission that Anglicans could and did conceive of catholicity without the Pope.

Dean Chadwick said that the Truth Sub-Commission had got into trouble over that one. He reflected on the difficulty of climbing the sheer face of the Eiger. He felt that the Unity Sub-Commission had got a little nearer the goal.

Professor Fairweather said that though Anglican ecclesiology was pluriform; it uniformly rejected a primacy as de fide. This was the issue.

Bishop Butler pleaded for a distinction between ongoing interpretation and the ruling of official documents. Emerging thought was capable of dynamic development.

Professor Fairweather felt that on the Anglican side any work done would be almost exclusively on the work of the theologians. There was only one official statement on the position of the Pope and that was solely concerning his lack of jurisdiction in England.

Fr. Tavard asked what it really meant to say that the primacy was de fide. He said that the American R.C./Lutheran Conversations had found the term ius divinum to be not helpful with regard to institutions.

Bishop McAdoo asked then if the Commission wanted two memoranda; one on Anglican ecclesiology and the Pope, the other on the meaning of the Pope's primacy as de fide.

Dr. Gassmann was unhappy at the idea of the work of the two Sub-Commissions being conflated. He wanted the documents clarified and put together at the next meeting.

Professor Fairweather commented that both Sub-Commissions had been just on the brink.

Fr. Tillard said that there were two problems. There was the question of their conflation and their continuance. He felt that it was too early to conflate the documents. They needed to be finished first.

Fr. Duprey agreed that it was not yet clear how far the three documents were to mature. He felt it was better to go on with the work.

Fr. Tavard wanted the documents put together.

Fr. Yarnold noted that 'Pringlands' had not always had completed documents.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that <sup>the</sup> Primacy Sub-Commission had followed on the work of the St. Katharine's meeting. The Truth Sub-Commission had had the difficulty of starting in mid air. Their work would be the continuation of the Unity Group.

The Dean of Christ Church on the question of the third paragraph of the Truth Sub-Commission's Schema for Future Work, said that faith was never independent of the community in which it operated. The two communities had once been separated on doctrine. This was not the case so much now. Theologians found themselves even so working within their own communities. When the Churches were united, remaining divergences would cease to exist.

Revd. Julian Charley still felt that there were difficulties, as a closer relationship between the two Churches would depend upon further doctrinal clarification.

Professor Root drew attention to the fact of freelance collaboration.

Bishop Butler observed a vicious circle. Unity in matters of the sacraments could not take place until there was a unity of doctrine and yet the converse was true that there would be no unity of doctrine until there was communion in sacris. Here was a challenge to an act of trust.

Bishop McAdoo reminded the Commission of the idea of an ecclesiology of an unprecedented situation.

After tea Bishop Clark asked for discussion on the Draft Press Release, and after some discussion the final Release was agreed upon. This was a short communiqué of approximately 100 words on the considered advice of the Press Officers, Fr. George Leonard and Mr. John Miles.

Bishop Clark then asked whether it was agreed that two papers were to be commissioned in 1976. He suggested Professor Fairweather should write a paper on whether the Primacy could be part of an Anglican ecclesiology and what part such a primacy would play in matters of faith. Professor Fairweather agreed.

Fr. Tavard was asked to unpack the Roman Catholic doctrine of primacy and to say how it was an object of faith. He also agreed.

Fr. Duprey felt that perhaps Roman Catholics used the term de fide too easily.

Bishop Butler said that he had a relative interest in the term, but was more interested in the extent of the requirements the Roman Catholic Church might find it in conscience necessary to make before admitting communion on the question of primacy.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked if it was the case that two drafters were to be set to work followed by a general circulation and then a Sub-Commission meeting.

Bishop Butler felt there was a muddle. Was the Commission working with the view to the publication of a document in 1976? The Truth Sub-Commission had certainly hoped this was the case. On the other hand the issues raised by the Unity Sub-Commission were formidable and would require a further statement.

Dr. Halliburton was not so dispondent and felt that both continuation and conflation could go on during the year.

Bishop Butler reminded the Commission that they had not discussed the two Sub-Commission documents in their final form in full session.

Dr. Gassmann asked for a schema for the marriage of the documents, but that the marriage should take place at the next meeting of the Full Commission.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that in terms of line of thought the St. Katharine's document and the work of Sub-Commission II were already linked. His problem was where the work of the Truth Sub-Commission should fit in.

Dr. Gassmann asked whether the Commission felt it was trying to publish next year or not.

Bishop Butler hoped that whatever was done during the year all the material would be incorporated.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher did not wish the Commission to assume that a draft document incorporating all the material could not be produced for next year.

Bishop Clark then attempted to assess the Commission's thinking. Did the Commission wish the three papers to be merged and the Unity Commission's problems to be answered in a draft schema for next year, together with the memoranda of Professor Fairweather and Fr. Tavard?

Dr. Yarnold reminded the Commission that their Schema had included the suggestion of three short papers.

Fr. Tavard urged that the members of the Unity Sub-Commission should continue their work.

Professor Fairweather felt that there was no hope of all the material being put together at the next meeting. This must be done beforehand.

The Revd. Julian Charley asked if there were to be two meetings or one before next year.

Bishop Clark hoped that there would be two.

The Revd. Julian Charley felt this would give more scope.

Fr. Tillard felt that no new material was necessary now, but felt that what was necessary was simply to find a way forward.

Archbishop Arnott hoped that a treatise would not be required. He suggested that members of the Commission sent to the Secretaries a list of criticisms of the two documents. He asked for a Christmas meeting to conflate material, a draft of which would then be sent to members, following which there would be a further meeting to prepare a schema.

Dean Chadwick wanted two answers from the two memoranda. The Roman Catholic tradition was rigorous in its demand for a primacy. The Anglican tradition was susceptible to but did not require a primacy. It was necessary to say that in the past these had been two mutually exclusive viewpoints, but that now it was time to see that neither position was necessarily absolute, if on other grounds unity was desirable.

Bishop Clark suggested that a small group met at Poringland at the end of the year. Two drafters might then have their work considered.

Revd. Julian Charley wondered if the drafters were necessary, if there were to be two meetings. The first to revise the St. Katharine's and Unity Sub-Commission documents, followed by a later meeting to incorporate the Truth material.

Dr. Gassmann asked if the Commission would look at the perspective as a whole.

Bishop Clark felt that the Commission was against the idea of two drafters. It simply wanted two Sub-Commissions.

Bishop Moorman said that two people could do a marriage of the documents which could then be considered by the Commission as a whole by circulation. He suggested Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Fr. Yarnold. Mgr. Purdy agreed with this.

Bishop Moorman suggested that two drafters might merge the three documents into a unity for working purposes. A first Sub-Commission could then work on these proposals and a second produce a schema.

Professor Fairweather noted that both drafters were in the same Sub-Commission.

Revd. Julian Charley felt that a premature marriage might damage both parties.

Professor Scarisbrick felt that the first step was redundant and asked for just two meetings.

Bishop Clark reminded the Commission that any work done at an unofficial first Sub-Commission would in any case be sent to the whole Commission.

The Revd. Julian Charley said that he was more concerned with the direction than the content of material at the moment. It must hang together.

Professor Fairweather agreed with the suggestion of two Sub-Commissions provided all interests were represented.

Mgr. Purdy also felt all was well provided the job of the first Sub-Commission was to synthesise.

Revd. Julian Charley felt that it was an impossible task for two people in any case.

Dr. Gassmann said that there were two parallel documents here. He felt they should be brought together when they were completed.

Dean Chadwick said that the logic of the two documents was difficult to reconcile. Unity and Primacy were logically prior. The work of the Unity Sub-Commission, continuing the work of the St. Katharine's Group, had been dealing with primacy as an expression of the unity of the Church. The locus of the teaching authority in the Church followed after this. If the Church possessed unity, it also possessed truth.

Professor Fairweather agreed that the conclusion of a document would move to the office of a protos and then its teaching function.

Dean Chadwick wanted to see a schema with Three Chapters. The two Sub-Commission papers were positive documents.

Professor Fairweather noted that they were not personal papers, but had been worked through by the Sub-Commissions.

Fr. Tillard saw the problem of infallibility as a consequence of a dimension of primacy. It was possible to accept primacy but not infallibility. Many would accept primacy but for infallibility.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted that Fr. Tillard had tried to indicate this in the later sections of the schema.

Professor Fairweather urged continuance on primacy of which infallibility was an aspect. He invited the Dean to give the titles to his Three Capitulars.

Dean Chadwick suggested that the first should be the Nature of Authority in the Church, the second Unity and the third Truth. Unity and Truth were not in conflict; it was not an entirely eschatological notion that they were one.

The Revd. Julian Charley still felt that on the Primacy it was not only a question of fear of abuse but also a question as to its very existence.

Bishop Clark summarised the feeling of the Commission and asked if a group should try to sort out further the material on Authority, Unity and Truth and that this then be fed back to the whole Commission. The comeback on this would go into an official Sub-Commission and its work likewise be sent to the whole Commission for reaction. In addition to this there would be the two memoranda from Professor Fairweather and Fr. Tavad.

This was generally agreed and Bishop Knapp-Fisher made the additional suggestion that comment on new material from the two Oxford Sub-Commissions should be sent to Christopher Hill at Lambeth.