

ARCIC: 24th August - 2nd September 1976

MINUTES

Tuesday, 24th August - 6.30 p.m. OPENING SESSION

After preliminary discussion of a practical nature, Bishop Clark opened the discussion on programme by thanking Fr. Tavard for his paper and noting the contribution of Dr. Eric Jay from the Canadian ARC. He said that since Oxford the informal Poringland and Hengrave Steering Committee meetings had taken place. Not all members of the Commission had been present at these two meetings, therefore there would be legitimate criticism. Nevertheless Venice had a total document. Bishop Butler felt that now the issue of historical description and the authority it carried must be faced. Bishop Vogel felt that this was too sharp. What was required was trajectories of convergence.

Dean Chadwick said it was difficult to define what the norm for judging history should be. Nevertheless it was necessary to make a jump from history. He suggested the Commission should jump.

Fr. Ahern asked that there should be a stronger stress on deductive processes.

Bishop Clark wanted the Commission to have that confidence in the text which would ensure productivity.

Fr. Yarnold did not wish to pre-empt a discussion on the shape of the document.

Bishop Clark asked for a movement forward, otherwise there would be depression. Bishop McAlooe agreed with this. Mgr. Purdy recalled the beginning of the Canterbury meeting.

Revd. Julian Charley asked for concentration on the new material.

Archbishop Arnott noted that the two Sub-Commissions at Oxford had not had an opportunity to criticise each other's work.

Bishop Clark concluded the session by remarking that there had been an attempt at Poringland and Hengrave to weld together the material of the two Sub-Commissions.

Wednesday, 25th August: 9.30 a.m.

From the chair the Bishop of Ossory introduced the Hengrave document. He did so formally noting the thrust of the document from the concept of koinonia as fundamental to the equally important relationship between truth and authority. The Bishop paid special attention to the newer material from Poringland and Hengrave. He stressed the complementarity of Anglican and Roman Catholic concepts of authority and the significance of the one major addition made to the earlier part of the document in the insertion of a paragraph on the diffuse nature of authority particularly stressed in the Anglican tradition. The Bishop finally asked how the Commission wished to handle the document.

Fr. Ahern felt that the document was over optimistic and needed considerable tightening up, though he was not unhappy at its development.

Bishop Clark urged the Commission to look at the new material.

Professor Fairweather noted two tasks 1) an examination of new material 2) an astringent redrafting of the whole document.

Bishop of Ossory asked for an examination of paragraphs 19 following, but after an intervention by Fr. Yarnold it was agreed to consider from 13 onwards.

Fr. Ryan objected to "universal communion". This would be misunderstood by baptists and other American protestants.

Fr. Duprey said this was a problem for multi-lateral conversations to solve.

Fr. Ryan suggested the phrase "That unity for which Christ prayed which we call universal communion".

Dean Chadwick preferred the simple addition of the phrase "The embodiment of that unity for which Christ prayed", but Mr. Charley felt this raised more problems.

Professor Root asked what was so objectionable in the phrase
the

Fr. Ryan replied to the effect that term had been a shibboleth since a book by Lansdorf in the earlier part of this century.

Fr. Yarnold was worried that the Truth Sub-Commission work on the nature of authority had been discarded, but Bishop Butler urged that as questions arose they might be given explanation. The document should not become an essay in linguistic philosophy.

Bishop Vogel was nevertheless anxious that faith should not be equated with propositional knowledge. He urged the addition of the appositional phrase "For the Christian truth is a person".

Fr. Ahern asked that the transition of thought at the beginning of V should be made clearer. - authority in matters of faith. The first three sentences of 13 did not zero in.

Fr. Tillard said that the koinonia required an authority in matters of faith, and primacy derived its authority from this service to the koinonia.

Fr. Yarnold urged the need for more precision in the phrase "The heart of this common phrase is Jesus Christ." He wanted this to mean a personal relationship with Christ.

Dean Chadwick wanted something to be said in this paragraph to the effect that though Christians had the task of understanding the truth in which they stood, nevertheless full understanding was eschatological.

Dr. Gassmann urged some treatment of authority in relation to the problem of a local church losing the truth.

Bishop Clark said that Christians tended to think of the communion being universally maintained until their own particular tragedy of division.

Fr. Ryan questioned the meaning of "character" in 14.

Fr. Tavard also disliked the word "continually" in relation to the Holy Spirit. Fr. Ahern also agreed with this point.

Professor Scarisbrick wanted to see some reference to the work of the Holy Spirit resolving the disputes of sincere men.

Fr. Yarnold wondered whether the use of 'memorial' was different to that of the Eucharist Statement. He preferred to leave out the reference to the Eucharist as confusing, but Bishop Butler thought it important to keep it in.

Dean Chadwick offered "in which is made present" instead of "of". Dr. Gassmann preferred "He makes present".

Bishop Butler was unhappy with the phrase "based upon". He preferred the view that the Scriptures were the norm of belief. They derived from the remembrance and not the other way round.

Professor Fairweather agreed with this, and Bishop Vogel noted a similar point in paragraph 2.

The Dean offered "Controlled by".

Fr. Tavard was also unhappy at the equation of repetition with confession of faith.

Fr. Ahern affirmed that creeds were not based on Scripture but the apostolic witness.

Fr. Yarnold was equally unhappy with the "ground" at the end of the paragraph, but Fr. Tillard said that this was correct because the subject was now the preaching of ministers.

Bishop Vogel returning to paragraph 2 asked for the insertion of the phrase "normative record of the authentic foundation of faith".

Professor Scarisbrick asked if the church had acted in way suggested in paragraph 15.

Archbishop Arnott thought that the homoousion was such an example.

Professor Scarisbrick asked if the word "valid" had any particular force at the end of paragraph 15. Professor Root echoed this.

Bishop Clark wondered whether the use of the word avoided the issue.

Bishop Vogel felt that it indicated that an expression or formula was right in a particular situation.

Bishop Butler did not feel that any formulas were necessary. He suggested that the word "authentic" would be better.

Fr. Yarnold felt that important material had been produced at Oxford by the Truth Sub-Commission and he quoted paragraph 3 and paragraph 7 of ARCIC 144/1/2.

Fr. Tavard felt that the present document was not as clear as this.

After coffee Bishop Clark nominated Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Fr. Tavard as drafters, and the discussion continued.

Fr. Ahern found that 16 was so pneumatological as to be unrealistic and asked for the excision of the three references to the Holy Spirit. He wanted the human element to be noted.

Fr. Ryan said that in the Marcionite Controversy it had not been suggested that a canon had been intended by the Holy Spirit.

Dean Chadwick felt that the suggestions simply indicated that the Holy Spirit's activity was not unmediated.

Fr. Duprey did not wish to see an opposition between the human element and the Holy Spirit.

Fr. Ryan wished to see a strengthening of the reference to the Holy Spirit in paragraph 17.

Fr. Tillard insisted that the Church was conscious of the Holy Spirit's guidance in matters of faith.

Dr. Gassmann said that when speaking of the Holy Spirit an act of faith was being made. Perhaps a final sentence could be added to this effect after the historical description.

Bishop Butler felt that the first sentence of 17 suggested the linear descent of the community. Were Anglicans aware of what they were saying in the document.

Fr. Duprey suggested that the word "universal" be left out.

Bishop Butler then wondered whether the argument had been surrendered.

Mgr. Purdy felt that the word "affected" was not the best possible one and Fr. Yarnold suggested the sentence be deleted.

Fr. Yarnold also found difficulty with the last sentence of 17, "he judged" sounded unilateral.

Bishop Vogel asked for a reference to the time.

Bishop of Ossory said that this reflected the fact that it was not unilaterally accepted that papal ratification was necessary to an ecumenical council.

Professor Scarisbrick suggested "his responsibility came to include".

Bishop Butler felt that the paragraph was confused and the last sentence might be omitted.

Bishop Clark felt the matter was important as it introduced the idea of an initiative in matters of faith.

Bishop Moorman felt that response to an appeal was inconsistent with a personal initiative.

Fr. Ryan said that several responsibilities had been confused in this paragraph, not all of which were related to matters of faith.

Dean Chadwick agreed that it needed redrafting. Nevertheless a value judgement was involved and it was in certain respects important for the Church to keep the concept of papal recognition.

Bishop of Ossory pointed out the importance of the reverse that there had been papal acceptance of doctrines not accepted by large sections of the Church.

Archbishop Arnott found 18 also rather repetitive in its references to the Holy Spirit.

Bishop Butler wanted to know which accepted positions had been shown to be inconsistent with the Gospel.

Professor Scarisbrick offered the dogma that outside the Church there is no salvation.

Bishop Butler said that it was an interpretation of this that had been rejected.

Fr. Tvard felt that according to the logic of the paragraph, declarations of impermanent value must indicate that Christ had abandoned his Church.

Archbishop Arnott was unhappy at the word "authentic".

The Revd. Julian Charley said that some things had been held which were now seen to be inconsistent.

Fr. Yarnold said this was not say that they had been originally mistaken.

Fr. Ryan was unclear as to which two operations of the Spirit were being referred to.

Bishop Vogel suggested the official teaching of the Church and the sensus fidelium.

Bishop Butler also found this unclear and asked for a redrafting.

Fr. Yarnold made a plea for the drafting of a distinction between different types of authority and drew attention to an alleged ambiguity at the end of paragraph 18. He recalled Bishop Butler's paragraphs at Grottaferrata.

Dean Chadwick asked what was the thrust of the paragraph.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher said that it was to lead into the special role of the primate.

Bishop of Ossory asked if the paragraph was too compressed.

Professor Fairweather did not like the suggestion that traditions believed at the beginning of the paragraph and Fr. Yarnold added that the whole phrase added nothing.

On paragraph 19 Dr. Gassmann felt that the two references to the Holy Spirit appeared simply to raise the tone of the debate.

Bishop Vogel asked for the addition of the word "special" in relation to the collective responsibility of bishops.

Bishop Moorman asked if there was a distinction between the bishop as primate declaring the common mind and the Pope interpreting and defending the common faith.

Fr. Tillard and the Bishop of Ossory said there had been no special implication behind this.

The Revd. Julian Charley did not like the term "College of Bishops", but more seriously he felt there were no adequate safeguards in the paragraph. He wanted to know what the extraordinary circumstances were and the force of the word "analagous".

Bishop Moorman did not feel that the paragraph described Anglican primacy very accurately.

Fr. Yarnold asked if the paragraph was talking about ex cathedra statements or had a wider reference.

Bishop Clark said that it had a more general reference.

Dean Chadwick felt that the suggestion of extraordinary circumstances was important. A gathering of all bishops might be difficult or impossible. The President might have to act and speak on their behalf for and the faithful.

Bishop Vogel felt that the paragraph described the ordinary exercise of authority.

Professor Root thought that the expression suggested that there was no primacy unless the circumstances were extraordinary.

Fr. Ryan felt that the Holy Spirit had been added on. He quoted Christus Dominus to the effect that the Bishops work was in the power of the Spirit.

Professor Fairweather noted the ambiguity of the analagous circumstances referred in paragraph 19. This appeared to give Anglican assent to the ex officio claims of the Pope.

Bishop of Ossory noted that the phrase "in communion with him" had been inserted to guard against such an understanding.

Bishop Vogel felt that if paragraph 19 were more concerned with ordinary authority, then paragraph 20 would follow more smoothly - to be followed by a further paragraph on the extraordinary role of the primate.

Mr. Charley asked for the last sentence to be simplified.

Fr. Ryan was unclear as to the meaning of "associated" in 20a.

Dr. Gassmann asked whether the ministry referred to in 20b was the particular ministry of the primate.

Dean Chadwick wondered whether the beginning of 20b would cause problems with non ex consensu.

Fr. Ryan said that this did not mean the pope could teach in isolation, it was the primacy to which this referred.

Mr. Charley was not happy with the word "apostolic" in 20a.

Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Butler queried whether a primate could not in fact act in isolation.

Mr. Charley asked for some treatment of whether primacy let alone papacy was a matter of faith.

Fr. Ryan commented that for the Roman Catholic even if the pope did act in isolation, he still did so as head of the college.

25th August: 3.30 p.m. -7-

Bishop Clark opened discussion on paragraph 21 from the chair.

Bishop Butler asked whether "local churches" referred to a diocese or a particular church.

Dean Chadwick suggested "in different regions".

Bishop Butler then asked for the sense of "however".

Fr. Ryan thought that "purely administrative" might be better.

Fr. Duprey insisted that autocephaly was compatible with primacy.

Fr. Ahern wanted "did" accept.

Bishop Butler offered "accepted and integrated". Nor could he accept the church as having been divided. He offered the word "Christendom".

Fr. Ryan questioned "absorbing".

Bishop Moorman noted the difficulty many had with the term "organic unity".

Fr. Yarnold wanted to see the phrase "ought always to maintain".

Bishop Vogel suggested the addition of the word "legitimate" to "purpose".

Professor Scarisbrick asked for an explanation of the logic of the last sentence. He maintained that in the seventeenth century the Anglican Church had been more centralised than any other.

Fr. Yarnold made a further plea for the clarification of the meaning of authority.

Dean Chadwick asked whether the concept of authority was to include the notion of the duty to obey.

Bishop Butler felt that assent was important. It could not be given in varying degrees.

Dean Chadwick said that even assent to a formula might have a footnote and that there could be a difference in the nature of assent according to the differing content of formulas.

Fr. Duprey agreed that the content of belief was important and maintained this in spite of Bishop Butler's question as to whether this even applied to ecumenical councils.

Bishop Vogel stressed that faith rather than assent was the important thing.

Bishop Butler stressed that the intellectual assent given to Nicea had vital importance.

Fr. Tavard suggested that clarification might be made. A footnote might deal with authority in relation to obedience, but the document must concentrate on trust.

Fr. Ryan noted that in the whole document authority and sanction were only put together in relation to the bishop of the local church.

Fr. Duprey insisted that the primacy did not involve the imposition of an overriding authority. He noted that paragraphs 1 - 7 concerned different aspects of authority.

Mr. Charley was worried about the relation of official authority to the convergent situation. He wanted a guarantee of legitimate freedom of thought. At what point was there a genuine admission that something had been wrong.

Bishop Butler insisted that this was a question for Roman Catholics too. Not even Vatican II managed to get the admission that the curia had been ^{wrong} in the Galileo case.

Dean Chadwick said that no church apologises, but a church might change its mind.

Mr. Charley was not concerned with apologies. He was rather concerned with integrity and did not wish mistakes to be simply skirted round.

Dr. Gassmann said that it had to be shown that the Church was not an automaton.

Fr. Duprey noted that all human authority had been described as inadequate in the document. Unam Sanctam had been clearly declared to be in error.

Bishop Clark feared that unless the Church was able to say where it stood, authority would lapse into private judgment.

Professor Root noted that it was not only Rome which had been wrong.

Fr. Ryan felt that the infallibility of the church should be stressed more.

Fr. Tillard agreed that 18 needed rewriting.

Professor Fairweather said that a footnote on infallibility would be very important indeed. The problem was whether the Roman Catholic theory of authority allowed for the reconsideration of decisions.

Fr. Tillard affirmed that progress in truth did not mean a series of additions, rather clarification.

Fr. Ryan felt that paragraph 9 needed expansion.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether there was agreement that there was a ministry for the safeguarding of the koinonia in truth, or was there simply agreement that this had existed in the past.

Dean Chadwick wanted to say that for the unity of the Church a ministry to safeguard the universal koinonia was needed.

Bishop Butler added that this need not necessarily be papacy or council. The question was whether it was necessary or whether the Church needed it.

Fr. Duprey wished to avoid the word "necessity". He preferred the term "will of Christ", but Fr. Yarnold felt there were difficulties with this. Fr. Duprey wanted to avoid a disjunction between history and matters of faith.

It was decided that the Commission should divide into three Sub-Commissions to deal with Section V, Section VI and finally paragraph 18.

Friday, 27th August: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop McAdoo introduced the first and second Sub-Commission documents from the chair.

Fr. Yarnold spoke to 156/V/1. He noted the changes from the Hengrave document. Paragraphs 13 and 14 had been tightened up. 15a was an addition from the Oxford Truth Sub-Commission. 16 was a substitution and 17 had been reworked.

Bishop Butler asked for the inclusion of a reference to the experience and witness of Jesus in paragraph 14. Fr. Ryan asked for clarification and Bishop Butler explained that he meant the revelation to Jesus.

Fr. Tillard did not know how this could be known.

Bishop Butler affirmed that tradition was the means.

Fr. Ahern felt that the word "remembrance" covered this.

Fr. Ryan supported Bishop Butler, but Archbishop Arnott felt that it would be difficult to understand.

In a straw vote 8 were in favour with 4 against.

Bishop Butler wondered whether the opening of paragraph 16 was historically accurate.

Dean Chadwick referred to Tertullian and offered "discussed".

Bishop Clark was unclear on the force of the word "because" in the penultimate sentence of 13.

Mr. Charley was unhappy at the word "schism" in the same paragraph.

Fr. Ahern said there had been discussion as to whether the word "faith" should be substituted by "truth".

Fr. Tavard also found the logic difficult.

Fr. Yarnold explained that the Sub-Commission had tried to say that Christ was the object of faith, and himself the Truth.

Fr. Tillard asked for the suppression of the sentence beginning "Because..."

Mr. Charley and Bishop Butler were unhappy at the negative nature of the last sentence.

Fr. Ryan suggested that a certain harshness was a good thing.

Dean Chadwick said that the Hengrave version was somewhat eschatological, yet it was perhaps better to avoid the word "schism".

Fr. Ahern noted the importance of the word "obscured", and Archbishop Arnott agreed.

Fr. Tillard offered "By everything which tends to destroy the communion".

Bishop McAdoo moved the discussion to paragraph 14.

Dr. Gassmann was unhappy that the Eucharist still appeared to be a human activity.

Mr. Charley did not feel that new language was discovered through the Eucharist, nor did he like the interpretation of the Eucharist Statement.

Bishop Vogel answered by noting that the data for re-interpretation was ultimately in the Eucharist, but Fr. Ahern felt there was too much in the sentence.

Mr. Charley asked for the removal of "Above all" and "makes present".

Bishop Clark found Hengrave 14 more satisfactory, but Fr. Yarnold said that in that position the Eucharist interrupted the thought of the document.

Fr. Tavad wanted to see the idea of proclamation first.

On paragraph 15 Bishop Butler asked for the addition of "expressing and" after "necessary for".

Mr. Charley complained that 15a needed expansion. It was not said to whom response was made.

Fr. Tillard questioned the necessity for 15a.

Bishop Butler did not wish to see too sharp a distinction between ordinary language and doctrinal definition.

Dean Chadwick offered the addition "for the clarification of what is believed".

Fr. Duprey wondered if the second sentence might be put in a more positive way.

Bishop Vogel explained that this section led up to the treatment of propositional expressions of the faith.

Bishop Clark saw the point in this and Archbishop Arnott drew attention to the last sentence of the whole paragraph.

Dr. Gassmann said the Gospel was contained in a language which addressed itself to men, but there was also a language which defined the faith.

Dean Chadwick felt that unless something like this was said the Commission would be accused of saying that the Gospel was doctrine simpliciter.

Fr. Tavad said that credal formulation was in propositional formulae, but the importance of this had not been made clear.

Mr. Charley did not like the term "historical matrix".

In paragraph 16 Bishop Clark disliked the Scripture references, but Bishop Butler and Archbishop Arnott felt they were valuable.

Bishop Butler thought the paragraph as a whole was excellent. It began at the bottom. Fr. Ryan liked its historical reference.

Mr. Charley felt however that the scriptural references might be seen to justify all historical development.

Bishop Butler felt there was some implication in this direction. He stressed the importance of the recognition of the Canon of Scripture.

Professor Root sympathised with Mr. Charley and did not wish there to be a blanket ^{approval} for all historical developments.

Bishop Clark felt that the last sentence needed tightening up.

Mr. Charley said that the recognition of the Canon could be interpreted in more than one way. There was the theological consideration of what was in the mind of God.

Dean Chadwick said that the Councils did have something to decide, the question of the differing lectionaries. Mr. Charley's point was not one an historian could answer.

Mr. Charley insisted that it was not an historical question.

Mgr. Purdy felt that a full stop after "whole" would help.

Fr. Ryan said that Mr. Charley had raised an important question.

Fr. T. Ryan was unhappy at the logic of the first and second sentences. The second sentence opened up a process with no limitation. He suggested "illustrated their certitude". The second quotation was more apposite than the first.

Moving on to paragraph 17 the Bishop of Ossory queried the suggestion that all the local churches sought the approbation of the Roman see. He asked for the deletion of the definite article and Fr. Tavad sympathised with this. Bishop Butler pointed out that this would make nonsense of the rest of the sentence.

Bishop Clark asked whether other churches deliberately abstained, and the Bishop of Ossory cited the churches of North Africa.

Bishop Butler felt this was true in regard to matters of discipline, but not in regard to fundamental matters of the faith.

Archbishop Arnott clarified this by saying that they did not necessarily accept the Roman answer.

Fr. Tavad further commented that the response from Rome was interpreted in different ways.

Bishop McAadoo then asked Professor Root to introduce 156/18/1.

Professor Root explained that the paragraph at Hengrave had been expanded into three.

Bishop Vogel asked for "a" rather than "the responsibility".

Fr. Yarnold noted that the style included several "we" phrases, but Professor Root said that this was to put a little fire into the document.

Fr. Ryan found the third sentence unsatisfactory and Professor Root noted that the Sub-Commission had not been happy with it either.

Fr. Yarnold asked for the thrust of the first paragraph.

Fr. Tavard said this was to indicate that the processes by which definitions were arrived at were by no means mechanical or automatic. The second paragraph concerned the ordinary exercise of magisterium and the third paragraph extraordinary.

Archbishop Arnott asked how the "interaction" took place.

Fr. Ahern asked why obligation was prior to competence.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted the new material in the reference to "conflict". He also asked what the sense of "proper interaction" was.

Bishop Moorman noted that Christ's promise had been referred to twice.

Mgr. Purdy found the word "automatic" difficult.

Bishop Butler offered "automatically free from errors in judgement".

Dean Chadwick noted that the last five lines asserted that the Church will endure. This was a very shocking statement. It was a matter of faith.

Bishop Butler found the word "confidence" weak.

Fr. Yarnold asked if right-wing Roman Catholics might see a denial of the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. Fr. Tavard and Fr. Tillard denied its existence.

Bishop Clark asked if the section on indefectibility was generally acceptable.

Mr. Charley agreed with its contents, but was unhappy at the use of the word. However Professor Root and Bishop Clark said that this was a footnote in the text.

Bishop Vogel found the definition of indefectibility very helpful in the present American situation.

Bishop Moorman suggested "that is why" for "thus".

Fr. Yarnold was still concerned with the question of ordinary magisterium, but Bishop Butler and Fr. Ryan found the paragraph acceptable.

Bishop Vogel found an ambiguity in the word "unique". The second part of the third paragraph seemed to speak of a different kind of authority. The Holy Spirit had been added. There seemed no possibility of failure yet not every conciliar decree was infallible.

Mr. Charley found the phrase "in obedience to the Gospel" unhelpful. Did this mean reception or the Scriptures?

Fr. Tavard said that conciliar decrees were assessed from two points of view; bishops gathered in council and the correspondence of the decrees to the Gospel on fundamental matters of faith.

Bishop Vogel still insisted that there had been an addition of a formal element - the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

Bishop McAdoo repeated the question as to the meaning of "obedience to the Gospel".

Fr. Tavard interpreted this as accordance with the Scriptures.

Bishop Vogel liked the phrase and noted its correspondence with the Lutheran dialogue.

Fr. Ryan offered "may possess unique authority". This depended upon the content of the decree (a fundamental matter of faith) and the process of discernment in the Church.

Bishop Vogel wanted the addition of "may" in respect of commitment and irrevocability.

Professor Fairweather asked for some modification. The Arian councils were relevant. Who discerned obedience to the Gospel? Was it private judgement? The Anglican role of the corporate Sensus Fidelium must be expressed here.

Bishop Butler wanted "the bishops".

Bishop Moorman questioned whether Vatican II took place in a time of crisis.

Fr. Ahern noted there had been no specification of councils.

Professor Root noted that this had been the Sub-Commission's response to the objections to the Hengrave draft.

Bishop Butler said that if local councils were being referred to, the whole paragraph was a nonsense.

Dean Chadwick suggested "which are of far more than regional concern, the bishops from more than one province"

Fr. Duprey made the point that there was no authoritative list of ecumenical councils.

Dean Chadwick asked for a longer treatment of the authority of councils. Numbers were not decisive. Content and manner of proceeding were both important. The authority of councils could not be looked at from a purely juridical point of view. Much depended on what was said. While councils might err, Anglicans also wanted to say something positive about them. The bishops were not inspired prophets, but their charism collectively was very different from that of the bishop in his diocese. In faith the Church affirmed that it was negatively assisted so as not to formulate error.

Bishop McAdoo insisted that conciliar authority included the substance of the decisions.

Bishop Clark was afraid of a purely circular argument here.

Mgr. Purdy felt that the Anglican reader would find the paragraph treating of what appeared to be Roman Catholic realities. It was in a historical vacuum.

Bishop Butler felt that if the Commission was envisaging a goal to its work, an ecumenical council might not merely be an abstract reality for Anglicans.

Dr. Gassmann asked for a projection ~~to~~ the future as well as an interpretation of the past - conciliar fellowship.

Fr. Tavad insisted that the conciliar process was indeed familiar to Anglicanism.

Bishop Vogel instanced collegial decisions in the current ordination of women crisis.

Dean Chadwick asked whether principles of ecclesiology prevented full communion. The document should elicit that truth which Catholic theologians wished to affirm by the term "infallibility".

Bishop Butler affirmed his conviction that crises of faith could arise which threatened the unity of the Church in its obedience to the Gospel. Catholics believed that God would enable the Church to make a judgement and that he would protect the Church from committing itself irrevocably to error. He instanced the Arian controversy.

Dean Chadwick seriously questioned whether the content of indefectibility and infallibility were known.

Mr. Charley felt that the thrust of the document, with its stress on episcopate, was in danger of becoming imbalanced.

Dr. Gassmann instanced the Barmen Declaration.

Fr. Ryan agreed that heroes and saints demonstrated one way in which God guarded the Church, but the Commission had the duty of explaining the institutional charism of the episcopate.

Fr. Duprey noted that Catholic theology often concentrated on extreme cases. This was certainly the case with infallibility.

Fr. Tillard said that it was not the only way the Church was led into the truth.

Mr. Charley still thought that the document was becoming too episcopal.

Bishop Butler cautioned that propositions were not infallible because they were true, rather the converse, but Dean Chadwick found the distinction very difficult.

Professor Root noted that the Sub-Commission had spoken of those with special responsibility.

The Commission decided not to look at the third Sub-Commission's work until it was in a more complete state. It was decided to adjourn into Sub-Commissions again.

Saturday, 28th August: 11.30 a.m.

The draft 156/V/2 was read and Bishop Clark opened discussion on paragraph 13.

Bishop Moorman noted the omission of a concern for mankind.

Fr. Yarnold explained this was to tighten the argument.

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the term "assist" in paragraph 14. The remembrance was the milieu of the search for language.

Bishop Butler and Bishop Vogel felt that "guides" might be better.

Fr. Tillard insisted that it was within the remembrance.

Professor Fairweather had a difficulty as the Gospel was already relevant.

Dean Chadwick offered "makes evident the relevance of the Gospel".

Mr. Charley had a problem over baptism and the Holy Spirit continually moving the People of God, but Bishop Vogel noted the prominence of public baptism and the re-affirmation of baptismal vows.

Bishop Butler noted that it was baptism, not a baptism.

Fr. Duprey suggested the addition of a comma after "worship", and Bishop Butler then suggested the addition of "and".

Fr. Tillard asked for "through proclamation of the word and reflection upon it", but Bishop Vogel noted that the text reflected the liturgical order.

Dean Chadwick suggested "through its proclamation".

Mr. Charley queried whether "interpretation" was the most precise word.

Bishop McAadoo suggested "communication" and others offered "restatement", "exposition", "expression" and "presentation".

Bishop Clark moved on to paragraph 15 and asked whether the "but" in the last sentence of 15a was necessary.

Bishop Butler felt this did add something and Mr. Charley offered "only instrumental".

Fr. Tillard now wondered whether "prophetic" was the right word.

Fr. Ahern noted that "translate" was otherwise colourless.

Bishop Butler wickedly questioned whether the second sub-paragraph added anything.

Fr. Tillard explained that this was to indicate that clarification did not mean Newman's theory of the development of doctrine.

Bishop Vogel asked for some conflation.

Fr. Tillard suggested the sub-paragraph be put after 14.

Bishop Moorman thought that the mention of diverse cultures was important and Bishop Butler wanted this extending to cultures of different geographical areas.

Fr. Ryan and Dr. Gassmann asked for this to be put into 14, but Mr. Charley still felt it was saying something distinct.

Bishop Moorman disliked the word "bettered".

In paragraph 16 Fr. Tavad wondered whether "at all" said anything. Was the reference to Matthew 18:20 allegorical?

Fr. Tillard still questioned the wisdom of the Acts 15:28 reference as it bore a very special relationship to other councils.

Fr. Yarnold maintained that it had the same assurance, but Fr. Tillard disagreed.

Bishop Butler suggested "implied an assurance that".

Bishop McAdoo wanted the content of councils to be mentioned.

Fr. Yarnold noted that the councils dealt with discipline and fundamental doctrine.

Dean Chadwick suggested the addition of a parenthetical clause ("and the subject matter").

Bishop Butler did not think that the paragraph was dealing with the criteria of councils.

Fr. Tavad noted three different levels of authority, that of the canon, that of fundamental doctrine and that of discipline, but Fr. Ryan thought that this was too anachronistic.

Dean Chadwick suggested the omission of the reference to discipline.

Fr. Tavad still maintained that the authority involved in the recognition of the canon was univocal.

Archbishop Arnott pointed out that the omission of reference to discipline made the link with the following material difficult to see.

Fr. Ryan made the point that the matter under discussion was the conciliar mode of authority and Fr. Tavad suggested a redrafting to make this clearer.

In paragraph 17 Professor Fairweather suggested that "but" replace "in" in the last sentence.

Bishop McAdoo asked whether the paragraph was saying that ratification by Rome was necessary for an ecumenical council.

Archbishop Arnott stated that consultation had taken place.

Fr. Ryan preferred to speak of the church at Rome.

Bishop McAdoo repeated his question.

Bishop Butler cited the examples of the Seventh Ecumenical Council and the request by the emperor for Roman confirmation of Chalcedon.

Dean Chadwick agreed that the paragraph accurately reflected the situation with regard to all the ancient ecumenical councils. While agreement was regarded as necessary, not every council accepted by Rome was regarded as universally binding.

Fr. Tavad felt that "validity" was too anachronistic.

Bishop Clark suggested "acceptance" but Fr. Ryan insisted on the word valid. There was the question of the incorporation of the creed into the civil law.

Fr. Tavad offered "legality".

Bishop Butler felt the civil reference was unimportant.

Fr. Yarnold felt strongly that "validity" was right.

Fr. Tillard wanted "reception". The recognition of the Roman see belonged to the problem of reception.

Fr. Yarnold pointed out that this would put the Roman see outside the workings of the council, but Bishop Butler did not feel the force of this point.

Bishop McAdoo felt that validity was anachronistic.

Bishop Butler noted its use by Ignatius, but Fr. Tillard felt there was a difference between the Greek and Latin.

Fr. Ahern suggested "binding force" or "power"

Dean Chadwick felt that validity was right.

On a straw vote 13 were in favour and three against.

Bishop Clark asked the Commission to look at 156/18/2.

Bishop McAdoo thought it good.

Bishop Butler noted that there were also false prophets who caused conflict.

Fr. Yarnold and Professor Fairweather asked for some nouns in the opening sentences.

Bishop Butler offered "at times there result conflict and debate".

Fr. Ryan thought there was a suggestion of progression. Things might be forgotten.

Dean Chadwick mused that truth was sometimes with those who were happy to stay put and be lapped.

Mr. Charley felt that "reminding" needed to come into the first paragraph.

Dean Chadwick felt that radical restatements might also be added to the list.

Fr. Tillard noted "remembrance" figured prominently in previous paragraphs.

Fr. Duprey wanted it to be clear that the lack of a guarantee applied to day to day teaching.

Fr. Yarnold sympathised with this in that it might seem to conflict with papal infallibility.

Dean Chadwick suggested the omission of the phrase referring to the absence of a guarantee.

28th August: 3.30 p.m.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the second sub-paragraph of 156/18/2.

Fr. Yarnold was unhappy with the sentence beginning "No initiative". Again it was not clear that this referred to the ordinary magisterium.

Fr. Ryan suggested the removal of "any", but Bishop Butler felt this would not help.

Fr. Ahern suggested the omission of the third sentence, but Fr. Tillard said this was an attempt to define ordinary magisterium.

Fr. Ahern felt it might also refer to extraordinary.

Bishop Vogel asked whether papal infallibility was defined in such a way that the pope could err, but on occasions did not.

Dean Chadwick suggested the removal of the "no initiative" sentence. He also suggested that the fourth sentence should begin "Even if those who have a specific responsibility..." and the sixth sentence should begin "We believe that Christ....."

Professor Root felt this would be a big loss.

Fr. Tillard explained that this indicated the indefectibility of the whole Church.

Fr. Ryan suggested that this might be put positively.

Fr. Yarnold felt that the present paragraph might be susceptible of a so-called Anglican view of indefectibility whereby the Church was restored from time to time by the Holy Spirit. The Roman Catholic view was that the Church never totally failed of the truth.

Bishop Vogel did not think there was a difference between the churches. The Church never ceased to be the Church.

Fr. Ahern said that not all local churches would err.

Bishop McAdoo recalled Bramall "That the whole Church can err completely in fundamentals is impossible.

Dean Chadwick welcomed the paragraph. He did not think that a humanistic notion of indefectibility was authentically Anglican.

Dr. Gassmann pointed out that people were referred to, not local churches.

Fr. Yarnold asked for the penultimate paragraph to be strengthened.

Bishop Butler offered "at all times" and asked for "certain".

Mr. Charley found Bishop Butler's suggestion unrealistic. He asked for "with Christian hope".

Bishop Vogel asked for "in faith".

Dean Chadwick affirmed that some liked it as it was.

On the third paragraph Fr. Ryan asked for the reference of "it" in the third sentence.

Fr. Tillard noted the reference to truth.

Bishop Butler suggested the amendment "Though not exhaustive they add nothing to the truth, but clarify the Church's understanding".

Bishop Vogel asked for a temporal note in the reference to recognition, but Fr. Tillard felt that the recognition of councils had not always been in the course of time.

Mr. Charley was unhappy at the ambiguity of "consonant with Scripture".

Fr. Tavad said that this had been deliberate.

Bishop Butler agreed with Mr. Charley that this was unacceptable.

Dean Chadwick noted that the sentence was not 'if and when'.

Fr. Tavad said that councils had to be consonant with Scripture to exclude what was erroneous.

Bishop McAdoo asked if it meant "being consonant with Scripture".

Bishop Butler pointed out that Arius could have accused the Fathers of Nicaea of being inconsonant with Scripture. He also noted that unless the reference was to ecumenical councils the paragraph was verbiage.

Mr. Charley said Anglicans used Scripture as one criterion.

Fr. Tavad said that the term "general councils" had been used in order to make sense of the last sub-paragraph.

Fr. Tillard pressed for specific reference to fundamental matters of the faith.

Bishop Butler suggested "Its decisions on fundamental matters of the faith".

Fr. Duprey suggested the removal of "consonant with Scripture".

Fr. Ryan noted the Church could make decisions at other times.

Fr. Yarnold suggested that "in consonance with Scripture" might be put into the first sentence, but Fr. Tavad said that anybody could speak in such a way.

Bishop Butler suggested "We believe that the Church, in times of crisis or when fundamental matters of faith are in question, can make judgements in consonance with Scripture which are authoritative. When the Church meets in ecumenical councils its decisions on such matters exclude what is erroneous."

Dean Chadwick suggested "made after the consultation of both Scripture and tradition and when given universal acceptance exclude what is erroneous".

Fr. Tillard felt that universal acceptance could not be one of the criteria.

Fr. Duprey defined an ecumenical council as that which had received acceptance. It was traditional theology that there was a primacy of content.

Fr. Ryan agreed.

Mr. Charley also noted that both traditions assessed content.

Bishop Butler made the point that reception was one of the criteria of infallibility, but infallibility resided in the council.

Fr. Yarnold was not happy with the word "confessed". Some things were true but no longer relevant.

Bishop Butler insisted that fundamentals were always confessed.

Fr. Duprey was unhappy that the last sub-paragraph suggested that Anglicans and Roman Catholics could constitute an ecumenical council by themselves.

Bishop Butler suggested "the churches".

Bishop Clark then asked for 156/VI/1 to be read.

Fr. Tavard queried the term "principal see" as neither the United States Catholic or Episcopal Churches possessed one.

Fr. Ryan and Bishop Vogel were not happy at the word "element" in 19b.

Mr. Charley suggested "is fundamental to".

Dr. Gassmann felt that fidelity was due to Christ but Fr. Duprey argued that there were two levels.

Archbishop Arnott queried episcopal ordination as ambiguous.

Fr. Ryan noted that some primates were installed.

Bishop Vogel urged that there should be some mention of Christian freedom.

Professor Scarisbrick wondered whether the first and second sentences of 20 might be removed.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher wondered whether there was a redundant "exist to serve".

Fr. Tillard felt that the first and second sentences showed that primacy was episcopal.

Fr. Ahern suggested that the last sentence of 20a might end 19.

Archbishop Arnott questioned whether a council had never acted without a primate. He cited Nicaea.

Dean Chadwick pointed out that the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Papal Legates had constituted a joint presidency. Constantine had not presided over the Council, only over the dinner in conjunction with it.

Fr. Tillard wondered whether the sentence added anything, but Bishop Butler and Mr. Charley insisted that it was a hinge of the argument.

Fr. Yarnold suggested "a council needs a primate".

Dean Chadwick pleaded for a less Western approach. He wanted to see a reference to primacy fostering freedom.

Bishop Clark noted that there was nothing yet on the intervention of a presiding bishop, but Bishop Butler felt this had been included in 19.

Fr. Duprey urged that the Commission must speak of infallibility somewhere.

Dean Chadwick proposed an addition to 19a. "Moreover if his position is recognised by the faithful to give him a general responsibility for the defence of the faith, the Church will rightly expect him to speak on his own initiative without necessarily holding a formal council to consult his colleagues".

Fr. Yarnold wanted a footnote on infallibility after 22a.

Fr. Ryan asked for the removal of "re-union" in 22.

Dr. Gassmann asked for an element of renewal. He felt that there should be love and confidence before unity as well as after.

Mgr. Purdy suggested "prospect".

Professor Scarisbrick found the word "adjustment" too comfortable.

Dr. Gassmann noted the ambiguity of episcopo.

Fr. Tillard objected to the expression "divine right". He preferred some such vague phrase as "belonging to God's design and cited Congar.

Fr. Duprey supported him.

Fr. Yarnold asked if the Commission could say that there needed to be a ministry serving the universal koinonia. This could be a corporate ministry, but the see with the best historical claim was Rome.

Fr. Ryan found the second part very abrupt. Anglicans did not feel the Roman primacy was just an accident.

Bishop Vogel felt the Commission already had the material necessary for agreement.

Fr. Tillard agreed with Fr. Ryan and wondered whether it could be said that the Roman see was not an accident without saying it was a necessity.

Fr. Duprey felt that if such material had to be included, it ought to be in a footnote.

Bishop Clark felt this might be valuable for ordinary Catholics as well.

Bishop Butler felt that the Commission could say something important on the Roman primacy being not merely an accident of history.

Mr. Charley felt that many Anglicans would want to be assured of certain negatives before any talk of unity.

Fr. Ryan wanted to know what the existential situation might be in which unity may be considered.

Fr. Duprey asked for infallibility to be dealt with in 19.

It was agreed that Sub-Commissions 18 and VI should continue their work and that V when it had completed its redraft should look at paragraphs 1-12 with the drafters.

29.8.76: 4.30 p.m.

Bishop McAdoo opened discussion on 156/V/3.

Fr. Yarnold noted that paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 had been re-arranged. There had been an addition to 15 on the way in which definitions could be reformulated, an expansion in 17 to explain "validity" and in 16 the content of councils had been included.

13 being acceptable Fr. Tillard queried whether "clarification" was the right word in 14.

Dr. Gassmann felt that creeds and conciliar definitions were too limited.

Bishop Butler suggested the addition "clarification and transmission" and this was accepted.

Dean Chadwick suggested that Dr. Gassmann's point could be met by replacing "by" with a comma. This was accepted.

Bishop Butler asked if "and its experience" could be added in the first sentence of 15, but Fr. Yarnold wondered whether this would upset the Hengrave logic.

Bishop Vogel wanted "ongoing experience", Bishop McAdoo "continuing" and Bishop Clark "subsequent".

Fr. Tillard continued to object to "prophetically".

Bishop Butler offered "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit".

By 10 votes to 1 the original text was retained.

Bishop Butler's suggestion that "stated in" be replaced by "intended by" was accepted.

Bishop Moorman found difficulty with the juxtaposition of the faithful and the content of councils in 16.

Bishop Butler suggested the text should read "substantial parts". This was accepted.

Dean Chadwick further offered "in different ways".

Mr. Charley and Bishop Moorman suggested "the subject matter of the definitions and the response of the faithful" and this was accepted.

Fr. Tillard's suggestion that "an important and widely representative" be deleted was accepted.

Bishop Clark found that 17 now suggested that the validity of councils might be only apparent after a considerable time.

Fr. Yarnold's suggestion that "not only" be omitted and "but also" be replaced by "and also" was accepted.

Dr. Gassmann thought that 16-17 were historical illustrations, but he did not want this to be limited to the early centuries. He now wondered if 18 would follow better after 15.

Dean Chadwick also noted reduplication with Hengrave 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Bishop McAdoo asked them both to pass on their views to the two drafters, and moved to 156/18/3.

Fr. Ahern was troubled with the negative associations of the word "ability" in 18b and Fr. Ryan and Fr. Yarnold agreed.

Bishop Butler did not feel this simply indicated potential.

Bishop Clark proposed "ability to continue to proclaim" but by 9 votes to 5 it was decided to retain the original text.

Bishop Butler's clarification of "though not exhaustive they do not add to the truth but clarify the Church's understanding of it" in 18c was accepted.

Bishop Hootman was sorry that "consent with Scripture" had been moved, though Bishop Clark pointed out this had been done at the Commission's suggestion.

Fr. Yarnold made the proposal that a colon should follow "erroneous" and then immediately the sentence "By the Holy Spirit...." This was accepted.

Fr. Ryan felt unhappy at the instrumentality of "by the Holy Spirit".

Mr. Charley was very uneasy that questions had been begged. Which were the ecumenical councils? What were fundamentals?

Bishop Butler offered his view that it was ultimately the prudent judgement of the individual believer which decided which councils were ecumenical and what were the fundamentals.

Mr. Charley said this helped but the paragraph did not say this.

Fr. Yarnold suggested a cross reference to 15 at this point. This was accepted.

Bishop McAdoo suggested "through the Holy Spirit" and this was accepted.

Dean Chadwick suggested a sentence from the Oxford Truth Sub-Commission document.

Dr. Gassmann asked for 18 to be divided into 18 and 19 at 18b. This was accepted.

Mr. Hill said that if this was done it should be borne in mind that both paragraphs were 'safeguards of truth'.

Fr. Ryan was unhappy at "proposed".

Bishop Butler's suggestion of "propounded by the Church" was accepted.

Fr. Duprey asked for the deletion of "which it designates as ecumenical councils".

Bishop Clark said this would suggest there had been no ecumenical councils since division.

Fr. Tillard noted that the councils had designated themselves.

Mr. Charley said that phraseology was important. It must not bind Anglicans.

Fr. Ryan suggested "some of which Roman Catholics have commonly called ecumenical".

Fr. Duprey noted that Pope Paul VI had written to Cardinal Willebrands on the occasion of the seventh centenary of the Second Council of Lyons describing it as a General Council of the West.

Bishop Butler suggested "Some of which it has designated as ecumenical". This was accepted.

Bishop McAdoo then referred 156/V/3 and 156/18/3, as amended, to the drafters and turned to a consideration of 156/VI/2.

Mr. Charley and Professor Fairweather introduced the document briefly before the session concluded.

30th August: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Clark opened discussion on the work of Sub-Commission 156/VI/2.

Dean Chadwick proposed an addition to 19a "which does not imply that his primatial authority is independent of his fellow bishops, or that power to make such an intervention attaches to him in a personal capacity".

Fr. Ahern further amended to read "merely personal".

Bishop Butler opposed "merely" and the Commission accepted the Dean's suggestion.

Fr. Ahern was unhappy that the note of recognition did not accord with the New Testament.

Fr. Yarnold therefore proposed "if his position is thus recognised".

Fr. Ryan liked this and it was accepted by the Commission.

Fr. Tillard felt 19a to be too episcopal and Dr. Gassmann agreed.

Fr. Duprey therefore proposed "in order to express the common mind of the Church".

Dean Chadwick preferred "the mind of the Church".

Mr. Charley felt that the logic of the document at this point was that the primate could speak in the name of the bishops.

Mgr. Purdy agreed as not every primatial utterance expressed the mind of the Church.

Fr. Ahern asked for the original to be kept and this the Commission agreed to do.

Fr. Yarnold wondered if the last two sentences added anything in 19b but Bishop McAdoo felt this important as governing primacy.

Archbishop Arnott noted a parallel with the Ministry Statement.

Fr. Ahern wondered whether unity might be brought into the third sentence of 20, but Fr. Duprey noted that the document had elsewhere noted the relationship between unity and faith.

Archbishop Arnott asked whether 20b was repetitive, but Bishop McAdoo and Professor Fairweather said that this was the link with what followed.

Fr. Ahern was not happy with the "whole people of God" in 21. He proposed "If it is to be fully effective requires responsible participation of the people of God."

Bishop Butler wanted to keep "whole" to make clear that bishops and primates are part of the people of God.

Bishop Vogel agreed.

By six to ten it was agreed to keep the original text and by four to eight to keep "whole".

Dr. Gassmann found the opening sentence of 21 somewhat naked.

Professor Scarisbrick thought that the logic of the paragraph required "president".

Fr. Ryan did not find the last sentence of 21 verifiable - it referred to primates and the Church. It rewrote history.

Bishop Vogel suggested "a president (primate)". This was accepted.

Mr. Charley understood Fr. Ryan's point.

Fr. Tillard asked for the addition of a sentence to 22b (The first sentence of 22b being previously transposed to the end of 22a): "Yet Anglicans do not see this necessity as so absolute that without this primate the Church could no longer exist. And they do not believe that when he speaks in the name of all his fellow bishops he necessarily cannot err. But we recognise that the position of this primate is coherent with God's design."

Fr. Duprey suggested an amendment to this "The universal koinonia of the churches", but Dean Chadwick felt this was simply stating a self-evident truth. The Church could exist without the primacy though it is highly desirable and in accordance with God's design.

Professor Root thought that this was all commentary material.

Bishop McAdoo thought the suggestion might help as spelling out Anglican difficulties.

Fr. Yarnold indicated that he too did not hold such beliefs as matters of faith.

Bishop Butler thought that difficulties ought not to come at this particular point. Mr. Charley agreed.

Fr. Duprey thought that the suggestion might help, but it said too much on primacy, and needed to be more precise on infallibility. The last part was good.

Bishop Vogel argued against the moving up of the first sentence of 22b. Bishop McAdoo and Mgr. Purdy agreed.

Professor Fairweather urged that Anglican difficulties should be dealt with later.

Dean Chadwick thought that 22a implied that the Roman primacy was coherent with God's design, but he asked whether this needed spelling out.

Fr. Tillard found that the second sentence of 22b needed expansion to be fair to Anglicans.

Fr. Ryan wanted something more positive on the way Anglicans were maintained in the truth.

Mr. Charley felt the logic of the document was suggesting that the primacy was coherent with God's design.

Bishop Clark felt that 22b really belonged to 23.

Bishop Moorman did not wish to see Anglican difficulties at this point.

Bishop Butler stated that there would have to be great changes on both sides.

Professor Root requested the addition of "and the churches of the Anglican Communion should be open and aware of the implications for their agreement of the need for primacy at the universal level", and Professor Fairweather supported this.

Mr. Charley said that this would then require an elaboration of the difficulties.

Bishop Butler thought that Anglicans were already being asked a good deal.

Dean Chadwick wondered whether there should be debate on 23 rather than 22.

Bishop Clark asked that 22 be reviewed in the light of 23.

Fr. Duprey did not want detailed negotiations to be put in a theological agreement. He did not feel 23 was at the amendment stage.

Mr. Charley agreed, as it had not even been seen by the Sub-Commission.

Bishop McAdoo suggested that difficulty might usefully be discussed and Bishop Butler agreed.

Dean Chadwick outlined the problems:

- 1) The limits of jurisdiction were undefined and therefore unlimited;
- 2) the basis of the primacy (as

commonly presented) belonged to a superseded exegesis; 3) the term jus divinum interpreted as implying that there can be no fully true church outside communion with the Roman see; 4) infallibility as an inappropriate term suggesting at the popular level an oracle.

Fr. Ryan and Fr. Tillard both asked for a stronger statement of agreement.

Fr. Duprey asked for the recognition that the Roman see was of apostolic foundation by reason of the deaths of Peter and Paul. He insisted that there must not be disagreement over bad Catholic theology.

Mr. Charley noted that the difficulties were emotive.

Bishop McAdoo asked if it could also be said that Peter was not the first bishop of Rome.

Dean Chadwick repeated his previous statement of the difficulties. He also expanded infallibility and the Marian Dogmas. They were relatively unimportant and they looked like statements about past events. He cited Chillingworth's and Farrer's objection to the use of infallible authority to establish a past fact.

Fr. Yarnold pointed out that it was only defined that Peter had successors.

It was decided that a new Sub-Commission would look at the problem outlined by the Dean and have in mind paragraph 22. The Sub-Commission would consist of Fr. Yarnold, Fr. Tillard, Bishop Butler, Bishop Moorman, Dean Chadwick and Mr. Charley.

The Sub-Commission then withdrew from the meeting to start their work.

The Business Meeting followed.

Tuesday: 31st August: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop McAdoo was in the chair and opened the discussion on 156/VII/1.

Dean Chadwick said that the document was terse. It said what was essential, though the Sub-Commission could not entirely agree as to what was desirable. He noted that in 24b there was a lack of clarity as to what was affirmed or objected to. There was still some work to be done on section (c).

Mr. Charley noted that something on the lines of the last Hengrave paragraph was desirable.

Bishop McAdoo noted that the claim in 23 did not follow from the previous sentence.

Bishop Butler suggested "the only see which makes a claim to such universal primacy" and this was accepted. "Primalial" was deleted in the same sentence.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher wondered whether the reference to the death of Peter and Paul was necessary here, but Fr. Ryan and Fr. Duprey thought it important.

Dr. Gassmann wanted to see the agreed consensus referring to more than simply primacy. He suggested "church and authority and in this context, in particular, primacy".

Bishop Vogel asked for the deletion of "some" in 24b.

Dean Chadwick said that this was a load-bearing word. Some thought that difficulty would be removed on entering into communion with Rome, others could not make that move without the recognition of a full sense of the Church.

Fr. Tvard said this also applied to Roman Catholics.

Bishop Butler noted that it was a hypothetical clause.

Fr. Yarnold raised a point of methodology. In (a) and (d) agreement had been maximised. He wanted to end up on a note of hope in (b) and (c) as well.

Mr. Charley said that (a) and (d) had shown alternatives. (b) and (c) were voicing concern.

Bishop Clark agreed with Fr. Yarnold. (b) could have been written before Vatican II.

Fr. Duprey asked for (a) to read "committed to such an interpretation of the scriptural basis". In (b) "full sense" was a problem. The Eastern churches were clearly churches. Lack of communion with Rome was a deficiency in that any local church which did not have communion with the whole Church was not fully complete.

Mr. Charley suggested "such interpretation of the Petrine texts".

Bishop Butler suggested "generally thought to be able to bear."

Fr. Ryan asked for an identification of the texts.

(a). Fr. Tillard suggested the omission of the last sentence in

Bishop Butler suggested "Roman Catholics are not dogmatically committed to any particular exegesis of these texts."

Professor Scarisbrick asked for that sentence to begin "however".

Fr. Ryan, Bishop Clark and Fr. Duprey were not altogether happy at Bishop Butler's suggestion. It appeared to be in conflict with Vatican I.

Fr. Ahern was also unhappy with this.

Bishop Vogel suggested the simple addition "most Roman Catholics".

Professor Scarisbrick proposed "However most Roman Catholic scholars do not now feel it necessary to stand by former exegesis of these texts in every respect".

Mgr. Purdy preferred the phrase "historically conditioned" which occurred in the previous draft.

Fr. Duprey also asked for its restoration.

Dean Chadwick wondered whether the paragraph actually made the point. The Commission had no wish to say that Peter had no leading role in the New Testament. The problem was the transmission to the Bishops of Rome.

Professor Scarisbrick's amendment, with the addition of "historically conditioned", was accepted.

Bishop Butler clarified whether the three major Petrine texts were to be referred to. This was also accepted.

Professor Fairweather said the present document was clearer than the previous one, but less positive.

Mr. Charley felt the optimism should come later.

Dr. Gassmann again made his point that the agreement was broader than primacy and this was accepted.

Dean Chadwick suggested the restoration of the sentence from the former paragraph 23 "While it does not wholly resolve....." This was accepted.

Bishop Vogel still felt that paragraph (b) suggested that some Anglicans did not feel their church to be fully a church.

Mr. Charley suggested the removal of the last part of the sentence and its substitution by "then a difficulty remains".

Dr. Gassmann noted that Vatican II had avoided describing all but the Orthodox churches as full churches. Nevertheless there had been the use of the term 'sister church' in official documents.

Fr. Ryan offered "in any real sense".

Dean Chadwick found this much more difficult.

Fr. Ryan and Bishop Vogel thought that trans-Atlantic semantic problems arose over this issue.

Bishop Butler suggested "in any sense fully a church".

Bishop Vogel still said this was open to the former interpretation.

Dean Chadwick observed that for some the problem would be resolved by a restoration of communion. For others the lack of a clear recognition of ecclesial reality was an obstacle to communion. He offered a solution: "But if it were further implied that as long as a church is not in communion with Rome, it is regarded by the Roman Catholic Church as less than fully a church a difficulty would remain: to some this difficulty would be removed by simply restoring communion, but to others the implication would itself be an obstacle to entering into communion with Rome". This was agreed.

Fr. Yarnold pleaded for a reference to post-Vatican II developments.

of the reference
Fr. Tvard suggested the omission to Peter and Paul and its substitution by the "universal primacy of the bishop of Rome" in (b). This was accepted.

Mr. Charley suggested that "should" be replaced by "need". This was accepted.

Archbishop Arnott asked whether a reference to Sister Churches might not be put in the Co-Chairmen's letter.

Fr. Yarnold again thought that developments in theology since Vatican II might go some way at least towards removing obstacles.

Fr. Ryan was not happy at a question and answer approach. He also asked for a summary of points of agreement in the Co-Chairmen's Preface or at the end.

After coffee Bishop McAdoo asked the Commission to look at paragraph (c) of section 24.

Fr. Ryan felt that it suggested an infallibility other than that of the whole Church.

Fr. Tvard had the same problem.

Fr. Duprey asked for some reference to the negative quality of infallibility.

Fr. Tvard proposed "for the Roman Catholic Church the pope's dogmatic definitions, when they fulfil the criteria of infallibility do no more, but no less, than express the mind of the church on issues relating to the divine revelation.

Fr. Duprey preferred conditions to criteria.

Dean Chadwick thought that Pastor Eternus defined a quality of teaching rather than a papal infallibility.

Fr. Ryan did not wish to see the term.

Fr. Duprey suggested "interpret" rather than express.

Fr. Tvard found the paragraph saying more than Vatican I.

Fr. Duprey suggested the phrase "to be preserved from error in expressing".

Bishop Butler did not wish to compromise the contingency of all statements.

Bishop Clark suggested "are preserved from error in expressing the mind of the Church on issues concerning the divine Revelation."

Fr. Tillard did not think a definition was necessary here.

Professor Scarisbrick and Mr. Charley felt that the phrase "no more, but no less" very important.

Fr. Tavard proposed a composite amendment. "For the Roman Catholic church the pope's dogmatic definitions which, fulfilling the criteria of infallibility, are preserved from error, do no more, but no less than express the mind of the church in matters concerning the divine revelation." This was accepted.

Bishop Clark found "characteristically" somewhat misleading.

Fr. Yarnold felt that the section suggested a non-conciliar view of the papacy. The Commission should not commit itself to novel doctrine.

Fr. Ryan agreed.

Archbishop Arnott asked for some reference to Vatican II in section (d).

Professor Fairweather suggested the omission of the sentence concerning the ratification of councils in (c)

Bishop Butler felt that ratification suggested that the authority of the pope was in the ordinary line of development of Catholic tradition.

Fr. Duprey felt the sentence was unnecessary and with this Fr. Tillard agreed.

Fr. Ryan noted that the definition of the Assumption was in line with Vatican I at which it had been petitioned.

Fr. Tillard asked for the removal of the reference to the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption.

To differentiate from the earlier dogmas Mgr. Purdy's suggestion of "recent" was accepted.

Fr. Yarnold hoped that the section might end in a positive way with the idea that the dogmas illuminated the content of the faith.

Bishop Vogel wondered whether a reference to the hierarchy of truths might be appropriate here.

Fr. Ahern said that many Roman Catholics questioned the appropriateness or necessity of the definitions. He felt that Anglicans also questioned the facts.

Mr. Charley firmly agreed.

Professor Root still felt "appropriate" to be correct. Anglicans had the option of accepting the doctrines.

Bishop Butler suggested "Most Anglicans doubt the appropriateness or even the possibility of defining them.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested the omission of "most" from Bishop Butler's amendment.

Professor Fairweather also affirmed that it was not a matter of Anglican faith to reject the dogmas.

Mr. Charley was still worried over their actual content.

Bishop Butler's amendment was accepted, as amended by Bishop Knapp-Fisher.

On paragraph (d) Fr. Tavad asked for the inclusion of the word "immediate".

Bishop Vogel suggested the substitution of "use" for "extension".

Archbishop Arnot repeated his request for references to Vatican II.

Fr. Duney suggested "theologians since Vatican II".

Mr. Purdy suggested "the Second Vatican Council has further encouraged theologians to seek".

Mr. Charley felt that Vatican II should be reserved for a positive conclusion to the document.

Professor Fairweather did not like the suggestion, as it implied that the pastoral approach had begun at Vatican I.

Bishop McAdoo also felt it had best come at the end of the document. This was agreed by eight votes to two.

On paragraph 25 Bishop Butler suggested "In view of the history of our present division", as Fr. Ryan did not like the way the first sentence opened.

Mr. Purdy said that the misuse of authority by the Roman see was one of the causes of division.

Dr. Gaggmann felt that the Roman Catholic Church should be specified rather than the Roman see.

Bishop Clark also felt this was too limited.

Dean Chadwick did not feel that 25 could be discussed in detail, as there was a conclusion to follow. He wanted to say that the acceptance of the Roman primacy by Anglicans would be a challenge to both sides.

Bishop Clark suggested that the same Sub-Commission should proceed to work on paragraph 25 and a conclusion.

Bishop Vogel took Bishop Moorman's place on the Anglican side and Bishop McAdoo referred the revised sections up to 24 to the drafters.