

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

ELEVENTH MEETING: VENICE, 28TH AUGUST - 6TH SEPTEMBER 1979MINUTESTuesday, 28th August: OPENING SESSION

From the chair Bishop Clark opened practical discussion on the time-table, after prayer.

Bishop Moorman thought that the subject opened up by Fr. Yarnold's paper (ARCIC 205) was a large one. He wondered whether it was too late in the life of this Commission to tackle a fourth agreed statement on the Church.

Archbishop Arnott and Bishop Butler saw the paper as contributing to an introduction.

Revd. Julian Charley reminded the Commission that there must be some elucidation of Venice.

Bishop Vogel agreed and noted an inconsistency between an episcopal collegiality and collegiality of the whole Church in the Venice Statement.

Revd. C.Hill asked for consideration of where the elucidations should come: in the Venice continuation or the theological introduction.

Professor Root saw the elucidations as having a small 'e'.

Concluding the session Bishop Clark welcomed Mgr. Bill Purdy and Fr. Barnabas Ahern to the Commission meeting after serious illness. He gave the apologies of Fr. Ryan and Professor Scarisbrick.

Wednesday, 29th August: MORNING SESSION

From the chair Bishop Clark invited Don Germano Paterno to read a letter of greeting from the Patriarch. Mgr. Purdy translated it.

Discussion on "Draft Continuation of Venice 24" (ARCIC 204) opened after it had been read.

Bishop Vogel expressed his gratitude to Julian Charley and Jean Tillard, but he wondered whether a discussion on the prepared papers for the previous year might not have been helpful. He found the draft too indicative. He would have preferred the subjunctive mood. He noted that differing christologies would affect certitude.

Archbishop McAdoo found it difficult to distinguish what was agreed statement and what was Roman Catholic doctrine. He missed a positive affirmation of the Anglican tradition on "The Spirit's Abiding in the Church".

Bishop Vogel saw the Venice Statement as primarily historical. The present draft seemed linguistically simplistic. He clarified this by asking for illustrative models. He expanded his reference to christology by referring to Chiraco's treatment of infallibility, which presupposed that infallible statements would be normal part of the life of the Church.

Bishop Vogel (continued) Another christology would imply a different attitude to certitude.

Fr. Tillard considered the Chiraco treatment to be based on a philosophy of knowledge rather than a christology.

Fr. Tavard asked whether the Commission was seeking to expound the four issues at the conclusion of the Venice Statement or whether it was seeking to come to a common mind with a joint model of primacy in which both traditions could be recognised.

Bishop Clark invited discussion in detail (I).

Bishop Butler thought that the comparison of Matthew 16 with Matthew to be inexact. The keys of the Kingdom were not given to the Apostles.

Bishop Vogel though Matthew 18 was a commission to the Apostles.

Archbishop Arnott in some ways preferred the Tavard/Vogel draft on this subject (ARCIC 181). He found the logic of the sentence beginning "This clarifies the traditional analogy...." (page 3) somewhat odd.

Archbishop McAadoo was not absolutely certain about the references to Galatians 2:2 and Acts 15.

Professor Chadwick rather liked Galatians 2:2. He was not so happy with "Even in the light of modern exegesis" (page 2).

Professor Root was equally unhappy with the next sentence.

Revd. J. Charley agreed that the paragraph needed re-writing.

Bishop Vogel would have preferred "prominence" to "leadership" in the previous paragraph.

Bishop Clark draw particular attention to the importance of the last paragraph of the section dealing with transmission.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that transmission needed to be more convincingly argued.

Bishop Butler drew attention to the parallel obscurity of the transmission of apostolic to sub-apostolic authority. He wondered why there was the Petrine stress in Matthew, Luke and John when Peter was already dead.

Revd. J. Charley was uneasy at the Commission's attempting to come to conclusive positions granted the present state of Gospel studies.

Fr. B. Ahern agreed. He preferred the word "record" to "suggestion" in the first sentence of this paragraph. This was more consistent with the final sentence.

Bishop Butler offered "no record of any explicit transmission".

Fr. Yarnold thought the sitz in leben argument had some cogency.

Bishop Butler thought that in 1 Clement and Ignatius a Roman Primacy was recognised as having been exercised though it was not explicitly stated.

Professor Chadwick felt the paragraph needed expansion. Reference should be made to the parallel obscurity of the emergence of an authoritative ministry. There should also be reference to the continuation of the role of the apostolic sees. The problem of transmission was one for all the churches and it was within that context that Rome should be seen - the city where Peter and Paul had taught as well as died. He thought it significant that a Roman Primacy had been exercised long before Matthew 16 was thought to justify it. The episcopal munus was a petrine role, but Rome was especially the see of Peter and Paul.

Bishop Butler asked whether Paul was the co-founder of the Roman episcopate.

Professor Chadwick agreed that it was from Peter that episcopal lists had been derived, though Irenaeus considered Peter and Paul to be founders of the Roman Church.

Bishop Moorman found problems with the idea expressed in the sentence "Yet because of the tradition..."

Revd. J. Charley agreed people today would say "So what".

Fr. Yarnold did not like the implications of "Came to be recognised".

Fr. Tavard wanted other reasons to be listed for the Primacy, e.g. the importance of the City of Rome.

Fr. Ahern drew attention to Paul's esteem for the Roman Church even before Peter died (and perhaps before his arrival).

Revd. Julian Charley felt the evidence for transmission was very complex and a matter for interpretation. The real issue was in what sense it was 'necessary'.

Bishop Clark considered the issue to be in some ways similar to the monarchical episcopate.

Professor Chadwick was of the view that the insertion of the fact that Peter was not the source of the apostolate of the other apostles would be important for Anglicans.

Fr. Yarnold wondered if the draft missed anything from the point of view of the United State/Lutheran/Roman Catholic discussions.

Fr. Tavard stated that so long as the Commission was discussing the New Testament transmission would remain a problem because it was not there.

Fr. Ahern saw a parallel between the last sentence and the discussion of trajectories in Peter in the New Testament.

Professor Root asked for attention to be paid to the infelicitous use of the word "tradition" in the final paragraph.

Professor Chadwick insisted that the paragraph was important because load bearing. He hoped that it would be expanded and discuss the general problem of transmission and then the question of Rome in particular. The exercise of Primacy was not only because Rome was the city where Peter and Paul taught and died but also because it was the capital of the Empire, for which reason the Apostles went there. For Christians today however the Roman Empire had no direct relevance. There was the problem of the protestant tradition which saw the papacy as a ghost of the Roman Emperor (Hobbes). Anglicans had been without a papacy for a long time and they were more likely to accept it if the imperialism of the past had been shuffled off.

Bishop Clark moved discussion to II.

Bishop Vogel offered an amendment to the second sentence: "At the universal level it is exercised in the collegiality of all the Bishops within the context and interaction of the whole Church. The universal Primacy is part of this universal collegial episcopate. Whatever universal jurisdiction is attributed to the Bishop of Rome it can be no more than the power that the Primate possesses within the koinonia of the Church to carry out this office of supporting and encouraging unity.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher noted an equivocal use of "serve".

Bishop Clark queried Bishop Vogel's use of collegiality with reference to the Church.

Bishop Butler offered "coresponsibility" and the Revd. Julian Charley offered "koinonia".

Fr. Tavard found the text on universal jurisdiction unreal. He exemplified the custom of the papal appointment of bishops.

Fr. Duprey countered that even the Roman curia recognised this as a patriarchal right.

Revd. C. Hill urged caution over the use of the word jurisdiction. For Anglicans at least this had a very specific diocesan or metropolitan connotation. The Alberigo paper (ARCIC 134) had indicated the many meanings of jurisdiction. It was important to say what was meant by universal jurisdiction and even more important what was not.

Fr. Tillard found Bishop Vogel's amendment ultramontane. The Primacy of Rome was a primacy in the collegiality of the Bishops not directly over the whole Church.

Archbishop McAdoo liked Bishop Vogel's amendment. It was important to present an acceptable picture of universal jurisdiction.

Fr. Duprey saw Primacy as relating to the College of Bishops which in its turn related to the koinonia of the whole Church.

Revd. J. Charley thought a universal jurisdiction acceptable if it was in the right context.

Fr. Duprey found Jean Tillard's interpretation of jurisdiction very helpful: "The authority necessary to accomplish a service".

Bishop Butler asked for "the legitimate episcope" in the second paragraph of page 4. This was to rule out a Lefebvre denomination being considered as the Church.

Fr. Tillard asserted that where a real Eucharist was there the Church was.

Revd. C. Hill said "legitimate" could be read to mean "in communion with Rome".

Bishop Butler though "legitimate" was open ended. He was thinking of ruling out episcopi vagantes.

Archbishop Arnott and the Revd. Julian Charley agreed that the paragraph should not to be seen to be unchurching non-episcopal churches.

29th August: EVENING SESSION

Professor Chadwick felt the first sentence of paragraph 2, page 4 could be read as a definition of the Church. This was unhelpful at this stage.

Professor Root found "effectively" in the previous paragraph saying too little or too much.

Fr. Yarnold was anxious to know whether the section was in common or only a Roman Catholic view. It seemed to suggest that universal primacy existed already for Anglicans. Archbishop McAdoo agreed, as did Bishop Vogel.

The Revd. Julian Charley thought the real question was how far it was a given which 'must' be accepted.

Professor Fairweather thought that Venice had recommended a universal primacy.

Fr. Tillard considered that the first sentence of the second paragraph reflected the dogmatic ~~decree~~ Christus Dominus. This was the reason the Orthodox were recognised as true churches.

Bishop Butler did not find this reference convincing. He was sure that the Decree on Ecumenism and the Constitution on the Church were the context in which to set Christus Dominus which was speaking about the Roman Catholic Church.

Fr. Tillard agreed on the context but disagreed with the interpretation. Did schism destroy the Church?

Bishop Butler felt it destroyed the right to be called the Church, but not churchliness.

Professor Chadwick recognised a possible clash of ecclesiologies, one based on a communion of local churches, the other on the universal koinonia with local representatives.

The latter would result in a primacy of power over local churches.

Fr. Tillard strongly agreed. He thought Bishop Butler was still using the universal ecclesiology when Vatican II had adopted one of the communion of local churches.

Bishop Butler countered that Vatican II did not include churches out of communion.

Fr. Tillard thought that if churches were not in horizontal communion they were out of communion for Bishop Butler, but there was imperfect communion.

Bishop Butler agreed but said the relationship was not reciprocal. The Catholic Church had perfect communion.

Fr. Duprey felt that the issue of the Church had not been finally settled at Vatican II.

Professor Fairweather said there was a need to be clear what universal jurisdiction involved. Certain lay Anglican Canadians had been worried by the Venice Statement.

Fr. Tavard was not over-enthusiastic at the term universal primate. Universal had a wide range of meaning. Primate could mean monkey!

Archbishop Arnott was anxious about abuses in jurisdiction. There was the case of Pius VII all but abolishing the French hierarchy at Napoleon's behest.

Bishop Butler referred to Garrett Sweeney's "The Small Print of Vatican I" (ARCIC 98). He could conceive of occasions when intervention might be right for the good of the local church.

Professor Chadwick thought that most Anglicans did not see the universal primacy respecting episcopal conferences. Many things were decided in Rome which ought to be decided locally.

The Revd. C. Hill enquired whether there were specific limits set with the uniat churches, e.g. the Maronites.

Revd. J. Charley asked whether other churches were in the sin of schism.

Bishop Vogel found the esse/bene esse distinction helpful.

Bishop Butler thought there was no question of sin, rather irregularity. The fullness of Catholicism was in the Roman Catholic Church, but Anglicans would say that both were less than that fullness in separation.

Fr. Duprey wanted a christo-centric ecclesiology, as in Vatican II.

Bishop Vogel agreed. A eucharistic ecclesiology was precisely this.

Fr. Yarnold did not want to go back on the affirmation of Venice 23. Bishop Butler's distinction between church and churchliness only worked with one ecclesiological model.

Rev. C. Hill recalled that at the Malines Conversations Lord Halifax had firmly rejected the branch theory because he had been baptised into the Catholic Church. An ecclesiology of local churches did not necessarily involve acceptance of the branch theory.

Archbishop McAdoo did not wish to go back on Venice. "Needs to be realised" indicated a help but infallibility introduced a problem. "Needs" did not mean "absolutely necessary".

Fr. Tavard considered that terms could mean different things in different perspectives, e.g. an ecclesiology of local churches.

Fr. Duprey looked at the issue from the point of view of fact. Infallibility could not be said to be necessary. It had only been defined comparatively recently, but a primacy had existed throughout the history of the Church.