

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION
 TWELFTH MEETING: VENICE, 26TH AUGUST - 4TH SEPTEMBER 1980

MINUTES

Tuesday, 26th August: OPENING SESSION

Bishop Moorman asked whether the 'continuation' of Venice 24 would be published if completed, so that 'elucidations' could take criticism into account.

Archbishop McAdoo did not want responses to responses.

Discussion followed on the decision in principle to receive former Episcopalian clergy into the Roman Catholic Church in the U.S.A.

Wednesday, 27th August: MORNING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo invited Don Germano Pataro to read a letter of greeting from the Patriarch of Venice. Discussion then began on 211/Petrine Texts/3 from the Venice 1979 meeting.

Revd. Julian Charley was critical of an assumed analogy between the role of Peter and the Bishop of Rome.

Archbishop McAdoo did not accept such an analogy.

Bishop Butler asked whether it was normative or historically descriptive.

It was agreed to remove the idea of analogy from the beginning of the document. Discussion followed on where the 'continuation' was to come. Fr. H. Ryan and Fr. Yarnold wanted the text to be added to or to replace Venice 24. The Revd. J. Charley, Archbishop McAdoo and Professor E. Fairweather preferred not to tamper with the text at all.

Bishop Vogel felt that the Matthew 18.18 commission by Christ as to the whole Church was too wide.

Bishop Butler and Fr. B. Ahern saw the text as referring to the local church.

Revd. J. Charley considered the draft to be seriously lacking in respect of any treatment of the question of transmission.

Bishop Butler did not see the fact that the Church was built on Peter.

Fr. Yarnold saw succession as the problem.

Fr. J. Tillard agreed but preferred to speak of a continuity not a true succession.

It was agreed that Fr. G. Tavard and Bishop A. Vogel should redraft the document.

Fr. Ryan and Archbishop Arnott did not like the suggestion that all transmission of apostolic authority was in question.

Fr. Tillard thought the problem was that Roman Catholic teaching had dealt with the petrine transmission separately from that of the other apostles. The Matthew text had been dealt with in the light of historical development.

Dr. Gassmann wondered what the fuss was about if those who did not accept the interpretation could accept the primacy as God's will.

Professor Chadwick thought that Canterbury 16 was relevant, as there had been an agreement on transmission in the collegiality of the episcopate.

Fr. Ryan equalled succession to continuity in office.

Revd. J. Charley detected real disagreement in the interpretation of accepted facts.

Fr. B. Ahern thought Peter in the New Testament showed no great ecumenical divergence.

Archbishop Arnott did not see the draft answering Venice 24a.

Revd. C. Hill asked for an indication that an acceptance of the Primacy did/depend upon the Petrine Texts.
not

§24b Archbishop McAdoo invited the Commission to consider 211/Jus Divinum/3 drafted at Venice 1979.

Fr. Ryan and Professor Fairweather were appointed drafters.

Professor Root noted differing terminology for God's will.

Revd. J. Charley asked whether the term 'will of God' indicated that something was normative.

Fr. J. Tillard complained of the lack of an ecclesial dimension.

Fr. Ryan wanted the shift in ecclesial thought between Vatican I and II to be made clearer.

Professor Chadwick saw the question of the authenticity of ecclesiality as bound up with 'jure divino'.

Fr. Tillard wanted some expression of 'perfect' and 'imperfect' communion.

Fr. Yarnold preferred 'divine law' to 'divine right'.

Bishop Butler thought Vatican II's subsistit in very important.

Fr. Duprey said it was introduced to indicate continuity with the apostolic church, not exclusive identity.

Dr. Gassmann asked what was the condition of ecclesial recognition.

Wednesday 27th August: EVENING SESSION

§24c Bishop Clark opened discussion on 211/Infallibility/3 from Venice 1979.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Revd. J. Charley did not think it really answered the questions.

Bishop Butler considered the real difference to be whether there could be any infallible definitions.

Professor Chadwick posed the question whether any defining body was incapable of being erroneous.

Professor Fairweather detected an inconsistency in the use of 'charism'.

Revd. J. Charley did not think the reference to Lambeth 1948 was helpful as Scripture was only one criterion among others. He agreed that a doctrine might not be high in the hierarchy of truths but it could affect a doctrine which was so.

Bishop Butler declared that Papal Infallibility was not important but it was necessary.

Fr. Tillard agreed as some doctrines had a dogmatic importance and others a pragmatic importance.

Fr. Ryan thought it important to affirm that there was an infallible agency.

Bishop Vogel saw the question as relating to the Spirit operating in the Church.

Professor Chadwick thought that an a priori infallibility had to include the case of Pope Honorius. Consonance with Scripture and Tradition added a lot of soda water to the scotch of a priori.

Revd. J. Charley was disturbed by a Catholic tendency to keep a 'text' at all costs.

Bishop Butler insisted that it was the 'intention' which mattered the form of words being contingent. He added that the Church did not only speak indicatively.

Bishop Clark was certain some things were certain.

Professor Root thought there was ^{more} convergence than it seemed.

Fr. Tillard said that 'infallibility' belonged to the office of declaring ce qu'est. It was always a judgement.

Revd. J. Charley insisted that 'infallibility' must be presented in a way which was acceptable to a united church.

Fr. Tillard wanted Papal Infallibility to be seen in the same light as the infallibility of General Councils.

Bishop Butler related the function of 'infallibility' to that of exclusion from the community - anathema sit. Anglicans too had this ability.

Professor Chadwick did not want to put Popes and Councils on a par.

Bishop Vogel said the logical difficulty was that 'infallibility' was a potentiality only to be tested in actuality.

Fr. Duprey linked 'infallibility' to discernment in the Church.

Bishop Butler considered it closed the options of debate.

Professor Chadwick said Nicaea and Chalcedon began the debate!

It was decided that Fr. Tillard and Revd. J. Charley should re-draft the document.

Revd. C. Hill drew attention to the Canadian Statement on 'Infallibility' as found in ARCIC 228.

Bishop Clark then asked for comment upon the Marian Supplement to 211/Infallibility/2.

Fr. Ryan queried the Church 'before and after the incarnation'.

Fr. Yarnold did not want other ways of interpreting the Immaculate Conception to be excluded.

Fr. Tavard did not want the question of Mary to be isolated from the whole Patristic understanding.

Professor Chadwick insisted that the problem was one of definability.

Thursday, 28th August: MORNING SESSION

§24d Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on 211/Jurisdiction² from Venice 1979.

Archbishop Arnott, Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Mgr. Purdy were appointed drafters.

Revd. C. Hill drew attention to Fr. Ryan's amendment (ARCIC 229) and to related passages in the Burnham draft 'Elucidation'.

Dr. Gassman thought the draft was too idealistic and spoke too much of power.

Fr. Duprey disagreed as exousia was a Gospel concept.

Fr. Ryan was unhappy at the treatment of metropolitans. They did not have an immediate jurisdiction.

Bishop Moorman spoke of the right of conscience.

Fr. Tavard thought fear could not be allayed while jurisdiction remained 'immediate' and 'universal'.

Fr. Duprey countered Fr. Ryan by pointing out that Eastern Catholic metropolitans did exercise ordinary jurisdiction.

Fr. Ryan saw help in an appeal to Christus Dominus of Vatican II which showed development from Vatican I

Bishop Butler fervently hoped there would not be too much Canon Law. Authority in the Church must be Christ-like and was to be contrasted with constraint.

Professor Chadwick feared bureaucratic interference and a power which was without limit.

Professor Fairweather and Bishop Butler thought there could ultimately be no legal safeguards - a supra legal approach was needed.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought primatial authority needed to be seen to be collegial. The Synod of Bishops had been disappointing in this respect.

Dr. Gassmann asked for a statement of the conditions of union.

Professor Scarisbrick detected a note of federalism in the document. If there were to be reassurances, they must be mutual. In the end trust rather than reassurance was called for.

Fr. Ryan hoped for more explicit Anglican objections.

Fr. Duprey wanted to see an agreement at the level of faith but its expression in different ways.

Fr. Tillard insisted that the statement of Zinelli at Vatican I indicated the dogmatic principle that the primacy was not for the destruction of the local church.

Mgr. Purdy explained that the draft had been intended to state doctrine.

Professor Fairweather considered an Anglican negative observation that acceptance of the primacy did not involve certain structures to be important.

Fr. Ryan asked for a schema which would a) explain papal jurisdiction dogmatically; b) expound Anglican fears; c) postulate a trajectory for the future.

Professor Chadwick saw universal communion as magnetically attractive to Anglicans. A system of government was not so.

Archbishop McAdoo then asked the Commission to consider the re-drafting of the material on the Petrine Texts (ARCIC 230/Petrine Texts/1).

Dr. Gassmann posed the question whether there was a biblical foundation for the office of the bishop of Rome.

Revd. J. Charley complained that the problem of continuity and succession had not been dealt with.

Bishop Clark insisted that each local church was in continuity with the apostolic church.

Fr. Ahern found some passages minimalist.

Fr. Tillard said that only some features of the Petrine ministry were transmissible. There were some signs in the New Testament of the centring of the Church in Rome. He cited Peter in the New Testament.

Fr. Tavard thought it unwise to base agreement upon speculation.

Revd. J. Charley repeated that transmission was the problem. The draft did not answer Venice 24(a). He wanted it said the texts did not form a major part of the argument for the Primacy.

Fr. Tavard saw two ways of handling the issue: 1) a treatment of the texts themselves; 2) a critique of the claims made for the texts.

Fr. Yarnold and Fr. Ahern asked for the statement of the prominence of Peter to come before its qualification.

Professor Chadwick considered the avoidance of the 'proof-text' method of argument important. It could be said that a Petrine office existed. There was a case for such an office today in a united Church.

Thursday, 28th August: AFTERNOON

Bishop Clark continued the discussion on 230/Petrine Texts/1. A number of drafting points were made and an inconclusive discussion followed on whether Peter's ministry was 'above' that of the other Apostles. Many members preferred 'is not of a different kind'.

Fr. Tillard pointed out that Peter was important among the Apostles, whereas Paul was important among the faithful of his Churches.

It was decided that Fr. Tillard and Revd. J. Charley should join Fr. Tavard and Bishop Vogel to re-draft the text.

Three sub-commissions proper were then formed to deal with Jus Divinum, jurisdiction and Infallibility.

Saturday, 30th August. MORNING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on ARCIC 230/Petrine Texts/5. Drafting points were raised in respect of references to "Cephas", the Council of Jerusalem, and the 'apostolic foundation' of the Church.

Fr. Tillard thought the paper might suggest that for the New Testament Peter had no importance at all.

Fr. Duprey insisted that there were differing rather than conflicting interpretations of the Petrine Texts in the Patristic period.

Fr. Yarnold wondered whether justice had been done to the older Roman Catholic tradition of the 'succession' of Peter.

Fr. Ahern thought the document was ambiguous in respect of whether it was the Commission which was rejecting certain interpretation or the Fathers.

Rev. J. Charley wanted to see the possibility of the rejection of an interpretation of transmission with an acceptance of the primacy on other grounds.

Professor Chadwick agreed. The use of the Petrine Texts was peripheral and subsequent.

Bishop Butler offered "This interpretation of the New Testament data has been questioned and it has been argued that it arose from an attempt to justify a development which had occurred even among those who question this interpretation...." This was accepted.

Professor Scarisbrick pointed out a duplication of material about the applicability of all New Testament texts about Peter to the Bishop of Rome.

Fr. Duprey was unclear as to the "many things" which were said about Peter.

Professor Scarisbrick pointed out that if the analogy between Peter and the Bishop of Rome held good there must be a sense in which it could be said of him that "On this rock...."

Fr. Ryan offered: "But although the sentence 'on this rock...' is spoken to Peter, this does not imply that the same words when applied to the Bishop of Rome can be said of him with an identical meaning". This was accepted.

Rev. J. Charley preferred the original material (drafted by himself and Fr. Tillard) on the transmissibility of the apostolic college as a whole.

Archbishop McAdoo asked the Commission to look at the relevant parts of that draft (230/Petrine Texts/2). It was agreed to substitute this material but with Fr. Ryan's amended sentence.

Bishop Vogel and Fr. Yarnold could not follow the logic of the final sentences. It was decided to remove the sentence "Many things said of Peter..." and the one following.

Professor Fairweather clarified the logic of the concluding sentence of the section by offering "The fact that Peter's role in its totality cannot be transmitted, does not however exclude..."

Professor Scarisbrick, Fr. Duprey and Bishop Butler wanted a more positive affirmation of the possibility of the transmission of some features of the Petrine ministry.

Professor Chadwick regretted that the Primacy had been based solely on Petrine and the Roman See. The text did not yet indicate how the Commission would like the Primacy to be.

Fr. Ryan and Revd. J. Charley saw this as a final paragraph and Professor Chadwick was asked to offer something to the drafters.

Fr. Tavard did not find the logic of such a paragraph apparent.

Fr. Yarnold returned to the question of the official Roman Catholic view of succession. It was agreed to add "whose successor the Bishop of Rome was claimed to be" to the final sentence of the first paragraph on page 3.

Archbishop McAdoo asked for the final paragraph of the document to be brought back with the new material when this had been drafted.

He then opened the discussion on 230 Jus Divinum/1.

Revd. J. Charley asked for the present Roman Catholic position on the churchly status of the Anglican Churches in the light of Apostolicae Curae.

Fr. Ryan held opinion to be open - hence the dialogue.

Fr. Duprey saw the question as to whether acceptance of the Primacy affected ecclesial status.

Bishop Butler believed Lumen Gentium to be of fundamental importance. Jus Divinum and ecclesiology were not connected.

Fr. Yarnold insisted that Roman Catholic Canon Law did not make communion with Rome essential for sacramental validity.

Fr. Tavard thought the question was set in a (wrongly) Roman Catholic way.

Fr. Ryan explained that the draft limited itself to the questions posed in Venice 24(b).

Revd. C. Hill reminded the Commission that the Wychcroft draft Introduction had touched on ecclesiology. Dr. Gassmann had posed two questions for when ARCIC examined this draft (217/A & B/3).

...O...

Saturday, 30th August: AFTERNOON SESSION

Bishop Clark invited continued discussion on 230/Jus Divinum/1. Drafting points were made.

Fr. Tillard thought it too sharp to say that the primacy was of divine institution in Vatican I. Stress was laid on "ex ipsius Christi....".

After considerable discussion Revd. Julian Charley proposed "derived from Christ" and this was accepted.

Bishop Butler and Fr. Yarnold were less than happy with the second sentence of paragraph 2. Bishop Butler felt it savoured of the "branch theory" and allowed for any community to be designated as a church. He regarded the references to the Orthodox "Churches" in Vatican II as primarily sociological. Fr. Yarnold was not clear as to the meaning of "a church". After considerable discussion the sentence was temporarily left in suspension.

Fr. Tillard preferred to say that Vatican II rejected the position that the Church of God was "co-extensive" rather than "identical" with the Roman Catholic Church.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher Archbishop McAbo found the phraseology in reference to Vatican II patronizing to Anglicans.

Professor Chadwick and Fr. Ryan on the contrary considered the phraseology exact and carefully worded.

Bishop Clark then brought the discussion back to the earlier disputed ecclesiological sentence.

After more discussion Fr. Tillard eventually proposed "Among the elements by which a Christian community is recognised as a Church the acknowledgement of the authenticity of the See of Rome is not a necessary one."

This found general approval, though Bishop Butler abstained. He wanted some reference to the unique claim of the Roman Catholic Church as expressed in subsistit in of Vatican II. He agreed to assist the drafters in this.

Professor Root successfully amended the Tillard amendment by the substitution of "being in communion with the See of Rome" for the reference to the acknowledgement of its authority.

Drafting points were made on paragraphs 4 and 5. In the final sentence the Revd. Julian Charley proposed "as God's will for his Church", rather than the reference to God's gift, as more exact.

In paragraph 6 Archbishop McAbo wanted a reference to the earlier provisos.

Revd. Julian Charley insisted that the implications of the paragraph needed to be brought out. Until there was greater Roman Catholic clarity in the recognition of the Churches of the Anglican Communion as churches, it was difficult to accept the conclusions reached.

Revd. C. Hill agreed. A positive conclusion depended on a resolution of the ecclesiological problem.

Bishop Moorman wanted the deletion of the whole paragraph.

Professor Fairweather and Fr. Ryan insisted that something must remain as it represented a common judgment.

Archbishop McAdoo was equally insistent that the weight the two traditions gave to the primacy as God's design for the universal koinonia was very different.

SUNDAY, 31st August. MORNING SESSION.

Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on 230/Jurisdiction/1.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher explained that the sub-commission had included some material from the Burnham Elucidation (226 Koinonia-Authority/1) and Fr. Ryan's draft (Arcic 229).

Dr. Gassmann found the initial sentence too authoritarian.

Bishop Vogel thought the second sentence should refer to the Roman Catholic position.

Father Yarnold thought power of jurisdiction attached to an office.

Fr. Ryan said the first sentence was his, but it was a definition of specifically Roman Catholic jurisdiction.

Father Duprey wanted a more theological definition. He was also critical of the criticism of the Curia.

Fr. Yarnold suggested "jurisdiction may be defined as the right to make or impose decisions....."

Fr. Ryan hoped it could be made clear that the Commission was speaking of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Then he offered ".....the authority (potestas) necessary for the fulfilment of an office".

Fr. Duprey asked for an explanation of 'ordinary', 'universal' and 'immediate'. He agreed to re-draft the second sentence.

Discussion followed on the critical reference to the Curia. Mgr. Purdy thought the main problem was the lack of understanding of cultural diversity. Another was that matters of little importance appeared to have the weight of the Pope behind them. In the end it was deleted. There was also drafting discussion over the last clause and it was adapted to read "legitimate freedom of conscience, thought and action".

In para. 2, Fr. Ryan could not accept that a metropolitan had jurisdiction. There was really only one Metropolitan in the R.C. Church, the Bishop of Rome.

Fr. Duprey thought it was only necessary to say that a Metropolitan's jurisdiction was different in nature from a bishop in his diocese. He regretted the R.C. destruction of intermediate jurisdiction.

Fr. Tillard thought theological and juridical levels were being confused.

After discussion Fr. Ryan offered "the jurisdiction of some metropolitans....". It was also decided to remove the final part of the sentence altogether.

Fr. Duprey then offered his draft for the second sentence of paragraph 1: "In consequence the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome as universal primate is called "ordinary" because it is inherent to his office; it is called "universal" and "immediate" because it must enable him directly to serve the unity and harmony of the koinonia as a whole and in each of its parts".

Drafting points were then made on paragraph 3.

Fr. Tavard was unclear as to the meaning of "must be seen to exercise". After discussion it was agreed by the sub-commission that this was a drafting error.

Fr. Ryan preferred to see metropolitan for primate.

Bishop Vogel was not happy as the ECUSA did not have such an episcopal office.

Sunday, 31st August: AFTERNOON SESSION

Bishop Clark invited continued discussion of 230/Jurisdiction/1.

In para.3 Professor Fairweather and Bishop Vogel successfully proposed the deletion of the reference to Metropolitan authority.

In para.4. Bishop Vogel asked for the deletion of 'personal' in the first sentence. Father Duprey agreed and proposed its substitution by 'own'. This was accepted.

Rev. J. Charley proposed the second sentence be split into two. After some discussion about the new third sentence a proposal from Archbishop McAdoo was accepted: 'The diocesan bishop is helped to make this universal dimension a reality by the universal jurisdiction of the universal primate'.

Fr. Yarnold and Rev. J. Charley thought the final sentence too compressed and Fr. Duprey queried 'eucharistic communion'. Bishop Butler successfully proposed 'Since the Church is the communion in charity of all the local churches....'

In para.5. Fr. Ryan hoped for the omission of the sentences defining 'immediate jurisdiction'. Bishop Knapp Fisher agreed.

On the contrary Mgr. Purdy strongly urged the reference to the possibility of appeal from a diocesan bishop be retained.

Fr. Ryan pointed out that this was not a consequence of the Pope's 'immediate' jurisdiction but his 'universal'.

Rev. J. Charley suggested 'Since this jurisdiction is 'universal' it affords a right of appeal....' This was accepted.

There followed much discussion on whether it was necessary to make reference to Vatican I.

Bishop Butler insisted that the right of appeal was very early. Canon Law was only a sophistication and truth could not be derived from it.

Fr. Tillard heartily agreed.

Fr. Ryan too thought it best to describe the reality in theological terms.

Bishop Butler asked if Fr. Tillard's paper Vatican II et L'Apres-Concile: Espoirs et Craintes (ARCIC 232) could be taken account of, particularly the para on 'plena potestas' (p.9)

Bishop Clark requested the drafters to take account of this.

Professor Chadwick hoped there would also be some reference to the differences between Anglicans and Roman Catholics regarding conciliarity. Anglicans had more than purely consultative conciliarity as had the Early Church.

Archbishop McAdoo hoped this might be put in para 7. Professor Chadwick was asked to draft something.

There was some discussion on the final sentence of para 6. It was thought by many to be unclear. Fr. Yarnold thought the first draft clearer (ARCIC 211/Jurisdiction/2). The drafters were asked to consider its restoration.

Drafting points on para.7 were raised. It was decided Anglicans did need 'assurance'. Matters in the earlier draft (211/Jurisdiction/2) were referred to by Fr. Yarnold.

Archbishop McAdoo accepted their suppression on the understanding that they would be referred to in the 'Elucidation'.

Rev. J. Charley wanted assurance that there would be no 'imposition' on Anglicans as well as no 'suppression'.

Professor Chadwick offered 'Or the imposition of traditions which are wholly alien to it'.

Fr. Ryan, Fr. Duprey and Rev. C. Hill found the oblique reference to the Uniat Churches an unhappy one. It was deleted.

Bishop Butler suggested the final sentence should be more modest and read: 'We recall the words of Pope Paul VI.....'

Monday, 1st September. MORNING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on 230/Infallibility/1.

Fr. Yarnold explained that the sub-commission had felt that the Duprey/Root draft on the Marian Dogmas had best be in the Elucidations.

Fr. Ahern was uneasy at the Church 'wandering away from the truth' in para.1.

Rev. J. Charley thought this of some importance.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed 'even if errors invade the Church'. This was accepted.

Fr. Tavard queried 'ultimately' - was the Church only brought back to the truth at the eschaton?

After lengthy debate Fr. Yarnold and Dr. Gassmann proposed the deletion of the sentence. Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed the addition of 'true understanding of the Gospel' to the following sentence. These were accepted.

Fr. Ahern wondered whether a contrast was intended between the 'faith of the community' and the 'mind of the Church' in the penultimate sentence.

Professor Root suggested 'Doctrinal decisions....'. Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed 'the communities faith' and the Rev. J. Charley asked for 'as grounded in the Holy Scriptures....'. These met the problem.

Drafting points were made on para.2.

Bishop Vogel asked for 'could' rather than 'would' in para.3. He also preferred to think of the Primate 'exposing' rather than 'correcting'.

Professor Scarisbrick strongly preferred 'would'.

Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Clark successfully proposed 'would be intended as'.

Bishop Butler was perplexed as to what 'the genuineness of what it teaches' meant.

Fr. Tillard, Rev. J. Charley and Professor Root thought a sentence had been omitted from the draft: 'If such definitions are said to be protected from error, the emphasis is on their truth, as guaranteed by continuity with the faith, rather than the authority of their authors.'

Professor Chadwick rather thought authority had a good deal to do with reception. He reminded the Commission of the Burnham draft material on the reception of councils. (226/Authority-Koinonia/1)

Professor Scarisbrick insisted that authority was of major importance.

Bishop Butler agreed. It was the condition for recognizing the truth.

Fr. Tillard disagreed. The Roman Catholic Church suffered from a kind of nominalism.

Bishop Vogel said truth was a criterion not an authority.

Archbishop McAdoo and Professor Chadwick felt re-drafting was called for.

Fr. Ryan was unhappy at an appeal to the common mind of the Church when there was no common mind.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that in paras 3, 4 and 5 there was no distinction between judgements and statements.

There was lengthy discussion on their distinction.

Rev. J. Charley saw the Commission diverging on whether it was speaking of the basic principles on which certain kinds of pronouncements function or the way in which the Church reacted to them.

Fr. Tillard insisted that para 3 only dealt with authoritative pronouncements.

Fr. Ryan felt the para could be read to be speaking of infallible statements.

Professor Chadwick asked for a re-draft after discussion of paras 4 and 5.

In para 4 there was some unease at the word of God as 'substantially distorted'.

Bishop Butler offered 'that its teaching will fatally misrepresent that truth'.

Monday, 1st September. AFTERNOON SESSION

Bishop Clark invited discussion on the re-drafted section of the Jurisdiction text (1.9.80. 9 a.m.) so that the drafters could complete it.

Fr. Ryan wanted it said that the Synod of bishops was not as fully representative as it could be.

Fr Duprey pointed out that it was classical theology that only representative bishops could not make binding decisions.

Fr. Tavard and Fr. Tillard objected to the Primate being outside the college of bishops. Fr. Tillard offered: "in correlation with the episcopal college"

Bishop Knapp-Fisher suggested that some of the material might better occur in the Elucidations. This was accepted.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to return to 'Infallibility'. He invited discussion on 4b - a proposed re-drafting (1.9.80: 1.50 p.m.)

Fr. Yarnold liked Bishop Knapp-Fisher's re-draft but preferred the original first sentence. It was agreed to retain it.

Fr. Duprey preferred the whole original sub-paragraph.

Fr. Yarnold asked for the deletion of the reference to unusual primates and general councils as it anticipated the argument of the document.

Fr. Ryan and Bishop Butler found the second sentence very conditional.

A number of theological and drafting points were made before it was decided to retain the original text, but with some reference to the inadequacy of words at the end of para 4.

Fr. Tillard also proposed a substitution at this point. 'Infallibility is the guarantee of the truth of the judgement expressed in the proposition or definition'.

Archbishop McAdoo asked for "By which it meant that infallibility...."

Professor Chadwick was unclear as to whether the Tillard amendment was another way of talking about the guarantee or a separate entity.

Fr. Tillard clarified his offering as "infallibility of the universal primate or General Council is the guarantee....."

Bishop Vogel felt this sounded like a definition.

Fr. Tillard again clarified "..... by which it implied that...."

There then followed a long discussion/^{on} the exact phraseology of a proposed addition on the inadequacy of language. After accepting amendments from Bishop Clark and Bishop Knapp-Fisher the Rev. J. Charley eventually successfully proposed "Although the language in which these definitions or decisions are expressed is never wholly adequate this does not invalidate the confidence that the truth it embodies is preserved from error."

A sharp disagreement arose between Bishop Butler and Fr. Yarnold on the relation between infallibility and language. In the end Rev. J. Charley proposed "Infallibility is not directly concerned with language but with a judgement".

Drafting points were made on para.5.

Fr. Tillard initiated a discussion on the sense in which a missionary was infallible in declaring 'Jesus is Lord'.

Fr. Duprey felt 'invalid' was the wrong word in relation to the Primate and Councils. Mgr. Purdy offered "..... would not be achieved...."

An important discussion arose on the question of the reception of infallible declarations.

Fr. Ahern and Professor Soarisbrick and Fr. Tavad wanted the opening of the sub-para to read: "Since what has been declared....".

Bishop Butler agreed. Vatican II had been very clear that what was infallibly declared would be infallibly received. Reception was therefore a criterion for recognition of infallible judgements.
the

Fr. Yarnold thought the whole section might be sent back to the drafters.

Rev. J. Charley agreed as more needed to be said. There was parallel material on conciliar reception in the Burnham draft.

Tuesday, 2nd September: MORNING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo invited Professor Chadwick to introduce a revision of paras. 6-7 of 230/Infallibility/1 (2.9.80: 9. a.m.). This was read before detailed discussion of para. 6. Drafting points were made.

Archbishop Arnott was unhappy with the sentence on being out of communion with Rome.

The Revd. J. Charley successfully proposed a clarifying addition: "...since they believe they have adequately been maintained in the truth during this time without acceptance of the Roman Primacy..."

Important amendments were made to the sentences on infallible decisions.

Dr. Gassmann and Bishop Butler substituted "without the explicit previous consent" for "independently".

Professor Chadwick proposed the deletion of the second part of the prior sentence and its substitution by: "...the conciliar process (of which the universal primate is a part) rather than with the universal primate or any one man, apart from the conciliar process."

Bishop Clark amended this to "...strictly conciliar process".

Bishop Vogel noted that it was the non-infallible pronouncements which were the problem!

Bishop Knapp-Fisher proposed the following sentence began "Thus Anglicans even when they are aware of the very rigorous conditions imposed on its exercise...."

Fr. Tillard did not feel that Roman Catholics held the Marian Dogmas to be "essential to faith". He preferred "linked to the essential faith".

Archbishop McAdoo asked if Roman Catholics had to believe them.

After some discussion as to the status of the Dogmas Fr. Ryan offered "the Immaculate Conception and Assumption as 'binding on believers". This was accepted.

Bishop Butler asked for a reference to Mary as Theotokos.

Discussion followed and eventually the Revd. C. Hill successfully proposed "Mother of God Incarnate".

After further drafting points there was discussion on the Chadwick addition to para. 6.

Revd. J. Charley said it was not easy to see what the new sentence meant without the Root/Duprey draft as it was too short.

Fr. Tillard wanted "underlying doctrines".

Professor Fairweather remarked that the Pope in defining dogmas positively for Roman Catholics did not define negatively for Anglicans.

Bishop Vogel asked for "Anglicans do not feel bound by their faith...."

Professor Chadwick asked for the drafting of a footnote on the lines of the Duprey/Root draft. This was accepted.

In turning to para. 7 the Commission accepted Professor Root's suggestion and turned to the Chadwick re-draft first.

Fr. Tillard felt the logic of the draft was disrupted in the Chadwick version. It was originally a consensus paragraph.

Revd. J. Charley saw the material in the re-draft as going in para. 6. This was agreed.

Professor Fairweather thought the Chadwick statement of Anglican difficulties more nuanced.

Fr. Yarnold saw para. 7 beginning with the existing sub-para. "Nevertheless we believe..."

Drafting points were then made on the Chadwick draft.

After some discussion on the mistaken and correct decisions of the Roman See in the Patristic and modern periods, Professor Fairweather successfully proposed a re-drafted amendment of Fr. Tavad. "It recognises that despite mistakes in the long course of the Church's history, the occupants of the See of Rome have often protected the Church."

Bishop Butler, Fr. Tavad and Bishop Vogel requested the deletion of the clause "quite apart from any independent criterion of dogmatic truth". This was accepted.

Bishop Butler objected to "gift of illumination".

Bishop Clark suggested "gift of divine assistance".

Bishop Butler did not want "inherent in the Pope's office".

Fr. Tillard proposed "necessarily attached to the office of the Bishop of Rome".

Bishop Clark thought "irrespective of their reception by the faithful" too strong.

Professor Scarisbrick proposed "can be regarded as secure and authoritative before their reception by the faithful".

Professor Chadwick now considered that his Anglican denial had died the death of a thousand qualifications. He wondered what the nature of his a priori now was.

Bishop Vogel wanted the sentence to remain. Infallibility resulted in only a formally significant statement. Anglicans wanted empirical justification.

Fr. Tavad also wanted it kept. It indicated the weakness of the doctrine.

SEPTEMBER 2nd Afternoon session

Bishop Clark discerned that the Commission preferred the Chadwick re-draft of 230 / Infallibility para 7. But that it should be put in para 6. He asked what new elements it contained.

Professor Chadwick thought his first sentence added something new. However the morning's discussion had made the gap very narrow. What now was the difference on infallibility with the morning's modifications.

Bishop Clark asked Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Fr. Yarnold to re-draft the material into para.6 The second half of the Chadwick re-draft should still go in para 7.

Fr. Yarnold and Fr Ahern found the opening sentence of the para 7 material weak: "Nevertheless....."

Fr. Duprey still felt this was better as an Anglican statement rather than a common one. Roman Catholics were already bound to recognise the bishop of Rome, not just in a united Church.

Professor Fairweather called attention to the need to re-draft the material so that it did not suggest that a universal primate could only speak with authority after unity took place .

Professor Chadwick took this and offered "in a united Church it would be recognised that....."

Rev. C.Hill hoped the first sentence or the original text would be modified in view of the significant convergence on the role of reception.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher agreed and wanted its substitution by the final Chadwick sentence.

Doctur Gassmann pointed out the possible logic the para. could follow. It could begin by a negative and then build up to a more positive assessment or vice-versa.

Fr. Tillard proposed another introduction: "We believe that even if the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome is not entirely resolved it can no longer constitute an obstacle between us, and that living together it could be resolved.."

Professor Chadwick hoped the commission would move from an acceptance of a primacy to difficulties with the term infallibility.

Archbishop McAdoe wanted the content of the original first sentence to come in somewhere.

Fr. Duprey and Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought that all the Anglican difficulties should come into para. 6

Professor Chadwick hoped that the two penultimate sentences of his draft would stand as there needed to be some statement of what the differences now were.

Bishop Butler hoped there would be a reference to the changed framework of the debate in the light of Vatican II. Neither Church had yet assimilated its fruits.

Bishop Clark called for discussion on the Chadwick re-draft to begin "Nonetheless...."

Fr. Duprey objected to the phrase "even above a general council of bishops". It was deleted. He also disliked "unique inerrancy" and would have preferred "such a unique role to the Bishop of Rome".

Professor Chadwick offered "unique protection from error".

Professor Scarisbrick asked the Anglicans whether bishops and synods were always and everywhere diminished because of the Bishop of Rome.

Professor Chadwick said not. He then said that the Commission was talking of "difficulties" not "differences" as he could accept that too.

Fr. Ryan objected to the term Cathedra Petri. The concept behind this had been rejected in a radical way by Vatican I.

Fr. Tillard asked whether the real problem was the diminished status of bishops or that everything came from one man.

Rev. C. Hill thought that the status of synods needed clarification. The problem was that the conciliar process became only consultative.

Fr. Tillard said the real problem was authoritative statements.

Professor Fairweather agreed. Infallibility gave an 'aura' to all pronouncements.

Fr. Tillard offered the ascription of infallibility to certain judgements of the Bishop of Rome is felt to have led to an exaggerated authority in all his statements. "

After discussion it was generally felt this was an important point and that the drafters should put it in.

Dr. Gassmann noted that something similar was elaborated in the U.S. Catholic/Lutheran agreement.

Bishop Vogel hoped four points would be made in conclusion

- 1) the acceptance of a universal primacy with an effective teaching office;
- 2) the difficulties Anglicans had with the term 'infallibility';
- 3) the declaration that those difficulties were no longer obstacles;
- 4) the need for the assimilation of Vatican II.

Fr. Duprey hoped for the inclusion of a sentence to the effect that even if the issue of infallibility was not completely resolved there was no obstacle now to a common life.

Bishop Clark wondered about the text of para.8

Fr. Tillard insisted that since that para had been written there had been a real advance.

Professor Chadwick also thought the two sides were now very close. Precision was now needed, a reference to Vatican II, and the fact that characteristics of each side were often presented.

Rev. J. Charley thought a final conclusion to all four documents could not be composed but the whole text could be seen.. This was the general feeling.

Discussion ^{took place} on the possibility of a further meeting to complete the four texts and in particular the infallibility draft. December 15th - 19th in Liverpool was canvassed. Professor Fairweather, Bishop Vogel, Fr. Ahern and Dr. Gassman could not manage this. It was difficult for Fr. Duprey.

3rd September Morning session

Archbishop McAdoo asked Bishop Vogel to read 230/Petrine Texts/4. Discussion followed paragraph by paragraph.

In paragraph 4 Rev. J. Charley did not think Peter helping the other apostles "to be what they are all called to be" at all clear.

After some attempts at re-drafting the following emendation by Professor Chadwick was accepted "Peter also serves the Church by helping it to preserve its unity (e.g. Acts 11:4 ff), even if in the same matter in his weakness....."

In para.6 there was debate about the legitimization of a development "which had already occurred". But it was eventually decided to keep to the text.

Fr. Yarnold wondered what exactly "specified" referred to in the last para.

Bishop Vogel replied that it meant as in the document.

Archbishop McAdoo invited Professor Fairweather to read 230/Jus Divinum/2.

Dr. Gassmann liked the introduction which linked it with Venice 24. He hoped similar introductions would be composed for the other three texts.

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the use of "Successor of Peter" in para. 2. Vatican I had said "unde quicumque in hac cathedra Petro succedit". (Caput II). The emphasis was on succeeding in Peter's cathedra.

Professor Fairweather and Fr. Yarnold pointed out that the Canon had said that Peter 'habeat p̄perpetuos successores'.

Fr. Ryan acceptably proposed "the primacy of the 'Successor in the chair of Peter' whom the Council....."

In para.3 Rev. J. Charley enquired whether 'Church of God' and 'a Church' were intended to be synonymous.

As this was difficult for the Roman Catholic members to say with exactitude it was decided not to press for clarification.

Discussion moved to the date of the interim meeting of the full Commission. Proposals for a February meeting were rejected. At the December meeting (15 to 19th: Liverpool) the Infallibility document would be completed and attention given to the Burnham Elucidations. It was thought that the ecclesiological Introduction would take much of the time of the next meeting proper (Windsor 25th August to 3rd September, 1981).

At the conclusion of 230/Jus Divinum/2 Fr. Ryan amended the first sentence of

the first alternative ending "In the past Roman Catholic teaching that the Bishop of Rome is universal primate by divine right or law has been...."

It was decided to end the text with the first alternative but to keep the second for use in discussion on a general conclusion.

Archbishop McAdoo invited Bishop Knapp-Fisher to read 230/Jurisdiction/2.

After drafting discussion on the first three sentences of para 2, the third sentence was amended by Bishop Knapp-Fisher to read: "The jurisdictions associated with different levels of episcopate (i.e. of primates, metropolitans and diocesan bishops) are not in all respects similar in kind."

3rd September. AFTERNOON SESSION

Bishop Clark invited Fr. Yarnold to read 230/Infallibility/2.

Drafting points were made.

Fr. Duprey asked whether the last sentence of para 3 needed some expansion.

Rev. J. Charley felt the argument was circular in any case.

Bishop Butler proposed that 'certainty' should be substituted by 'guidance'. This was accepted.

In the last sentence of para.4 Professor Chadwick wanted the addition of "...a universal primate, verified in the experience of the Church, by which it..."

Bishop Butler opposed this as it evacuated the concept of infallibility of meaning.

Rev. J. Charley thought this illustrated the crucial difference between the two traditions. Roman Catholics had an immediate guarantee of the truth. Anglicans had to wait for reception.

Bishop Butler said that Newman had waited to see whether the definitions of Vatican I had been received.

Professor Chadwick thought this fact was support for his amendment.

Rev. J. Charley thought otherwise. With the amendment it would read as the verification of a judgement as true, rather than the verification that it was an infallible statement as in the original text. The amendment was not accepted.

In para 5 Professor Scarisbrick thought it best not to tie the footnote on Pastor Aeternus too closely to the Gallican articles of 1682. The sentence was deleted.

Rev. C. Hill asked for the inclusion of more material in the sub-para on the Marian Dogmas from the original Root/Duprey draft. The drafters were asked to do this.

In para 6. it was agreed to add Professor Chadwick's amendment to the end of the first sub-para "It is not characteristic of Anglicans to think religious certainty enhanced by a doctrine of papal infallibility".

After considerable discussion on the existing two final sentences of this sub-para they were deleted.

Professor Chadwick pointed out that the first implied that with 'explicit prior consent' the Pope could indeed make infallible judgements. The substance of the sentences was found earlier in the sub-para in any case.

Professor Fairweather amended "person and work of Christ" to "the history of salvation". This was more appropriate for the Marian Dogmas.

Professor Chadwick also successfully proposed an additional sentence: "They are confident that she was prepared by divine grace to be the Mother of our Redeemer and that her glory in heaven is proportionate to the honour God gave her on earth".

In para 7. Fr. Tillard was unclear as to the meaning of "R.C. freedom..."

Rev. C. Hill wanted an indication of convergence on both sides. Anglicans wanted unity and universal communion and therefore a ministry of unity for the universal church.

Fr. Tavard proposed "R.Cs acknowledge...." and suggested that the sentence be reversed with the preceding one. These were accepted.

Professor Chadwick thought the conclusion of 230/Petrine Texts/3 relevant.

Fr. Tillard noted that Canadian Anglicans had felt the need for an office of guidance in doctrine and faith.

Fr. Duprey was unhappy at the sentence "We believe..." If this was so then there was no difference.

Professor Chadwick thought this ought to be the first sentence.

Professor Fairweather pointed out that the text implied that only when the churches were united could the Pope speak infallibly. Was this what Roman Catholics wanted to say.

Rev. J. Charley was not at all happy at the para. There was still real disagreement.

Fr. Tillard said the point of disagreement was that infallibility was strictly linked to the office of the Bishop of Rome. It was agreed that a certain infallibility was given to the one who presides.

Rev. C. Hill reminded the commission that this para. was a first draft. It was the work for Liverpool in December.

Bishop Clark put it to the commission that paras. 1 - 6 were clear. This was agreed.

Professor Chadwick said that reception was still on the table. The question was what a difference of this magnitude had on whether a step forward could be taken. The problem had been reduced to size. Anglicans wanted universal communion but were not attracted by centralized government.

Bishop Butler thought the problem of reception was bound to come up in the RC/ Orthodox dialogue.

It was agreed that Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Knapp-Fisher should prepare a draft conclusion for Liverpool in December.

Rev. J. Charley would also write something to indicate his general unease at the overall position.