

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

THIRTEENTH MEETING: WINDSOR, 25TH AUGUST - 3RD SEPTEMBER 1981MINUTESTuesday, 25th August: OPENING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo took the chair. It was decided that the Venice Continuation should be taken first. It was also agreed that the section on Infallibility should be tackled at the beginning. (ARCIC 230/235/236).

Wednesday, 26th August MORNING SESSION

Bishop Clark was in the chair and opened discussion on the Infallibility Section (paragraph 22).

A number of members were critical of the second sentence in 22, and it was agreed that it should be redrafted.

In para. 23 Julain Charley asked whether there ought to be a definition of authority. He thought not and Bishop Butler agreed, but Bishop Vogel wanted some definition of authority as mediation.

In para. 24 Bishop Vogel disliked "Authoritative pronouncements". Dr. Gassmann and Fr. Tillard both found the paragraphing and order illogical. Professor Chadwick hoped the Roman Catholic members were happy with its blazing Protestantism.

In paragraph 25 Fr. Tavard thought the first and second sentences did not follow. Professor Chadwick thought its treatment of indefectibility too bland. He would prefer indefectibility as a footnote explained not as an inherent quality but a gift of divine grace. Revd. J. Charley wanted it made clear that indefectibility was not academic or intellectual so much as about the life of the Church.

Fr. Tillard remained unhappy with both paragraph 25 and 26 and complained that earlier proposals for a paragraph on the Holy Spirit had been ignored. The result was too juridical.

Mgr. Purdy agreed, finding the Catholic/Methodist Statement more fruitful.

Bishop Vogel asked for the emendation "some later traditions" in paragraph 26.

In paragraphs 27-29 Professor Chadwick posed a question as to whether justice had been done to the historically conditioned nature of statements and pronouncements.

Bishop Butler reminded the Commission of his view that it was judgements rather than the form of words which were infallible.

Revd. Julian Charley looked for a differentiation in the levels of papal statements.

Fr. Ryan doubted whether the last sentence in 27 related to the material on the Petrine Texts. Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Bishop Vogel wanted a reference to the Resurrection in the material on the Assumption. Revd. C. Hill found the Roman Catholic treatment of the Marian Dogmas acceptable.

Fr. Tavard was concerned that the Commission was accepting a particular interpretation of the Marian Dogmas.

Revd. J. Charley wondered whether the Marian material could be put together.

Fr. Ryan found it helpful as teaching Roman Catholics what the Dogmas were really about.

In paragraph 31 Fr. Tillard and Bishop Butler agreed that Infallibility as an absolute term also related to God in the authentic tradition of Vatican I. Papal Infallibility, according to Gasser was only a ministerial infallibility at the service of God's Infallibility.

Archbishop McAdoo wanted the last two sentences of 31 linked by "since".

Fr. Yarnold asked Anglicans whether their tradition had been really maintained in the truth by "the formal conciliar process" in paragraph 30 or a more dispersed authority.

Professor Fairweather did not find paragraph 31 reflecting an enlightened Anglican mind. He was anxious that it was addressing a Roman Catholic teaching which did not exist.

Professor Chadwick invited the Commission to accept an addition at the end of 30 "Since Authority has power to define with certainty, if and only if there is genuine revelation to interpret.

Mgr. Purdy found much of the Anglican criticism of Papal Infallibility shared by Roman Catholics.

Fr. Yarnold agreed and hoped this might be reflected in paragraph 34.

Revd. C. Hill observed that the Commission was refining the separate sections on Infallibility as if it had been following its traditional method of reaching a common statement.

Fr. Tillard agreed and still hoped a way might be found to put them together.

Professor Chadwick was insistent that the issue was a universal one and thus a proper question to try and work out together.

Archbishop McAdoo, Fr. Ryan and Bishop Vogel thought otherwise, as it was important that members of the two Churches should see themselves described.

Professor Fairweather thought there was unnecessary confrontation.

Fr. Ryan wanted the Commission's consensus more clearly stated at 33.

Bishop Butler thought that much Anglican objection was to interpretation rather than official teaching.

Fr. Tillard agreed and thought it possible to offer a joint interpretation which would not be contrary to a true hermenutic, of Vatican I.

Bishop Vogel, Fr. Ryan and Fr. Tavard all disliked "final sign" in 33

Fr. Yarnold found the shape of 33-38 unsatisfactory, as they concluded with disagreement on the Marian Dogmas. The agreement on Infallibility in 39 was better before the Conclusion as a new 38.

Revd. J. Charley agreed that the Commission should state common ground as far as possible and end on a positive note, but he wanted specific difficulties to be clear: "a priori"; "the Marian Dogmas"; "the past". He was particularly concerned lest certain decisions should be made binding on Anglicans, e.g. Trent.

Fr. Duprey and Fr. Tillard recognised that ecumenical councils were hard to define.

Bishop Butler saw the issue was raising the meaning of subsistit in. If only fully 'ecumenical' councils were binding, had the voice of God been silenced since the Fourth Century?

Dr. Halliburton found the three separate references to Anglican difficulties perplexing. They did not marry up with the positive Roman Catholic Statement on Infallibility.

Professor Chadwick did not find that 'a priori' exactly stated the problem. The question was rather whether it was inherent in ministerial office to define teaching which had to be accepted.

Fr. Yarnold proposed the substitution "by virtue of ministerial office".

Fr. Duprey was certain that the issue was what the Churches believe today.

Archbishop McAdoo thought it significant that some problems had arisen since the separation.

Dr. Gassmann thought the Anglican statement was on Infallibility as it had been understood in the past, but the Roman Catholic material presented a new understanding.

Revd. C. Hill suggested that the order of the material be changed. The Anglican response to Infallibility as it had been understood should come first followed by present Roman Catholic understanding and finally a common statement.

Professor Fairweather found the statement on Anglican processes very weak. There was an Anglican practice of magisterial authority.

Dr. Gassmann did not like the apologetic tone of the Anglican statement.

Professor Chadwick thought paragraphs 33 and 34 good, but he questioned whether the word "Infallibility" actually added anything to them. The Commission had not in fact said what the "unsolved difficulty" in 33 was.

Bishop Clark thought it was the location of Infallibility in one person.

Fr. Tillard agreed. The difficulty was not in the function, but that there was no reference in the New Testament to the Infallibility of a special person.

Professor Chadwick saw no problem with charism attached to office. The problem was whether this was the only factor that counted apart from obedience to the Word of God.

Bishop Vogel was sure that Infallibility belonged to the Church, but for an individual it had to be proved.

Fr. Ryan thought that Roman Catholics in the United States would dismiss the Anglican disagreement formulated in 39. The Commission must say that Infallibility served the word of God. It indicated the questions which could be addressed to Scripture.

Professor Fairweather finally asked for an unpacking of the sentence "It is proclaimed because....." in 24.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to look at the Authority Elucidation (ARCIC 246).

Fr. Yarnold felt the questions still did not exactly match the answers in 1.

Fr. Duprey hoped for cross referencing at 6 with the section on jurisdiction in the Continuation, also at 8 to the Petrine Texts. He would have preferred a reference to homousios rather than the two natures in 2.

Professor Chadwick proposed "An expression we did not use" in 5.

Fr. Tavard did not find the example of the Fathers of Chalcedon in 3 actually illustrated the sensus fidelium.

Bishop Vogel did not like "sets the seal" in 3. He also wanted the addition of "A Council is so evidently self-sufficient....."

Fr. Ryan and Professor Fairweather questioned whether the contraries hit each other at the end of 3.

Bishop Butler thought the problem was the title not the office of Patriarch in 7.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher found the Lambeth Conference reference too condensed in 8.

Thursday, 27th August. MORNING SESSION.

Archbishop McAdoo took the Chair. Six members of the Commission were absent in the Infallibility sub-Commission: Bishop Knapp-Fisher, Father Tillard, the Rev. Julian Charley, Father Yarnold, Professor Chadwick and Father Duprey.

Discussion began upon Petrine Texts. In para.2 Bishop Vogel proposed 'he opposed Peter' as more accurately reflecting Galatians.

Archbishop McAdoo wondered whether 2 would be read as a grudging acknowledgment that the latter part of Acts centred on Paul.

Mgr. Stewart thought 'so-called' unfortunate in 1.

Rev. C. Hill mentioned correspondenceⁿ with Professor G.O'Collins of the Gregorian University on Peter's role as the first to proclaim the Easter message. It was agreed the sub-commission should take into consideration the points he made.

Dr. Gassmann thought 'exclusively' redundant in the first sentence of 1.

Mgr. Purdy and Archbishop Arnott thought the first sentence read oddly. Had anyone suggested that pastoral responsibility was restricted to Peter?

Dr. Haliburton thought that 5 moved from biblical exegesis to history.

Archbishop Arnott found 6. weak.

Dr. Gassmann agreed and hoped the last sentence would say that the tradition was at least not in contradiction with the New Testament, otherwise there would be no connection. Many things could be proved to be God's purpose.

Bishop Butler found 7 a very moderate statement. If Peter was given leadership by Jesus then there was a strong presumption that there should be leadership in the Church in subsequent generations.

Professor Scarisbrick hoped more could be said than the last sentence which was couched in negative terms.

Bishop Clark and Bishop Butler wanted the omission of the vague word 'possibility'.

Archbishop Arnott wondered what was being said in the penultimate sentence of 8.

Professor Fairweather thought the second sentence needed inverting.

Dr. Gassmann asked for the deletion of 'in this society'.

Mgr. Purdy wondered whether 'at times' meant a few weeks.

Dr. Haliburton asked whether Roman Catholic members were happy with the 'would be' of the last sentence.

Fr. Tavard warned that the paragraph was not intended to go beyond the evidence of the New Testament.

Bishop Butler proposed 'a Petrine mystery will be.....'

Bishop Vogel returning to 7 offered 'this does not exclude the continuation of a ministry of unity.....'

Bishop Moorman asked for references to Venice.

Archbishop McAdoo invited consideration of ius divinum.

Bishop Moorman queried the Latin and Archbishop Arnott proposed that the Vatican I reference should be footnoted.

Dr. Cassmann found the order perplexing and hoped for a reversion to that of Venice.

Archbishop McAdoo suggested 'during his life on earth' in 10. Professor Chadwick had also made an identical written proposal.

Bishop Clark wondered about the phrase 'source of the Church' but Fr. Ryan insisted that it was over this very issue that the Council of Trent was suspended.

Dr. Cassmann wanted to be clear that 11 implied that there were other visible manifestations of Christian communion.

Professor Scarisbrick asked guidance of other Roman Catholic members on this still debated issue of the Church and the churches. He thought other churches were defective in not teaching the Roman primacy.

Bishop Butler proposed 'do not belong to the visible manifestation of full Christian communion'. Vatican II spoke of imperfect communion.

Professor Scarisbrick was happier with 'a church' rather than 'churches'.

In 12 Bishop Butler was concerned that providential development could be contingent upon particular historical circumstances. Bishop Vogel, Fr. Ryan and Professor Fairweather saw the paragraph as posing a question.

Professor Root wondered what 'under different circumstances' meant. Mgr. Purdy proposed 'in changed circumstances'.

Archbishop McAdoo wanted the addition of 'a universal primacy such as has been described' in 13.

Fr. Tavard asked for the removal of the patronising 'and understandably' and suggested 'other churches' would be better than 'non-RC churches'.

Rev. C. Hill raised Professor Chadwick's query over the word 'consensus' which was apparently not liked by Evangelicals.

Archbishop McAdoo then called for discussion on Jurisdiction.

Archbishop Arnott found the whole subject rather dull. In the first sentence of 15 he wanted the mention of 'an office' brought forward.

Fr. Ryan was concerned at the intrusion of universal between ordinary and immediate. The two were directly related. He proposed an emendation including the suggestion of Bishop Butler and Bishop Vogel that 'immediate' should be explained as unmediated; 'Primacy is called ordinary and immediate (not mediated) because it is inherent in his office; it is called universal because it must enable him directly to serve.....'

Mgr. Purdy felt 15 in need of some revision. It should state the nature of the anxieties and only then explain the canonical language. Moving to 16 he suggested that it should be indicated that jurisdiction is also an Anglican phenomenon. Bishop Butler suggested that 'Jurisdiction in both our communions is given for.....'

Mgr. Stewart asked for a cross reference to the Elucidations. (para 6).

Dr. Gassmann found problems with a bishop 'imposing' decisions. Professor Root proposed 'implementing', Bishop Vogel 'effecting'. Bishop Butler offered 'taking and effecting decisions'.

Rev. C. Hill suggested another reference to Elucidations (para.5).

Fr. Ryan found the logic of the first three paragraphs unhelpful and proposed that the section began with 16, 17 and then 15.

Bishop Moorman wanted the retention of the opening sentence of 15 at the very beginning. Bishop Clark suggested a conflation of the opening sentences of 15 and 16 but Fr. Tavad felt the two sentences ought to be retained intact but together.

Fr. Tavad also had difficulties in 18 with 'and be seen to exercise'

Bishop Moorman was not happy with 'the Church which is a communion in charity of all the local churches'. Bishop Butler suggested 'of the local churches'.

Rev. C. Hill was unhappy with the opening sentence of 19. It might imply that papal jurisdiction was unlimited.

Bishop Vogel proposed the first and second sentences ^{be linked} with a causal 'since'.

Fr. Ryan eventually proposed 'the scope of such jurisdiction is clear but not precisely defined because its limits are moral.....'.

In 20 Bishop Butler ^{asked for} 'the concern for catholicity must not be divorced'.

Finally Professor Fairweather asked that the reference to the status of the Thirty Nine Articles be deleted from the Elucidations (para.3).

28.8.81

28th August, 1981. MORNING SESSION

Bishop Clark took the Chair and outlined a possible shape for the final report: Co-Chairmen's Foreword; Preparatory Note; Introduction; Three Statements; Authority II; Three Elucidations; Appendices. (The Infallibility sub-committee was still absent).

Dr. Gassmann hoped the original Co-Chairmen's Prefaces would find a place before the Three Statements.

Bishop Clark then invited discussion on the Introduction (ARCIC 245/3.)

It was generally agreed that the draft was very good and that most criticisms would essentially be drafting points. Two drafters were appointed - Mgr. Purdy and Professor Fairweather, and a number of drafting points were made.

28th August, 1981. AFTERNOON SESSION

Bishop Clark invited discussion on the Infallibility sub-commission draft (248 Infallibility I).

Bishop Butler had a general anxiety that there was a conflict between Council and Pope.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher, Fr. Tillard and Rev. J. Charley reassured him this was not so.

In 23 Dr. Gassmann found the idea of preservation from error too negative.

Fr. Tillard accused him of understanding infallibility as Hans Küng did. Infallibility was in fact a facet of indefectability.

Fr. Yarnold and Archbishop McAdoo suggested 'preservation in the truth'.

Fr. Tavard wanted 'essential doctrine'.

Rev. C. Hill thought the reference to Anglican theology in footnote 2 did not do justice to the Article.

Professor Scarisbrick proposed 'Anglican belief'.

In 24 Bishop Vogel hoped the Commission would accept 'is the final means of showing' but Fr. Ryan found 'means' too causative and Dr. Haliburton did not like 'final'.

Fr. Ryan offered 'final indication' but Rev. J. Charley agreed that a temporal note undermined the authority of a definition

Fr. Tillard suggested 'ultimate indication' as qualitative rather than temporal.

In 25 Fr. Tavard found the final proviso on Scripture redundant.

In 26 Fr. Tillard asked that the order of the second sentence should be 'articulate, elucidate and define'.

Dr. Cassmann was unhappy at the idea of permanent statements.

After some discussion Bishop Butler eventually proposed 'a more definitive judgement'.

Fr. Tavard found 'either kind of statement' highly confusing. Fr. Ryan thought the distinction was too sharp.

Bishop Vogel was uneasy at the ambiguity in the use of 'authoritatively' in the last sentence. If councils were authoritatively they were so because true.

Authority mediated what it claimed to mediate. What was meant seemed to be canonical authority.

After considerable discussion various suggested emendations were made. 'Even in official declarations' was eventually accepted.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked whether the parenthetical sentence should be retained. A number of members hoped so but Professor Fairweather who had re-drafted it still felt it unnecessary. A long debate ensued. Fr. Ryan and Rev. C. Hill felt the sentence a useful corrective against fideism.

Fr. Tillard wanted the sentence, but was disturbed by the Blondellian overtones in the word 'recognise'; he preferred the original.

The Commission decided to retain the original although a number of members would have preferred the excision of it in any form.

30.8.81

ARCIC 247 (contd)

29th August, 1981

MORNING SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo took the chair and invited the Commission to consider 27.

Fr. Duprey questioned 'authorized spokesman'.

Prof. Fairweather considered the last sentence redundant.

Revd. J. Charley agreed, pointing out that the issue was dealt with in 30.

Dr. Gassman wanted clarification that the Commission meant that other agencies had been inspired to preserve the Church from fundamental error.

Fr. Tillard and Bishop Knapp-Fisher confirmed this.

Bishop Clark thought that the reference to an authorized spokesman implied infallibility.

Fr. Tillard rejected this interpretation as those without the charism of infallibility could speak the truth.

Bishop Butler then denied that the paragraph had any interest whatsoever. The question was how this authority was known - by office or by an examination of content.

Mgr. Stewart thought there was some confusion of principle and history.

In para 28 Revd. J. Charley objected to the first sentence as an Anglican carte blanche.

Fr. Tillard agreed and proposed some reference to historical circumstances.

Bishop Butler again found the argument unhelpful as many people stood up in a council - he cited here deacon Athanasius

Bishop Vogel was puzzled as to what further verification was involved in the final sentence. Did this mean the same thing over a longer period of time?

Prof. Root agreed. Verification by what means?

Revd. J. Charley understood it in terms of reflection.

Prof. Scarisbrick asked if Anglicans would always reserve their judgement.

Archbishop McAdoo said it depended on the definition and Bishop Vogel emphasized the 'may'.

Prof. Chadwick offered to re-draft the sentence.

Dr. Halliburton did not find the example of Pope Leo very helpful - the presence of his legates was more important.

Dr. Gassman asked whether the conditions not laid down at Vatican I could be found.

Fr. Ryan pointed out that these were common sense conditions he must not be insane or drunk.

Bishop Butler agreed and cited Pope Liberius who had been under pressure from the Emperor to accept semi-Arianism.

Mgr. Purdy noted there were two categories of conditions.

Fr. Yarnold went on to say there were more than common sense conditions as it was clear that the Pope must consult the Church although this had not been defined at Vatican I.

Fr. Tillard thought the Commission might be in great difficulties on this issue. There were three categories:

- 1 common sense conditions
- 2 those in Vatican I
- 3 those mentioned by Gasser e.g. a definition must not be against jus divinum

In 29 Fr. Tillard wanted the sentence 'We agree in rejecting...' brought up to be the third of the para.

Fr. Tavard found this helpful as stating christological principle first but Fr. Yarnold was not sure that this did not upset the logic.

Prof Root queried whether there was one Anglican position on the Marian Dogmas.

Dr. Gassman and Bishop Knapp-Fisher thought all Anglicans were against the defining of the Dogmas even if some accepted them.

Fr. Tavard thought the sentence 'We recognize.....' unnecessary.

Revd. C.Hill hoped the relation of the Dogmas to Christ and the Church would be retained somewhere.

Revd. J.Charley had misgivings about Mary's heavenly glory being 'proportionate' to her honour on earth.

Prof. Chadwick explained that the words came from a violently anti-papal writer of the 17th century.

Revd. J.Charley said this did not make them true.

Professor Fairweather was unhappy about the additional paragraph to 29. He had problems with 'nor a necessary conclusion from revealed truth'. Scotus' Immaculate Conception seemed to have better evidence in Scripture than the Predestination of the 39 Articles. It was wrong to develop a principle that directly Marian doctrines should be excluded. There was a good deal of doctrine about the effects of grace - including our own resurrection.

Revd. J.Charley said the problem was that the Christological truths behind the doctrine did not need to be expressed in Marian terms and were more clearly expressed directly.

Mgr. Stewart deprecated the value judgement in the last sentence. He thought some reference to the hierarchy of truths would be better.

Fr. Tavad argued for the omission of the footnote to 29 but Fr. Ryan, Fr. Tillard and Bishop Arnott found it a useful corrective.

Revd. J. Charley was unclear what the reference to the 'first fruits of the Resurrection' meant.

Fr. Ryan thought it ought to be made clear this was a statement of RC understanding.

Bishop Clark thought the last sentence of the para. had a 'snarl' in it.

Revd. J. Charley saw this and said what they really wanted to say was that both traditions had been equally inadequately maintained in the truth!

Fr. Ryan and Prof. Root found the sentence on reception unclear. What did 'on either view' refer to?

Bishop Butler thought it meant 'R.C.S accept but Anglicans reject'.

Fr. Tillard disagreed. The issue was not so simple as that.

Bishop Clark found 'a priori' polemical.

Prof. Chadwick saw the question as to whether there was a gift of the Spirit attached to an office in indifference to the Word of God.

Fr. Duprey insisted that the first condition must be obedience to the Word of God. The gift was for the service of the Word of God.

Revd. J. Charley said the question was whether it was guaranteed.

Fr. Yarnold thought Fr. Duprey's position sounded like 'the Pope is infallible unless he makes mistakes'!

Fr. Tillard said the difference was between preaching the Word and proclaiming it with a charism.

Fr. Duprey and Bishop Butler agreed that 'guaranteed' was the crucial word.

Fr. Tillard and Fr. Duprey were concerned that the footnote on reception by Fr. Ryan had been removed to the Elucidations by the Sub-Committee.

Bishop Moorman was puzzled that infallibility had been defined negatively; yet did the Marian Dogmas negate a serious error?

Fr. Ryan thought there was sufficient pastoral error to warrant the dogmas especially in Latin countries. He mentioned a virtual monophysitism in Mexico cited by James Doyle.

Fr. Yarnold distinguished two senses a) a negative assistance which b) helped the Church to understand the truth in a positive way.

Fr. Tavard had problems with "properly applicable to God alone".

Bishop Butler suggested "unconditionally applicable only to God".

Dr. Gassmann hoped the Pope would be a servant as well as a focus of unity.

Professor Chadwick asked for the removal of "in spite of remaining differences", but

Revd. Julian Charley fought for its retention.

29th August: AFTERNOON SESSION

From the chair Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on the material from the Petrine Texts Sub-Commission (248/Petrine Texts 1)

Professor Chadwick opened with the general point that there was not much in the text about Peter's faith. This would have surprised St. Augustine.

Fr. Tillard agreed with this. The breviary readings indicated that the rock was Peter's faith.

Bishop Butler found this unacceptable. He also found it gravely deficient that there was no mention of Our Lord's commission to Peter in paragraph 2.

Revd. J. Charley was unconvinced about Peter's pre-eminence at a witness to the resurrection. This could be said of Mary of Magdalene in St. John's Gospel.

Fr. Yarnold hoped that if the resurrection reference were taken out there would be some mention of Peter's preaching in the document's treatment of the Acts.

Professor Root doubted whether the section actually answered the Venice question.

Revd. J. Charley agreed that a final sentence was required.

Professor Chadwick found it odd there was no mention of Peter's denial, but Bishop Vogel reminded the Commission that the text was concerned about the use of the Petrine references for a particular purpose.

Revd. J. Charley wondered whether there could be a cross reference to the Elucidations.

Fr. Tillard thought the best place for a reference to Peter's failure would be in para. 4, but Bishop Knapp-Fisher wanted it in 2.

Professor Fairweather and Fr. Yarnold thought it inappropriate altogether.

Bishop Butler and Bishop Clark both wanted a reference to the Church being built on Peter.

In para. 4 Fr. Yarnold and Fr. Tillard disliked "Not different in kind", but Dr. Halliburton found this very helpful.

Revd. J. Charley offered "Not essentially different", but Fr. Yarnold could not accept this.

Fr. Tillard proposed "this ministry remains that of an apostle".

In para. 7. Revd. J. Charley accepted "a continued ministry", but wanted the word "possibility" brought back from the original draft.

In para. 8 Revd. J. Charley objected strongly to the omission of the sentence on the Church. It stated the whole basis of unity.

Bishop Clark accepted this, but asked for it to be redrafted, as several members of the Commission had not understood the point of the sentence.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to consider the work of the Ius Divinum group (ARCIC 248/Ius Divinum/1).

There was a continued discussion on how much Latin should be found in the text and on the unfortunate political overtones of the English phrase "Divine Right". Ius Divinum was to be retained in the text, but the extended quotation from Vatican I was to be put into a footnote without an English translation, as its true meaning was paraphrased in the body of the text.

Revd. J. Charley had an anxiety that paragraph 11 had ducked the issue. The Commission had skated round the meaning of "subsistit in".

Fr. Duprey reminded the Commission that "subsistit" was a substitution for "est". The intention was to affirm continuity but in an open way.

Fr. Tillard proposed the addition of "which is maintained/continued in the Roman Catholic Church".

30th August: MORNING SESSION

Bishop Clark took the chair and opened discussion on the work of the Jurisdiction Sub-Commission (ARCIC 248/Jurisdiction/1).

A number of drafting points were made.

Fr. Tillard regretted the change of order. He thought it better to begin with the difficulties.

Mgr. Purdy explained the change was to show that Anglicans also had an understanding of jurisdiction.

Fr. Tillard did not press his point.

In para. 17 Fr. Tillard questioned whether the problem was simply the misunderstanding of a technical term. Bishop Knapp-Fisher offered: 'Difficulties have been caused by the attribution of universal, ordinary and immediate jurisdiction to the bishop of Rome by Vatican I and misunderstandings arising from these technical terms'.

Fr. Tillard strongly preferred 'precise canonical limitation' in 19. 'Definition' was not true to Vatican I. Bishop Clark and others preferred no change as it would suggest unlimited power.

In 20 Fr. Tavard was uneasy at the idea of jurisdiction being 'given to the primate'. He proposed 'The purpose of jurisdiction is to enable....'

Dr. Gassmann instanced the difficulties in the translation of 'primate'. In German primus meant the leader of a gypsy band!

Fr. Yarnold asked for the second sentence to open the para. as it indicated the purpose of jurisdiction.

In 21 Professor Chadwick asked for the inclusion of the whole sentence from Paul VI and the whole section to go into a footnote.

Some members felt this would spoil the logic of the text which was about jurisdiction. It was agreed to leave the matter in suspense until the Conclusion had been discussed.

Fr. Tillard was still agitated by 'definition' in para. 19.

Eventually Bishop Knapp-Fisher successfully proposed: 'Although the scope of universal jurisdiction cannot be precisely defined canonically, there are moral limits to its exercise deriving from the nature of the Church and of the pastoral office of the universal primate'.

Bishop Clark then asked the Commission to examine the work of the Elucidations Sub-Commission (ARCIC 249/Elucidation/1)

A number of drafting points were made.

Fr. Yarnold was still unhappy that the criticisms mentioned in para. 1 and 2 relating to historical developments appeared not to have been answered. It was eventually agreed to accept the chair's suggestion that 'historical' be deleted.

In para. 3 Fr. Duprey's suggestion of 'the apostolic' faith was substituted for 'their own faith' and 'the faith of the apostle' as Professor Root, Bishop Vogel and Fr. Tavard disliked these expressions.

Revd. J. Charley doubted whether 'universally binding' was correct. Fr. Duprey proposed 'for it to be a true expression of the faith'.

Fr. Tillard repeated his difficulties over definitions having 'authority' but no suitable alternative word could be found, 'standing' or 'weight' being too weak.

Professor Fairweather and Dr. Gassmann had difficulties with the material on lay integration in decision making. It was untrue to say that Anglican lay involvement was only consultative. This sentence was deleted.

Bishop Butler wanted 'the ordained ministry' rather than 'ministerial authority' in 4 and 5.

Dr. Gassmann pointed out an apparent inconsistency between the Elucidation and Continuation in 6. Here 'power' was used, there 'authority'. It was agreed both should read 'authority or power (potestas)'.

Fr. Duprey and Fr. Ryan asked for 'the same canonical power' in the sentence on different levels of episcope.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher asked for the removal of the final long sentence as it was duplicated in the Continuation. Bishop Butler and Fr. Tillard agreed to this if the last clause were put in the Continuation and a cross-reference were added.

In para. 7 Professor Fairweather queried the exactitude of 'the Orthodox tradition of autocephalous patriarchates'. It was agreed to change this to 'the ancient tradition of patriarchates'.

Professor Chadwick asked for the deletion of the reference to their complex origins.

In 8 Fr. Yarnold and Dr. Halliburton asked for the addition of 'In Christian doctrine' to strengthen the logic.

Dr. Gassmann pointed out a gap in the logic. There was no direct reference to a universal episcope. He proposed 'and that the maintenance of visible unity at the universal level includes the episcope of a universal primate.'

Fr. Tavard proposed that 'This is a doctrinal statement' should replace the longer sentence.

31.8.81

MORNING SESSION

From the chair Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on the re-drafted Introduction offered by Mgr. Purdy and Prof. Fairweather (ARCIC 250/Introduction/1)

Drafting points were made.

In para 6 Rev. C.Hill wondered whether the word 'link' would help in the opening sentence.

Fr. Duprey proposed a 'visible link and focus'.

Rev. J.Charley objected to 'represents' as liable to be misinterpreted. It was not used in the Canterbury or Windsor Statements. He proposed 'is a sign of'.
In 7 the Rev. J.Charley asked for 'sacrament' to be put in quotes.

In 8 the Rev. J.Charley proposed 'preached, believed and obeyed'.

Fr Yarnold asked for 'life, death and resurrection' but Fr. Tillard was not happy with its sotirolgy.

Rev. J.Charley proposed 'to receive through the Holy Spirit the fruit of his death and resurrection, the culmination of his life of obedience'.

AFTERNOON SESSION

From the chair Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on the revised draft of the Infallibility Sub-Commission (ARCIC 248/Infallibility/2).

Bishop Knapp-Fisher pointed out that the sub-commission had decided to omit the footnote to para.30.

Drafting points were made.

In para. 27 Professor Chadwick wondered whether 'even outside a formal synod' would make the sense clearer.

Bishop Clark and Bishop Butler found this helpful but

Fr. Tillard and Fr. Tavard did not.

After discussion it was decided to accept Bishop Butler's suggestion of 'apart from a synod'.

In 28 Fr. Tillard and Fr. Tavard wanted 'a decisive discernment of the truth'.

Dr Gassmann asked whether the penultimate sentence correctly formulated the R.C. position. It implied that a judgment was only accepted after an examination of its conditions.

The R.C.members insisted this was correct. Fr. Ryan pointed out this was exactly what De Romani Pontificis said

Dr Gassmann also thought that Anglicans could only affirm the final sentence if they were already in communion with Rome.

In 29 Bishop Butler had difficulties with the idea of enhancing a claim. There was a general dissatisfaction with the whole sentence and it was eventually decided to ask Prof. Chadwick and the Revd. J. Charley to revise it.

Fr. Tillard wanted to keep Fr. Ryan's footnote - his daughter. He proposed that it should come after the reference to reception by the faithful.

Fr. Yarnold thought it needed some re-drafting.

Bishop Moorman and Professor Fairweather did not think thirty the right paragraph as this concerned Anglican doubts.

Fr. Duprey eventually proposed that it followed the reference to Vatican I in para. 28.

Fr. Ryan re-drafted it and after further modifications by Mgr. Purdy it read:

The phrase definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae irreformabiles (such definitions are irreformable by themselves and not by reason of the agreement of the Church Vatican I, Sessio IV Pastor Aeternus cap. IV) does not deny the importance of reception of doctrinal statements in the Roman Catholic Church. The phrase was used by the Council to rule out the opinion of those who maintained that such a statement becomes 'irreformable' only subsequently when it is approved by the bishops. The term 'irreformable' means that the truth expressed in the definition can no longer be questioned. 'Irreformable' does not mean that the definition is the Church's last word on the matter and that the definition cannot be restated in other terms.

Bishop Butler hoped the penultimate sentence of para. 30 was not suggesting there was no need for a universal primate.

The Revd. J. Charley did not think it implied this as the universal primate was not the only means of ascertaining the truth of revelation.

Professor Scarisbrick queried 'perfect communion' Fr. Duprey preferred 'full communion' as the best way of expressing what was meant.

Archbishop McAdoo found 'granted' odd.

Returning to para. 29 Professor Chadwick and Revd. J. Charley offered their revised sentence: "For many Anglicans the teaching authority of the bishop of Rome, independent of a council, is not recommended by the fact that through it these Marian doctrines were proclaimed as dogmas binding on all the faithful".

1 September 1981: MORNING SESSION

From the Chair Bishop Clark called for discussion on the Conclusion (ARCIC 248/Conclusion/1). Several members were unhappy with the text as drafted at Liverpool. It was thought this text no longer adequately described the real agreement reached: remaining difficulties were felt on both sides. Other members warned about the danger of trying to summarize both agreement and disagreement. Some wanted a note of realism to remain, others wanted the tone to be more optimistic.

Professor Chadwick wondered whether 'infallibility' remained an obstacle of such dimensions that schism must remain till the second coming.

Fr. Tillard agreed.

Bishop Butler proposed 'even if serious difficulty remains over infallibility, this may ultimately prove to be one of approach and not a difference of substance'.

Revd.J. Charley did not want differences to be whitewashed, however a step towards full communion had been achieved. Yet Anglicans wanted assurances of what would be binding.

The position of the Authority Elucidation was then discussed, together with the Co-Chairmen's Foreword (ARCIC 251/Co-Chairmen's Foreword/1) The latter was thought by Fr. Tillard to make a good conclusion to the whole Report. It was agreed, at the suggestion of Fr. P. Duprey, that the Elucidation should come between the two Authority Statements.

The Revd.J.Charley proposed that the Co-Chairmen's Foreword should become the general conclusion, while the Liverpool draft should conclude Authority II.

Mgr. R. Stewart thought that para. 32 (ARCIC 248/Infallibility, 3) would make a good authority conclusion.

From the chair it was proposed that Bishop Edward Knapp-Fisher, Fr.H. Ryan, Fr.J.Tillard and the Revd.Julian Charley should propose a re-arrangement and re-drafting of the material and this was agreed. He then moved the Commission to a consideration of the Prefatory Note to the Final Report (ARCIC 218/2).

Drafting points were made and Bishop Clark asked for the Malta Report to be included somewhere in the final document.

The Commission then examined the draft Co-Chairmen's Letter to its respective authorities (ARCIC 252/Co-Chairmen's Letter/1).

Drafting points were made and in general it was thought the document needed more nuancing for its recipients.

Revd. C.Hill asked for a clearer formulation for Anglican Synods to respond to. Bishop John Howe then explained the Anglican procedure of reception.

Bishop Butler insisted there should be one basic letter to the two authorities. Fr. Duprey agreed that special styles were unnecessary.

Professor Chadwick asked for the addition of material indicating the Commission had been faithful to its mandate.

Mgr. R. Stewart thought it an opportune moment to explicitly recommend a new Commission.

Revd.C.Hill suggested that the staff of the Vatican Secretariat for Unity, with Bishop Howe, Archbishop McAdoo and himself should redraft. This was accepted.

ATERNOON SESSION

Archbishop McAdoo opened discussion on the re-drafted Conclusion (248/Conclusion/2). Drafting points were made and accepted.

Fr.Tavard wanted a softer Roman Catholic position in para.39.

Fr.Stewart and Fr.Tillard thought it possible to put in 'infallible statements/definitions' to achieve this.

Bishop Butler asked whether Anglicans looked primarily at the content of, the authority of or the Scriptural warrant for a primatial ex-cathedra statement.

Fr. Tillard was sure that Anglicans would base their agreement with such a statement on its content and its coherence with Scripture.

Professor Fairweather was, however, not happy with the contrast. Archbishop McAdoo thought it was nevertheless true.

Professor Chadwick also found the expression of Anglican/Roman Catholic difference a straight-jacket.

Fr. Duprey insisted that Roman Catholics also examined the content of a statement.

Revd.J. Charley consequently successfully proposed the deletion of the whole of paragraph 39, so that the document would end at para. 32 (ARCIC 248/Infallibility/3).

The Commission accepted drafting points on para. 32.

The Commission then discussed the proposal that the Co-Chairmen's Foreword (251/Co-Chairmen's Foreword/1) should become the general

conclusion (see 248/Conclusion/2 recommendation 3). This was accepted and the Co-Chairmen's Foreword became the Conclusion.

Drafting points were subsequently made and accepted and the 'link paragraph' to open Authority II was also accepted with the omission of the final sentence.

Fr. Duprey then asked for some discussion of the order of the material in the Final Report. The following was agreed: Preface (historical); Introduction (theological); the Statements (followed immediately by their respective Elucidations - excepting the new Authority II); Conclusion; Appendices - list of members, list of meetings, the Malta Report, the two Common Declarations.

Professor Chadwick asked for some protection from Protestant and Orthodox sniping and the Revd. J. Charley was also worried in case readers would see no progress on 'Justification by faith' as well as a threat of absorption by the Roman Catholic Church. It was agreed that Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Fr. Ryan should compose material on this issue and that the Revd. J. Charley should also think about the matter for the Commission to consider an inclusion in the Conclusion.

MORNING SESSION: September 2nd

The whole document was read through for final approval with Archbishop McAdoo in the chair. Only substantive points were raised: minor editorial matters were to be left to the Secretariat, Fr. Yarnold and Bishop Knapp-Fisher, as the text was prepared for the press. The reading of the Preface was deferred.

In the Introduction (ARCIC 250/Introduction/2) para. 8 Professor Chadwick proposed the addition 'declared and made just'. After initial acceptance (8-6) this was eventually rejected (9-3) as raising too many questions.

The Elucidation was deferred.

In the Petrine Texts (ARCIC 248/Petrine Texts/2) para. 4 Archbishop Arnott asked if 'although' was not a non sequitur. After some discussion Fr. Duprey successfully proposed the retention of the draft text.

The Petrine Texts were then accepted.

In Jus Divinum (ARCIC 248/Jus Divinum/2) para. 11 Professor Scarisbrick asked for 'might' rather than 'may' but Bishop Clark and Bishop Butler preferred 'may' and the draft was retained.

Jus Divinum was then accepted.

In Jurisdiction Professor Root asked whether the concluding quotation from Paul VI at the Canonization of the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales was to be continued. This was agreed by means of a footnote.

Jurisdiction was then accepted.

Before turning to the final reading of the Infallibility text the Commission gave general instructions to the Secretariat for the drafting of an appropriate Press Release.

In Infallibility (ARCIC/248/Infallibility/3) para. 30 Bishop Clark and Fr. Tillard wanted to guard against an interpretation which implied that a special charism was unnecessary.

Revd. J. Charley proposed 'Yet, we agree that even without.....'

Fr. Duprey proposed 'The special charism.....'

Bishop Butler was also uneasy that the sentence should suggest the Papacy as an optional extra.

Fr. Duprey consequently proposed 'a Church would still possess means.....'

Professor Chadwick proposed that the matter be put the other way round: 'It is not that without a special charism....the Church would possess no means of receiving...'

After careful discussion it was agreed that the text as drafted did not imply a special charism was superfluous and the existing text was retained on this understanding (8-6).

Infallibility was then finally accepted.

The Bishop Knapp-Fisher/Fr. Ryan additional draft material for the Conclusion was then discussed.

After initial acceptance doubts were expressed.

Revd. J. Charley found the new material over ecclesiastical and Anglo-Catholic.

Fr. Tavard thought it mixed the Reformation and present shared experience.

Bishop Clark had doubts about the Reformation references.

Bishop Butler thought the Revd. J. Charley's concern was Evangelical rather than Reformation.

It was agreed that the Revd. J. Charley and Bishop Knapp-Fisher should attempt a re-draft.

The Elucidation of Authority I (ARCIC 249/Elucidation/2) was accepted - a proposal that sentences should not be taken out of context was referred to the following discussion on the Preface.

In the Preface (ARCIC 218/2) an addition to the above effect was accepted by Mgr. Purdy and Professor Chadwick.

Fr. Ryan and Bishop Butler proposed the deletion of the reference to unencouraging developments as a Pandora's Box. But this was not accepted.

The Preface was then accepted.

Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Revd.J. Charley's re-drafted addition to the Conclusion was proposed at the end of the session, but although there was good support for it a decision was deferred till the Final Session.

FINAL SESSION

Bishop Clark took the chair.

The revised draft addition to the Conclusion by Bishop Knapp-Fisher and Revd.J. Charley was discussed, Professor Scorisbrick in particular finding it difficult. Alternative drafts were also offered by other members. A vote was taken which showed the Commission equally divided (7-7, with 3 abstentions). It was therefore decided not to make reference to Reformation insights or other emphases in the Conclusion.

The Conclusion was finally accepted.

The Co-Chairmen's letter to the authorities was accepted (ARCIC 252/2).

The Press Release was accepted (ARCIC 253/1 and 2).

It was recommended that Miss Anne Tyler and Miss Margaret Orrell should be recommended for some appropriate award from the other Church in deep gratitude for their work which enabled the Commission to function with efficiency and harmony.

The final establishment of the Commission as a charity in British Law was announced by the Anglican Secretary. The use of the money would be decided by the Trustees (Bishop Knapp-Fisher, Bishop Clark and Fr.Yarnold) in consultation with the other Co-Chairman.

The Commission completed its work with the quiet recitation of the Te Deum in the Chapel of St. George, Windsor Castle.

During the meeting the Commission visited Lambeth Palace (1st September) and was received by the Archbishop of Canterbury, receiving the Cross of St. Augustine and the Co-Chairmen the Lambeth Cross. The Commission was also visited by Archbishop Derek Worlock (2nd September) who had just returned from Rome and who gave the Anglican members of the Commission (and Dr. Gunther Gassmann) a new edition of the Vulgate on behalf of Pope John Paul II.