

ANGLICAN - ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

Second Meeting: Durham 22nd - 31st August 1984

Wednesday, Aug. 22nd, 20:30 - 21:30 OPENING SESSION

Bishop Santer, in the chair, led opening prayers. He then welcomed Bishop Ashby who had been unable to attend the first meeting at Venice.

Canon Stephen Sykes, chairman of the Department of Theology at the University of Durham, welcomed the Commission to Durham and also conveyed the good wishes of the Dean and the Chapter. He spoke briefly of the work of the Dept. of Theology and of the A/RC contacts that have developed since Ushaw College became associated with the Department.

Canon Hill explained the timetable, the arrangement for worship, and the proposed visits to Ushaw and Lindisfarne.

Mgr. Stewart outlined the general plan of the meeting - to work on "Church and Salvation" until Sunday (inclusive); then to devote time to preliminary discussion of "Growth in Reconciliation/ Partial Communion" on Monday and part of Wednesday. Wednesday evening and Thursday would be given to further work on "Church and Salvation" in the light of any drafts etc. prepared during the first phase of the meeting.

Bp. Lessard and Canon Baycroft would present interim reports later in the meeting on the N.American ARC's work on partial communion.

Canon Hill reported briefly on the progress of the Anglican Churches in preparing responses to ARCIC-I. Only New Zealand has produced a definitive synodal report, but the process is going according to plan in Australia, Canada, England, U.S.A. In general reactions to Eucharist and Ministry seem positive; rather more questions are raised about Authority - both because of the different style of statement and because of the nature of the subject.

Prof. Wright mentioned that in USA the A/RC coordinating committees are sharing the first draft of their responses later this year.

Mgr. Stewart said that the Unity Secretariat had asked Episcopal Conferences to send their responses by Easter 1985. Since he reported on six responses at Venice last year, three more conferences had responded (Nordic, German, Canadian); all were positive and, where critical, constructive. He too noted that Authority presented more difficulties than Eucharist and Ministry.

The Commission adjourned at 21:30.

Thursday, Aug. 23rd, 09:30 - 12:45

The chairman Bishop Murphy O'Connor introduced the first phase of the Commission's work with a reminder of the programme entrusted to ARCIC-II by the 1982 Common Declaration. The balance between theological and pastoral approaches is of vital importance. Thus justification is not just a past problem but a real issue for the People of God today. And to study Growth in Reconciliation we must consider how in various parts of the world partial communion is finding expression. To begin work on "Church and salvation" he would invite the three members who had prepared papers for this meeting to introduce them briefly.

(a) ARCIC 19/1 (84) "Justification by Faith; a Perspective": Prof.Chadwick

Prof.Chadwick had been asked to trace how this question became a problem in the course of the Church's history. He had studied Luther, the Acta of Trent (Sessions V-VI), the major Protestant critics of Trent, and the principal Anglican writers. He had tried to present the material as a systematic theologian with a strong historical bent, especially the basic question:- Is a man first declared righteous by God with the consequence that he then slowly becomes righteous, OR is it through the process of training etc. in the Church that he reaches the state of righteousness? i.e. Is righteousness inherent or imputed?? He noted some related questions he had not treated directly, e.g. - De Auxiliis; The Nature of Assurance; venial and mortal sin etc.. There was also need to ask how we should talk of sin and salvation today. The terms of the 16th century discussion are not easily used in 20th century discourse. Beyond the central issue the commission will need to think about some consequential questions (e.g. Purgatory). He was grateful for Fr. Yarnold's comments to ARCIC 19/2(84).

In response to Mr.Charley, Prof.Chadwick said that Bp, Forbes, though an independent mind, was very characteristic of the Laudian period and presented an encyclopaedic digest of the writings of many writers (A and RC).

Bp,Santer asked whether Dr, McGrath's view (ARCIC II, 17 (84)) was acceptable - that RC/Lutheran USA dialogue had done our historical work for us. Fr, Yarnold echoed this. Prof..Chadwick admired the RC/Luth.work but noted that their problems were not absolutely identical with ours. In response to Bp,Santer, Fr.Yarnold said that, on general principles of interpretation, the comprehensive condemnation at the end of Clement XII's Unigenitis could not be interpreted as an ex cathedra statement. Bp,Ashby agreed - a very specific condemnation of one man's views, rather than a statement of universal faith addressed to the whole Church.

Prof.Chadwick In Lutheran Churches the question of "justification by faith" became a far more prominent issue than it ever was for Anglicans. In Anglicanism the question arose later under the influence of the Moravian and pietistic traditions.

Fr,Tillard stated that the earliest Anglican traditions make little reference to "Justification by faith", The context was very different to that of the Continental reformation, since Anglicanism, wishing to remain Catholic, placed such emphasis on sacraments, episcopacy. Justification is not a typical dividing issue between Anglicans and RC's. We must not waste time on it.

Fr, Duprey said this is no longer a dividing issue between Lutherans and RC's (cf..Meyer in ARCIC 13/5 83). We must study not justification as such but an integral and ecclesial notion of justification, i.e. Church and Salvation.

Bp.Santer said there are still people who do think it is a church-dividing issue.

Prof. Wright said that any statement on "Church and Salvation" must be careful to show the response to Anglican Evangelical worries on this point. Do Anglicans and RC's have insights on the question which Lutherans have not? Lutherans in USA would ask this.

(b) ARCIC 15 (84): "Church and Salvation": Prof. Pobee.

Prof. Pobee said he had been amazed how biblical studies have led different denominations to agree on questions about salvation; this might transcend some older controversies. He had concentrated on the NT, but noted that in Africa now there is considerable emphasis on the OT -- the protological salvation of creation stories and the aitiological salvation of Exodus narratives. Repeatedly we see that no one imagery will do the whole works; we need to bring together groups of images that balance and correct one another. In the last part of his paper he looked at the Church and Salvation: are the demands of the Church necessarily those of conscience? One can do all the Church requires and yet be found wanting - a warning against making excessive claims for the Church. Four claims needed special attention: (i) Saratorium for sinners; (ii) tabernacle of salvation; (iii) grace through faith, a matter of lifestyle, not just an intellectual exercise; (iv) the importance of the sacraments. Finally he noted that the Church is called to vicarious sacrifice for the world's salvation.

Fr. Adappur did not wish to see too sharp a contrast between what the Church teaches and what a man can possibly do.

Prof. Pobee had been referring to added legalism; no amount of doing things can establish a claim on God.

Sister Boulding disagreed with the last part of the paper: there should not be so sharp a dichotomy between structures and koinonia.

Bp. Vogel liked the paper's emphasis on mission.

Canon Baycroft said (ref. p.9) that Luther's original phrase had been "Semper peccator, semper poenitens, semper iustus": the emphasis was on "although I am a sinner, I am justified" rather than on the other way round.

Prof. Pobee said we needed to keep the imagery of Christ's sacrifice: the Just One offering himself for sinners in solidarity with them.

(c) ARCIC 16 (84): "Church and Salvation": Fr. Tillard

Fr. Tillard's mandate had been to discover what the Church in its human aspect has to do with salvation. Is it simply the fruit of justification or involved in the process? He studied the link between NT ethical demands and salvation: why is the human being called to do something in order at least to remain in salvation? This is clear in all the NT traditions, including Romans. Then he discussed the "sacramentality" of the Church as evangelized/evangelizing, gathered/gathering, reconciled/reconciling. In the third part of his paper he said the Church's task (munus rather than potestas) as proclaiming and explaining the word, being God's instrument in all that leads to the Act of Faith and that helps the human to remain within the power of God's grace. But the Church has no power over the Act of Faith itself, which comes solely from the Holy Spirit, the grace of God. This does not, however, mean that the Church has nothing to do with justification. (A recent gathering of Swiss exegetes had endorsed his approach)

In response to a question from Fr. Adappur, Fr. Tillard pointed out that his paper considered the Church's relation to the act of faith rather than the structure of the act of faith in the individual believer.

Sr. Boulding asked whether people, reacting against the idea of the Church as "organon", do so because they assume that this underrates the fruitfulness of grace.

Bp. Vogel was wary of instrumental language as between God and Man, preferring that of "presence".

Fr. Kyprou said we should look at the Church as Christ in time and space rather than as a juridical, institutional structure. If we look at the Church in this way we can more easily see it as efficacious sign without implying that it "comes between".

Prof. Wright thought Fr. Tillard's emphasis that the Church does have something to do with Justification raised the question whether some Anglicans hold it has nothing to do with it. Is this a point of disagreement?

Fr. Tillard was convinced there was no fundamental division here - even if some are inclined to repeat apparently divisive slogans.

Mr. Charley found "has a part to play" a misleading statement unless it was unpacked. The Church must preach the Gospel, but one must not imply that the Church makes a contribution that is not wholly the work of God.

Fr. Dunrey said that the Church, created by God, must not be thought of as an independent entity.

Mr. Charley said the Church is crucial in preaching the Gospel of Justification.

Fr. Tillard added "and in celebrating the Sacraments".

Mr. Charley said these came after justification. What do we mean by justification? There is the biblical concept (justification) and the concept of a particular theological tradition (justification plus sanctification).

Bp. Santer said that in speaking of the Church as instrument the question rises: do we see it as merely impersonally employed by God or as persons with free will and cooperation? If we are speaking of persons, the language of 'contribution' is unavoidable.

Sr. Boulding asked whether Evangelicals would see justification as leading to participation in the covenant. Did this show a role for the Church?

Mr. Charley thought this a confusion of images.

Bp. Vogel preferred synonyms ("witness", "judgement") to the term "contribution".

The meeting broke for coffee..

From the chair, Bishop Mark Santer invited the Commission to continue the discussion of Fr. Tillard's paper.

Fr. Brendan Soane asked why the Revd. Julian Charley was hesitant about the Church 'contributing' to salvation. In reply Mr. Charley said the evangelical suspicion was that the Church was somehow part of the formal cause of justification.

Bishop Raymond Lessard referred to another paper of Fr. Tillard which he found even more helpful than that under discussion. Faith is itself in the context of a communion of faith - not only the individual. He went on to quote Fr. Tillard approvingly: "The means of grace are not extrinsic to the experience of faith".

Fr. Duprey agreed that 'contribution' was ambiguous. The Council of Orange had been emphatic that there were no good works before justification. The Church itself was the fruit of salvation.

The Revd. Julian Charley found language about the sacraments confusing, especially baptism. Sacraments must be part of an obedient response of faith.

Abp..Butelezi insisted that sacraments were not just outward rites.

Canon Baycroft urged the Commission to work on a statement on baptism based on the Lima Text but with a stronger emphasis on the necessity of faith. He too quoted Fr. Tillard: "Salvation does not come from the believer's action but it includes it".

Mr. Charley agreed with this for 'salvation' but not 'justification', unless the term was being used in its wider sense. Hence the importance of correct terminology.

Canon Hill drew attention to ARCIC-I's seminal statement about baptism in the Introduction (para. 8) to the Final Report.

Mgr. Stewart also alerted the Commission to the treatment of the Church as a sacrament and sign of the Kingdom in the Anglican-Reformed International Commission's Report God's Reign and Our Unity.

But Fr. Yarnold was cautious about a statement on baptism - it would open ARCIC to the attack of those involved in the catechetical debate.

Bishop Ashby asked if there was real disagreement on baptism. Were evangelicals saying both Churches had overemphasized it? It was certainly not an automatic device for salvation.

Mr. Charley thought some explication of baptism would clarify justification.

But Fr. Peter Akpunonu was against concentrating on baptism alone. There were other means of salvation.

Bishop Santer urged the Commission to concentrate on Church dividing issues. He recognised this meant some imbalance of subject matter. There was a need to reappropriate the wider context of faith to which the divisive issues belonged but it was important not to confuse legitimate areas of dispute with Church dividing issues.

Bishop Vogel agreed that some issues were agreed but also forgotten and not given their proper emphasis.

Professor John Pobee also wanted the Commission to draw attention to issues.

Bishop Santer emphasized the importance of the confession of a common baptism.

Mrs. Tanner did not want the St. Albans material to be forgotten and Bishop Santer agreed that the Commission ought now to turn to the drafts of the St. Albans Sub-Commission (ARCIC-II 20/(a) and (b) (84).

Mr. Charley introduced 20(a) Church and Salvation: General Framework with the admission that the drafting group responsible for it did not feel it was as clear as it could have been. In particular paragraph 5 with its distinction between God's perspective and man's was somewhat confusing. He also drew attention to paragraph 7's treatment of the Church's part in salvation.

Fr. Yarnold then spoke briefly to 20(b) Justification, noting overlap with 20/(a) on Scriptural images.

Professor Wright believed the claim in para 4 to be very important: if there was agreement on the New Testament image of justification this was highly significant. But what of Peter Toon's contention that the Anglican Articles captured a Lutheran understanding? Was there agreement?

Professor Thornhill stressed the need to identify the questions which needed to be answered. There had been considerable non-communication since the sixteenth century due to terminological misunderstanding. Justification had often been taken out of its wider New Testament context. He wanted more weight on Redemption which was not merely liberation but becoming God's own and precious to him - this was more mutual. He also called for a clear introduction on the Mystery of God and Man. Theologians laid clumsy hands on the mystery of God's dealing with mankind.

Fr. Duprey asked the Commission not to forget the notion of propitiation (hilasmos) (20/(b)). Salvation was also a reward in some sense 20/(a)

Mr. Charley agreed that there was common ground in the linguistic agreement but also called for illustration of agreement on its implications. He noted the Homily on Salvation used forgiveness as a synonym for justification.

Bishop Vogel disparaged the use of the two perspectives in 20/(a). How could the Commission speak of God's perspective? It would be better to concentrate on God's initiative and the human response.

Bishop Cameron posed the question whether the various New Testament images were interlocking or interchangeable. Was there even a single New Testament image of justification? The Commission must be engaged in the search for truth. This might mean a change of mind and even the traditions which nurtured us. In the task of describing fallen man's relationship to God the sixteenth century reformation had not quite completed the task.

Professor Davis was appreciative of all the work which had been put into the papers but asked for the contemporary context for salvation. There was the trap of placing our historical problems in a context inappropriate for today. Contemporary questions needed to be asked about salvation: salvation from what; by what; to what; for what. What was the nature of sin and from what do we need to be saved? In 20/(a) he questioned whether the glory of man was not also the glory of God and wanted a stronger eschatological emphasis. In 20/(b) he queried whether there was complete agreement that all are born into an inherently sinful condition and objected to the suggestion that only an adult can respond to God.

Canon Baycroft and Professor Wright noted the need for editing in respect of inclusive language.

Bishop Santer concluded the morning session by asking members to table the questions which need to be attended to. Should a group or groups work on a skeleton framework?

Bishop Michael and Lady Ramsey joined the Commission for lunch.

Thursday, Aug. 23rd, 1610 - 1715

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor, in the chair, welcomed Rev. A. Braund, ecumenical secretary of ACC. He then invited members to state briefly what they thought must be contained in the Commission's eventual paper. After this general session the meeting would divide into smaller groups each to prepare a one-page schema of the direction and sequence of such a paper. After a brief plenary tomorrow to gather the results, groups would then work on in greater detail.

Sr. Boulding: we have not yet exploited the full meaning of Koinonia: the St. Alban's draft is very brief on this (eg paras 4, 7). The Koinonia is brought into existence by God's justifying activity.

Fr. Adappur: many matters of discussion are complementary rather than exclusive, not least re God's action and man's cooperation. Much of the controversy is due to emphasis rather than exclusion.

Bp. Ashby preferred the more global terms "salvation/sanctification" to "justification". We must also put the emphasis on mission.

Canon Bavercroft: We must state we have surveyed the whole area and that the only "mines" we have discovered are these or those problems. We could affirm a common understanding of the sacramentality of the Church and then show that certain questions which might appear to cause problems do not in fact do so. But our presentation should be positive (e.g. by a great emphasis on Baptism) and should also be popular and persuasive to renew the momentum of ARCIC I.

Prof. Pobee: We spoke a lot of complementary images but have zeroed in on Justification. We need the broader perspective of salvation, and to treat justification in relation to it. We also need clarity on the ecclesiological implications of salvation. And we must present salvation today in a secularised world and in relation to non-Christian religions.

Fr. Thornhill: (a) To whom are we addressing our statements, to our authorities, or to a wider public? (b) We must identify the deepest concerns of the Protestant and Catholic traditions which have given rise to apparent disagreement; can we agree that the progress of biblical scholarship can help people see that the concerns of either end of the spectrum are not necessarily lost by agreement with the other party?

Bp. Cameron: (a) Be clear about the people we are addressing (cf Common Declaration 1982), otherwise a limitless agenda. (b) We could make progress by simply defining what we understand justification to be. We have rather neglected the Venice group paper ARCIC 8 '83) on variety of images etc.

Fr. Soane: Something should be said of the Sacraments as God's work and human activity.

Fr. Tillard: This is a bilateral dialogue to bring two Churches together, not the WCC addressing the world. If we seek to embrace everything, we shall do nothing. We have to try to discover how and why the questions which were dominant at the point of our rupture are no longer so important. In the 16th century the problem of the Church was not an issue between us.

Fr. Yarnold agreed. We should address the precise points which Evangelicals had asked us to address - justification and faith. Our statement might be rather technical and less appealing to the general reader. It could deal with biblical issues; how disagreements arose; a brief systematic theology of salvation as gift and of man's cooperation in the Church.

Mr. Charley thought the St. Alban's material a beginning in the right direction - salvation with special reference to justification. In dealing with it in terms of its relevance today we should seek to allay the fears some people feel. To this end he drew attention to five points: (1) Why was this so important a question at the Reformation? (2) What is the precise meaning of justification? (3) How does it relate to 'judgement', and so to division? (4) The need to take one other image (e.g. regeneration) and see how it relates to justification; (5) examine "symptoms" (assurance, final perseverance, indulgences, merit ...) which are subsidiary, but still worry people.

Prof. Wright: ARCIC I did not consider justification a major issue, but Evangelical concern has now led us to study it. Hence he would support Mr. Charley. But (a) once clear about justification, symptoms will fall into place and we can see what one is free to do (b) is it still true that this is "the grand question that hangeth yet in controversy" (Hooker)?

Bp. Vogel: Justification is a special problem for some but is of significance for everyone. The significance for all should be stated in the light of the difficulties of Evangelicals.

Prof. Davis: (a) We have to focus on particular difficulties, but are we agreed on our basic concept of God? (b) Justification questions are often linked with privatised piety. Are the Evangelicals who raise these questions representative of the spirit we are trying to engender between our Churches? (c) We must affirm that we are still part of the one Catholic Church.

Bp. Santer: We must refer to the doctrine of the Church, but is it our main theme? We should refer to it in so far as there is need for a balanced exposition of justification. A general exposition of the Church would lead us to everything yet nothing. Also, we must beware of linking union to a particular ecclesiology.

Abp. Butelezi: as we await responses to ARCIC I we must see our work as part of an on-going process and bear in mind the wide spectrum of audience in our Churches.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: our audience is the same as that of ARCIC I. We are a bilateral dialogue. But we must identify with the present concerns of our traditions.

Mrs. Tanner agreed with Bp. Santer, and liked Mr. Charley's five points. Our work could take the form of an elucidation of the latter part of para 8 of Introduction to Final Report. This would encompass most points. Sr. Boulding agreed.

Canon Hill: The St. Alban's group tried to use para 8 as a springboard, with some of the material from Venice '83.

Fr. Adappur: in India theologians are concluding that the normal way of salvation for a Hindu is Hinduism. Something similar might be said of dechristianised people in the West. But it is the salvation of Christ. In this context, what is the relevance of a detailed study of the technicalities of justification?

Fr. Tillard repeated that ARCIC's prime task is to address two separated Communion seeking unity.

Fr. Duprey: we need to be precise on why there is a difference between us, or on why we are seen to differ.

Canon Hill: One part of our agenda is not the whole agenda. As well as our duller "16th century" work we have to get on to wider issues as we develop the "Growth in Reconciliation" theme, since this is for the reconciliation of the world and involves Gospel, Mission, the Church's task as an effective instrument.

Bp. Vogel agreed. We must tackle 16th century problems from today's standpoint, and use a terminology that will identify the problems rather than repeat them.

Fr. Akpunonu spoke of lack of mutual understanding in Nigeria, where Catholics simply would not ask how Anglicans are justified, but would concentrate on attitudes to sacraments and structures.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor then repeated the task of the groups - in the light of this discussion and of the work done in preparation for the meeting. He hoped they would bear in mind what had been said about the addressees of our eventual paper.

The meeting then broke up into three groups.

Friday, Aug..24th, 09:30 -12:30

From the chair Bishop Santer asked the three rapporteurs to present their outlines: ARCIC-II 21/1, 2, 3,/84. The plenary was invited to comment on omissions, unnecessary material, balance and shape.

Fr. Thornhill presented the work of Group A (21/1/84); The Rev. Charley that of Group B (21/2/84); and Fr.Yarnold Group C (21/3 /84). The three rapporteurs were asked to note the discussion and to produce a unified schema. Bishop Santer then asked for comment.

Fr.Yarnold was troubled by the remaining confusion over act and process in the work of Group B. Act was not God's act of justifying, the process being our response. In traditional Catholic theology - indeed in Scripture - God's act is not just declaration but also his regenerative act in making us his sons and daughters (habitual, sanctifying, created, grace). Canon Baycroft said this^{was} why Group A had spoken of event rather than act.

Sr.Boulding was also unhappy that the forensic imagery was used to suggest that God's activity was only in the past - God is active now.

Bp.Cameron thought that the distinction between justification and sanctification was clarified by recalling that justification indicated a change in relationship.

Fr.Akpunonu saw regeneration as a synonym for justification.

Fr.Soane agreed and pleaded for a not too sharp distinction. If there was a change in relationship there must be a change in us, as God does not change.

Mr.Charley now felt the St.Albans material too bland. There were appalling difficulties over the 16th century.

Fr.Thornhill asked whether the plenary was dealing with shape or content. In any case a distinction must be made between the biblical usage with its own economy and the wider reality it referred to. This was the Tridentine usage. But the essential concerns of Protestantism had something to teach Roman Catholics.

Prof.Wright noted that all three groups wanted some definition of justification. But if the Commission was thinking of the contemporary situation there must also be a definition of faith. Fr.Soane agreed and Can.Hill reminded the Commission that this had also been recognized at St. Alban's.

Bp.Murphy-O'Connor was anxious over taking up the 16th century. There had been unresolved debate within the RC Church in the 17th and 18th century.

Mr.Charley insisted on honesty about certain basic radical differences.

Canon Baycroft had been hoping the 16th century would be dealt with in a way to leave history behind. This required a look at contemporary anthropology, where 'Catholic humanists' ∟ himself were very unhappy with statements such as 'we have no health in us'.

Bp.Vogel said it was a mistake to save history. ARCIC methodology up till the present had been to look at present faith.

Prof.Pobee agreed. Did we still associate ourselves with the Final Report's echo of the Philipians quotation from the 1st Common Declaration: 'Forgetting what lies behind and striving forward to what lies ahead'.

/including

Prof. Wright asked if there was to be any historical references.

Bp. Vogel replied that the Evangelicals must say.

Fr. Tillard apologized for re-repeating himself, but he believed the Commission was on the wrong track by going back to justification. The real problem was grace and works. Both Churches felt obliged to preach the Gospel for the salvation of the world. Both Churches prayed -- intercession was a special evangelical emphasis. Both felt obliged to celebrate the sacraments. The real question was whether there was agreement on the relation of grace these similarities implied. Was the similarity only external? This was an ecclesiological not a historical question.

Mr. Charley sympathized but still insisted that history could not be ducked. History pin-pointed Jean's issues. If his suggestion was followed the Commission must start from justification to go on to show the real issue. There was also the problem of the authority of Trent and of its re-interpretation - this sometimes appeared to an outsider such as himself to be a slightly unscrupulous ballgame. But he did not want a massive historical treatise.

Bp. Cameron saw the possibility of a statement with a high degree of consensus. If it conflicted with Trent or Unigenitus that was a Roman Catholic problem. A statement was part of a process in which both traditions would learn. Some Anglicans who had a tight definition of justification based exclusively on Romans might have to learn, just as Roman Catholics (as Fr. Thornhill had said) would also learn from biblical scholarship.

Mrs. Tanner was confused. The discussion was swinging between justification and the Church and grace. She asked Fr. Tillard what his statement implied for the structure of the document.

Fr. Tillard confessed his ignorance. He continued, however, to see the problem as sanctification not justification. For the salvation of the world the grace of God did everything - yet the Church also had something to do, not only as a sign but as an organon or instrument. The Church was not accidental to salvation. God's grace "needs" the Church.

Archbishop Butelezi didn't think this divided and reminded the Commission that John Pcbec's paper had seen the Church as God's agent.

Fr. Duprey was sure this was at the heart of the debate: The instrumental quality of the Church serving salvation. In the 16th century the individual aspect predominated.

Canon Baycroft found Fr. Tillard's answer to Mrs. Tanner in the structure of the draft from Group A and Mrs. Tanner also pointed to Group B.

Bishop Vogel was uneasy at the "symptoms" and "expressions" in groups B and C. They were to do with Christian psychology.

Sr. Boulding wondered whether the treatment of grace and merit wasn't a second stage.

Fr. Soane did not think there had been much discussion about venial sin.

Bishop Santer reminded the plenary that Fr. Yarnold had asked for merit and venial sin to come under the systematic exposition. The other matters were practices. Merit and grace were very important for Hooker. God's grace effects what it declares. The relation between justification and forgiveness needed exposition as forgiveness changed relationships.

Bp. Cameron also recalled the great debate in Protestant Scholasticism on the relation between justification and forgiveness.

Prof. Chadwick was despondent that grace and works had to be settled before Rome and Canterbury could be in Communion. This had long divided both traditions e.g. Jansenism and Arminianism. He might not live long enough to see the composition of a de Auxiliis.

Bp. Santer agreed. What was required was reassurance that the two traditions need not maintain their breach of communion.

Fr. Soane urged the composition of a dogmatic statement rather than the closing of theological debate. The de Auxiliis controversy was not about the fact of grace and free will but about explanations of their relationship.

Fr. Tillard concurred and pointed to the similarities between the controversy between Evangelicals and other Anglicans and that between the Jesuit and Dominican traditions. Even the Jesuits were not heretical! His study of Augustine and Cyprian had shown that the diversity of catholicity was not in essence cultural but due to different legitimate understandings of God's relation with humankind.

Fr. Yarnold asked for enlightenment on the order of the draft. The historical problems had been put first in two schemas but ARCIC-I had always put a common understanding first.

Fr. Duprey spoke of the surprise of dialogue. At the beginning of ARCIC-I separate statements had been envisaged after a common affirmation of faith. In the end they found agreement made this unnecessary.

Bp. Ashby urged a tangential treatment of history. He was not anxious about purgatory, etc. There were variations in personal piety which were not high in the hierarchy of truths.

Dr. Gunther Gassmann believed that it was necessary to indicate that there was deep controversy - otherwise why was the matter being dealt with. Justification was the tip of the iceberg of grace and works and the role of the human person in salvation. Luther spoke for those who were in despair in their uncertainty of salvation in spite of the fulfilment of religious duties. The debate was not scholastic but existential.

Prof. Wright in agreement with Fr. Duprey and Bishop Vogel wanted to avoid the historical approach of the USA Catholic/Lutheran dialogue. He was still unclear as to whom the list of 'symptoms' in B was addressed.. Some items seemed to be taken from 'What is wrong with Rome' tracts, but what of 'assurance'? Did Catholics have problems with Evangelicals about this?? The list ought to include a Catholic critique.

Fr. Thornhill was hesitant to follow ARCIC-I in speaking of history only after a joint statement because people would read in their own misunderstanding of terms.

But Canon Hill reminded the plenary that the ARCIC-I methodology had been to avoid the use of controversial terms in a fresh common statement and only to use traditional terms - if at all - afterwards.

Friday, Aug. 24th, 11.15 a.m.

REPORTS ON NATIONAL ARCS.

After coffee, Bp. Murphy-O'Connor took the chair and introduced a discussion of recent work of national ARCs.

Mgr. Stewart summarised the contents of the letter sent to national ARCs by the co-chairmen and mentioned brief responses from Zimbabwe and France.

Canon Hill said the letter had gone to 18 national ARCs. Acknowledgements had also been received from ARCs in Wales (dormant), Scotland (dormant), Belgium (mainly pastoral questions re Anglican chaplaincies), USA (to be discussed later). Lambeth also received the minutes of Canadian ARC. He asked how many members of ARCIC are members of National ARCs: only six appeared to be so.

(a) Canon Baycroft reported on Canadian ARC which had slowed down a bit after work on a response to Osservazioni SCDF, to the Final Report of ARCIC, and to BEM. But the question of Mixed Marriages created great difficulties.

Fr. Tillard spoke of the complex situation especially when the R.C. requirements we insisted on in cases where the R.C. partner is non-practising and the Anglican practising. R.C. bishops had been reluctant to change rulings for such cases. Anglican bishops had then begun to take a harder line.

Mgr. Stewart referred to recent referral of question of mixed marriages to SPUC by ACC-6. Perhaps a mixed group could evaluate the 1975 A/RC report on the subject. The SPUC plenary meeting in November 1984 was to study the ecumenical implications of the new Code of Canon Law; this would also be pertinent.

Canon Hill said that ARCIC's present programme was already full; it could not take up mixed marriages as well. But the way ahead could be discussed at the Informal Talks in November.

Prof. Wright asked what had happened to the report Canadian ARC prepared a few years ago.

Canon Baycroft said it had gone to a joint group of A/RC bishops. The R.C. bishops could not see how the canon law could be changed and had asked for a draft on which guidelines could be prepared on how to live within the present regulations. There had been no action so far. He also mentioned Canadian ARC's Study Guide to the Final Report; the demanding work done by members of ARC in travelling to five talks, etc. all over the country; and the anxieties felt concerning the academic freedom of theologians (particularly in regard to SCDF).

Fr. Tillard spoke of the seriousness of these anxieties and of their effect on attitudes to the imminent visit of the Pope to Canada.

Prof. Chadwick said these worries were shared in England but observed that England had rather more than its fair share of very liberal theologians.

(b) Bishop Ashby reported on New Zealand. After the Papal Visit to Canterbury there had been a very good response to joint A/RC services all over New Zealand on one Sunday in September 1982. Similar services were planned for Sept. 30th 1984, as conclusion to six weeks of joint study of the Final Report; a study guide had been prepared for this purpose. The media were supportive and three pairs of bishops had discussed Eucharist, Ministry, Authority, on TV. ARCCNZ had started in Nov. 1983 (10-a-side), and was encouraging practical ecumenism and mission at local level. There were annual joint meetings of bishops. In the diocese of Christchurch there had been joint clergy schools. R.C. observers were now regularly invited to diocesan and general Synods. Mixed marriage problems were similar to those in Canada, especially where the R.C. was weak.

Fr. Duprey said the purpose of the law was to ensure the faith, and a responsible pastor should take decisions to achieve that.

Fr. Tillard said that priests who acted thus did not get the support of their bishops on the basis of law.

Canon Hill referred to the section "Of Reliance on Law" in the A/RC 1975 report on mixed marriages.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked whether New Zealand could be judged a place in which partial communion had already reached a very significant stage.

Bp. Ashby agreed and thought New Zealand a country in which any process of unity by stages or by regions could well go ahead.

(c) Abp. Butelezi said that in South Africa the joint theological group no longer met, but that annual meetings of bishops (five-a-side) continued; he would see that minutes were sent to the secretaries of ARCIC. In South Africa also mixed marriages were a problem; a proposed common rite had not won acceptance because of difficulties over Communion. The Anglicans are involved in the work of the Churches' Unity Commission and find it helpful that there is R.C. participation in some of that Commission's Theological working groups. South Africa had offered to host a meeting of ARCIC, but travel costs had ruled this out. Both Churches faced many common problems; although RCs are not members of the SACC they had taken part in a joint publication on Removals, and in a group of ecumenical delegates to USA and Europe earlier this year.

Canon Hill mentioned RC-Anglican-Lutheran contacts re Namibia.

(d) Prof. Pobee said that in the present political situation in Ghana the first concern of Church leaders was with Church survival, but there were good informal A/RC relations in the north. As yet they had not tackled the Final Report, but the Synod hoped to discuss the possibility of formal dialogue.

(e) Fr. Adappur spoke of levels of ecumenical activity in India, e.g. local dialogues after the visit of the Syrian Orthodox Catholics to Rome. Bishops meet to discuss common problems vis-a-vis the Government. There were local discussions of BEM; people were interested, but there was no official organ to promote dialogue and this led to some lethargy. Though liking the idea of unity, people remained jealous of their identity.

Canon Hill said that closer A/RC relations had recently developed in Sri Lanka and a formal dialogue had started.

(f) Fr. Akpunonu said that Anglicans and RCs, together with a variety of Pentecostal Churches took part in the Christian Association of Nigeria. In the difficult situation in that country Christians came together when threatened, whether by the resurgence of Islam or by political problems. After last year's ARCIC meeting he had reported to his bishop (President of the Conference) and to a meeting of priests of the province; all had been willing, but the political problems of the last twelve months had made it difficult to do anything. There was still considerable mutual distrust between the two Churches. But some clergy were now starting dialogue on an individual basis. In one part of the country excellent progress was being made on joint translation of the bible. He felt that were it not for the political crisis, more substantial progress might be made.

Bishop Moorman (co-chairman of the Joint Preparatory Commission and member of ARCIC I) and Mrs Moorman were the Commission's guests at lunch.

In the afternoon, members visited Ushaw College.

Friday, Aug. 24th, 1630 - 1830

Bishop Santer took the chair and called on Fr. Yarnold to introduce the composite schema (Church and Salvation ARCIC II 23/1 (84) after which he opened discussion to the Commission as a whole.

Bishop Vogel missed a sufficient statement of the problematic (as found in the earlier Group B draft 21/2). More weight in was needed to lead in to the history.

Prof. Davis was reassured that the title of the whole document was Church and Salvation. But if so, an informed reader would look for fine bits of litmus paper in statement: the salvation of the entire cosmos; the God who creates as well as saves; Christ and the Cross; the Church as the gift of God; a contemporary explanation of guilt and grace.

Mr. Charley cited the work of Christ in 3 (ii). The other matters were not, however, divisive.

Fr. Duprey admitted the need for one or two sentences to explain why the focus was on some aspects and not others. The plenary should beware of too much detailed comment at this stage, it must leave some freedom for the eventual drafters.

Fr. Yarnold saw the Church as gift in 3 b (i).

Canon Baycroft warned the Commission of his difficulty in signing something on purgatory, indulgences and related matters.

Bp. Cameron proposed a preamble explaining the Commission was dealing with issues which have divided but at the same time recognizing the contemporary world issues which face the Christian community. He was not anxious to impose his own ecclesiastical inhibitions on others.

Canon Hill enquired whether the logic of the document would be damaged if the historical section (2) came after the common understanding (3) as a lead in to the matters of belief and practice (4).

Mr. Charley saw the historical section as setting the context rather than attempting an elaborate historical reconciliation.

Fr. Tillard preferred four points: the Conclusion (5) suggested the two traditions wanted to agree on grace when they already agree, furthermore justification was only a fragment of the doctrine of grace on which it was dependent; Kortwright's stress on regeneration and the re-creation of humanity was important, regeneration was also closely linked to and he rejected their separation in 3 b (iv) and (v); there was a distinction between the agreement necessary for communion and disagreement on secondary affairs such as purgatory, his own faith in purgatory was low; he finally emphatically disagreed with the separation of Scripture and systematics (3 (a) and (b)).

Sr. Boulding made three points: she preferred history after a statement of common faith, linked with the 'Two warnings' of 1 (d), 1 (b) and (c) also ought to be reversed; in 3 (b) vii the separation of baptism as incorporation into the koinonia and as the sacrament of justification was unfortunate; in 4 (a) it was difficult to speak of one doctrine of purgatory as there was a catholic diversity.

Bishop Vogel supported the move of the historical material. He liked Gunther Gassman's historical explanation of Luther's protest as a way in. Prof. Wright sympathized, providing the historical material was not actually reduced. He repeated his unease about section 4.

Fr. Thornhill was uneasy with 3 b (iv) as it began to give justification too great a prominence. He agreed with Jean Tillard that grace and works was the real issue. The present schema was out of kilter.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor emphasized that the groups had the freedom to do some re-ordering. The plenary should not over schematize. Fr. Yarnold agreed but still felt the position of the historical material ought to be decided in advance. Mgr. Stewart thought this would best emerge in the drafting. He thought the Conclusion (5) might mention the Church.

Mr. Charley agreed that the Conclusion was unsatisfactory. Nor did he want to resolve all the practices in 4 but an allusion ought to be made to them to show they were peripheral.

Abp. Butelezi had been won over to the importance of some historical reference. It was important to show the problem had been dealt with. Bp. Santer asked if this meant he wanted history later: yes.

Mgr. Stewart doubted whether much could be done on the consequential practices in 4 till the substantive work on a common statement in 3 had been completed.

Bp. Santer asked if there was a common mind about the place of the historical material. Bp. Cameron thought it was a matter of form rather than substance but Fr. Yarnold wanted a working decision and Fr. Thornhill suggested a positive statement first. The chairman was certain the important question was what if anything did human beings contribute to their salvation. He then asked what the final document would be about. The Commission was like a car with a flat tyre constantly going off in one direction: the Conclusion was all about justification.

Mrs Tanner was certain the real conclusion was 3 (b) vii. She also agreed with Sr. Boulding in asking for the reversal of 1 (b) and (c). Mr. Charley absolutely agreed that 3 (b) vii ought to be the conclusion. Section 4 would then be a sort of bracketed post script on practices. But this would mean the history must come earlier or the text would end on a divisive note.

Fr. Tillard also wanted 3 (b) vii as the Conclusion. This would enable the Commission to avoid an individualistic approach by reference to the koinonia. It would also answer Kortwright's main point. He was also unhappy at the formulation of 3 b (i) which suggested that the koinonia was simply the collection of justified individuals rather than the 'community of women and men in the Church'. Fr. Thornhill said this was what had been intended.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor recognized sections 1 - 3 as the essential draft.

Fr. Yarnold continued to be anxious about the place of history.

Bp. Vogel argued that it should come where needed in the actual logic of the draft. It could be brought earlier with some re-ordering.

Bp. Santer sensed that the Commission was now anxious to move into drafting groups. The consensus was for four groups of six rather than the larger sub-commissions.

When the session resumed after a short interval, Bp. Santer stressed the need to finish this discussion this evening.

Dr. Gassmann said (a) the document should culminate in Church and Salvation and that the areas of diverse practice etc. (n.4) could be worked in to the historical section; (b) The historical section would be more logically placed earlier rather than later, since the reason ARCIC is dealing with this issue is primarily an historical one; (c) in the Reformation debate the ecclesial as well as the personal-existential was in fact at issue. Perhaps a suitable title for the document might be "Salvation, the Christian and the Church".

Fr. Soane agreed that something specific must be said about both the individual and the community.

Canon Hill agreed that 'practices' could be linked with the historical section. To treat of community-and-individual would also help us later on to avoid an individualistic approach to moral issues.

Bp. Santer said that the introduction should state that readers of ARCIC-I have asked us to expand the treatment of koinonia and also to consider doctrine of salvation/justification. We see these as linked.

Fr. Tillard said justification concerns the relationship of the individual to God. But indulgences in 16th century were a problem about the Church. Which was the real prior cause of division?

Fr. Yarnold thought we had not the expertise to present historical studies of indulgences at the Reformation etc. Our task is to reassure people worried by the doctrinal implications of present practices. He added that a desire to conclude the document with 3(vii) should not lead us to prejudice the content of the paper.

Mr. Charley agreed. The section on 'practices' could come after justification and before the Church.

Canon Baycroft thought we should be warned by the fact that in Authority I the summary of remaining difficulties (24 a-d) led many people to neglect the positive content of paras 1-23.

Prof. Chadwick remarked that not all the nettles ARCIC-I faced had contained the anticipated sting.

Sr. Boulding thought that if the Scriptural and Systematic elements of n.3 were combined, considerable re-ordering would be necessary.

Fr. Yarnold maintained that a brief statement of what Scripture says is needed.

Fr. Tillard warned against setting a false antithesis between the Scriptural and the theocentric.

Sr. Boulding referred to the koinonia references in the first part of the systematic section; were we to write on justification or on koinonia?

Mgr. Stewart felt that we were beginning to expand on matters that would best be left for group discussions and drafting.

Bp. Santer and Bp. Murphy O'Connor stated that the chairmen now had sufficient material for making decisions about the groups and their work for next day.

Mr.Charley hoped that now that this stage had been reached we would not be asked to turn to other subjects on Monday.

Canon Hill agreed that, since the N.American ARCs' reports were interim ones, it should be possible to rearrange the division of labour so that this meeting could major on the main topic. He detected that the Commission now wanted to get to work in sub-groups.

It was agreed that the chairmen and secretaries would decide on the membership of four groups of six and the topics which they would work on. The session then adjourned.

Saturday, August 25th

In a brief plenary at 09:30 the chairmen explained the plan of work for the next stage.

- Group 1: -Introduction and General Presentation;
Fr.Adappur, Bp. Ashby, Dr.Davis, Fr. Duprey, Dr. Gassmann,
Bp.Vogel.
- Group 2: -Historical Section
Sr.Boulding, Prof.Chadwick, Bp.Gitari, Bp.Lessard, Fr.Soane,
Prof.Wright.
- Group 3: -Common Understanding: (3 a,b i-vi)
Fr.Akpononu, Bp.Cameron, Bp.Santer, Mrs.Tanner, Fr.Thornhill,
Fr.Yarnold.
- Group 4: -Common Understanding: Church and Salvation (3 b vii)
Canon Baycroft, Abp.Butelezi, Mr.Charley, Bp.Murphy-O'Connor,
Prof.Pobee, Fr.Tillard.

The Commission worked in these groups for the remainder of the day, and at 18:00 attended a reception given by the Dean and Chapter of Durham.

Monday, August 27th, 09:30 - 12.45

Bp. Murphy O'Connor, in the chair, explained the plans for the day's work.. The four papers prepared by the groups were then read aloud:

- Group 1: ARCIC-II 24(a) (84) Introduction
- Group 2: ARCIC-II 25(a) (84) (Historical)
- Group 3: ARCIC-II 26(a) (84) (Justification)
- Group 4: ARCIC-II 27(a) (84) The Servant Church as Sign and Steward.

Spokesmen for the four groups were asked to make introductory comments on their papers.

Bp. Vogel (Group 1) explained the structure of the Introduction. After picking up the theme from Final Report, Introd.para.8, the group attempted to state the problems in balance, and to give a wider context while concentrating on the issues needed for union.

Prof. Chadwick (Group 2) said Group 2 set out to state how Justification became a problem in the 16th century and to offer some reflections on the origins of these disputes. After sketching the position of Luther and noting that the question of Justification is clearly linked with his protest against various medieval practices etc., the Group spoke of Trent, noting that it does not offer or condemn a synthesis of Lutheranism but dealt with aspects that caused concern (and had been formulated by someone somewhere). It then spoke of the Articles which were finalised some twenty years later and did not contain matter directly condemned by Trent. The Commission might think a less succinct treatment of Trent and the Articles was necessary. Finally the Group offered a short list of issues still discussed; this could only be dealt with properly when details of the drafts of the systematic sections were available.

Fr. Yarnold (Group 3) said the systematic presentation began theocentrically and moved on to koinonia and Scriptural images. Para.4 spoke of the need for salvation and God's saving power as grace and man's ability to make a free response by faith - described in para 5. Para.6 indicated two complementary aspects of God's love (once-for-all;/ process) and 7 showed how various biblical images had elements of both. Para.8 speaks explicitly of Justification: it does not say that this image has this dual polarity; but that, while it stresses one aspect, it is inherently linked with other images that express complementary ideas. Paras. 9-12 speak of various misunderstandings (noting what we see as common concerns behind them) and then of merit and reward.

Mr. Charley (Group 4) said the group set out to show the part the Church plays in the economy of salvation (Sacramentality, without using the word). The Church is (a) not peripheral, (b) not "in control". Concern for unity is not just for our own sake but for the world, for the Church is Sign and Steward (sacramental) and must transmit the Gospel not just by repetition but by life. The Spirit nourishes the life of the community and also makes its proclamation effective. All is part of God's gift. The image of God in the first creation involved responsibility: salvation involves the restoration of this image in the new humanity (the paper uses biblical images other than, but complementary to, Koinonia). Our cooperation in no way detracts from the sovereign grace of God. As sign the Church has to embody and reveal God's purpose

especially in its share of the way of the Cross (a safeguard against triumphalism). As steward the Church is responsible for proclaiming the Gospel and in enabling believers to grow in holiness, all under God's grace. The Church has no power over the word or over the believer's faith-response, but God has chosen to work through the Servant-Church. 'Sign' and 'Steward' are inseparable aspects of the Church's call to share in God's work.

General Discussion

Fr.Thornhill thought the historical detail excessive; also that 4 (ecclesiology) should precede 3 (justification).

Fr. Yarnold suggested 4 should also precede 2 (history).

Fr. Thornhill preferred to dismember 2 and introduce its elements as needed. He was more concerned about the order of the doctrinal parts.

Bp.Cameron referring to the obvious overlap of 1/6 and 3/3 (scriptural images), thought 3 was the better place.

Mrs.Tanner suggested an historical appendix; overmuch detail might unbalance the overall text. She liked 4 very much but hoped the anti-triumphalist section could be strengthened. The Church must enable Christians to recognize the signs of the Spirit in the wider world.

Bp.Santer was grateful for 4, but as part of an ARCIC-statement on the doctrine of the Church something stronger was needed. The sacramental nature of 'sign' could be strengthened; more could be said of the Church as Body of Christ, and of saints and martyrs as a special visibility of Christ's power. Triumphalism should be avoided, but not by neglecting the power of the Cross.

Fr.Akpunonu liked 4, but found it less positive and more defensive than he desired. There should be more on the Church as continuation of Christ's salvific work in time and space (cf. passage on p.3 "The Church has no power "), and as means of salvation.

Prof.Wright found 3 (Justification) weak on historical perspective and therefore too generalised. Was the title of the whole text to be "Church and Salvation"? We need a more 'complete' title since we do not intend a comprehensive treatise on both.

Fr.Soane found 2 (history) a great help. The questions at the end of 2 are in fact answered in 3, but this has still to be made obvious. In due course we must speak directly of practices of piety, etc. ; but already we can say that practices are to be understood in the light of the doctrine here treated.

Can Hill observed that, if 4 preceded 3, the document would conclude with justification. We must think of the shape of the whole text. One could think of the general and particular approach of Authority I and Authority II.

Mr.Charley (a) thought it logical for 4 to follow 1 directly. (b) Some thought 4 not sharp enough, but the whole theme would be enriched by a simple and non-polemic treatment of 'Sign' and 'Steward', an area in which many people found difficulties. (c) 2 needs to be shortened and its closing questions should be answered precisely in 3. (d) 3 would conclude with the doctrine of salvation rather than that of justification. It should also reflect the fruits of recent NT studies on the equality theme of justification in Paul.

Fr. Akpunonu observed that the historical section , even if overlong did give us the basis of the real and as yet unanswered questions that face us.

Mgr. Stewart was hesitant about Can.Hill's parallel to Authority I and II. People might neglect the general positive statement when concentrating on ARCIC's response to the particular issue.

Fr. Duprey was happy with the state our work had already reached. All the essentials were there. 2 should be shortened and 3 should respond more clearly to 2's questions. Our task is agreement in faith; we must avoid the temptation to enter into theology too much. 4 keeps to the essentials and avoids terms liable to misunderstanding etc. This material could also assist towards an easier reception of ARCIC-I.

Fr. Tillard also hoped to see 4 after 1. He praised 2: even if too long, it must not be lost, since much of our problem is historical. Some of this material could be transferred into the Introduction, to show how questions about the sacramentality of the Church can give birth to two views about it (neither peripheral nor "in control"). The whole text could conclude with explanation of the possibility of pluralism of visions in one Church united in one faith.

After coffee Bishop Santer took the chair and invited final general comments on the drafts.

Bishop Lessard was concerned for consistency with the U.S. Lutheran-Catholic Statement in which justification had been central and the Church secondary.

Fr. Adappur believed that they contained all that was necessary, but the section on the Church seemed to put the fullness of God's action and the Church in false opposition (4). He wanted less history but it was difficult to say how much was too much.

Fr. Tillard thought some Lutherans were not happy at the U.S. Lutheran-Catholic Statement. It was not a bible.

With these remarks Bishop Santer closed the discussion and asked for detailed criticism. He suggested a revised order to take account of the earlier wish to move the ecclesiology up beginning with Group 1, but then going to 4, 2 and 3. Paragraph by paragraph criticism of Group 1's draft then began (24/(a) (84)).

Discussion of Introduction

Paragraph 1

Bishop Gitari found the quotation ignored the 'wheat and tares', but Mr. Charley said the New Testament pattern was to speak of the Church as its members professed to be.

Paragraph 2

Fr. Soane and Bishop Santer considered the last sentence unclear. What did it refer to?

Bishop Vogel replied that 'the community of believers' was intended to be a synonym. But Dr. Chadwick, Professor Wright and Bishop Lessard preferred the omission of the paragraph. Bishop Ashby, however, was sure something was needed in the presentation at this point.

Fr. Yarnold asked for an expansion of paragraph 1 with more emphasis on the missionary and reconciling aspects. Fr. Tillard agreed.

Paragraph 3

Mr. Charley thought the draft would be more incisive if paragraph 4 came before 3. Canon Baycroft sympathized but felt the second sentence of 3 took care of it.

Mgr. Stewart warned about the dangers of dismissive language: 'some', 'seem', 'are thought' etc.

Professor Wright did not know what the subject of the first

sentence was. Nor was Professor Chadwick at all clear what question was being answered.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether the concern was about ARCIC-I or general Anglican and Roman Catholic teaching? If the latter the Roman Catholic needed to be more widely expressed.

Bishop Santer saw the problem in the disparate character of the issues. Did Roman Catholics do something wrong - Anglicans should do something right! But Bishop Vogel denied there was a balance intended.

Mr. Charley warned against attempting a comprehensive introduction.

Fr. Tillard said the perspective was of some Anglicans, but not some Roman Catholics. It was some Anglicans in front of the block of the Roman Catholic Church and some other Anglicans. But Bishop Vogel only knew some Roman Catholics who were concerned. Canon Baycroft cited the Holy Office! Bishop Vogel thought the CDF was some Roman Catholics! Bishop Santer thought not.

Professor Wright was sure both 'teaching and practices' had to come out or stay in.

Mgr. Stewart thought that as the questions came in different ways they did not need to be handled in the same way.

But Canon Hill reminded the Commission that 'justification' was not Evangelical private enterprise as it had been requested by the Anglican Consultative Council.

Fr. Yarnold now saw that the paragraph was speaking of particular concerns. Sr. Boulding suggested: 'the agenda has been given'.

Paragraph 4

Bishop Lessard queried its essentialness.

Fr. Soane wondered whether all Anglicans would be happy with its sharpness.

Professor Wright and Bishop Santer urged that only the first and last sentences be retained.

Bishop Cameron said 'expand or omit'.

Mr. Charley thought the word 'emphasis' misleading: he still preferred the para. before 3.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor did not want to overestimate the readership.

Fr. Yarnold felt critics disliked ARCIC's reduction of disagreement to differences of emphasis - he preferred 'insisted on

But Fr. Adappur was not happy as this meant a disowning of the past.

Bishop Vogel argued that the U.S. Catholic-Lutheran dialogue had demonstrated that the controversy was a matter of emphasis.

Fr. Duprey reminded the plenary that the Introduction would need changing if the ecclesiology was brought forward.

Fr. Yarnold was sure the sixteenth century thought it was more than emphasis. Trent did not say Dr. Luther had got his emphasis wrong!

Bishop Cameron was uneasy at the reduction of the historic tensions to doctrinal issues and Canon Hill agreed, speaking of the jurisdictional break in England before the doctrinal cleavage. Fr. Tillard agreed and Canon Baycroft spoke of the mutual distortion of memories.

Professor Wright did not understand the logical transition between 3 and 4. At first the draft spoke of Anglicans and Roman Catholics, then Lutherans.

Professor Chadwick urged omission - or an expansion. It could begin by saying what everybody is agreed about: God and God alone gives justification; only by the righteousness and merits of Christ; but in man something is required. Then the draft should expound where disagreements emerged: whether the decision of forgiveness lays the ground for sanctification or whether sanctification was the ultimate ground for God's acceptance of man. Mr. Charley found this helpful.

Sr. Boulding judged it better to hold the para. until the history had been discussed.

Paragraph 5

Mr. Charley thought 5 and 6 duplicated later material and could go, but Fr. Thornhill wanted some allusion to the many images.

Canon Baycroft did not want to lose the 'mystery'.

Professor Chadwick agreed that justification was not the sole image. Yet it expressed as others did not that a person who gets to heaven is good.

Fr. Thornhill agreed and went on to point out an omission from the whole draft: the two biblical senses of justice. There was a condemning justice and a divine saving justice. God's plan in Romans is revealed as saving justice (Lyonnet).

Paragraphs 7 and 8

Mr. Charley understood the problem actually to be the atonement. Eucharistic teaching had now made things clearer.

Fr. Yarnold wanted an explanation of the order - Church and justification - to show they were not two subjects.

Mgr. Stewart agreed.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor really wondered whether the Introduction had better be written at the end.

Fr. Thornhill and Canon Hill hoped for some expansion of the cosmic dimension and the danger of confining salvation to the Church. Bishop Vogel revealed the paragraphs had originally been fuller. Professor Wright did not like the word 'faithful' - the offer should be to all people.

Fr. Akpunonu disliked the concessiveness of the word 'ability' this was the mission of the Church.

Mr. Charley disliked the conflation of Salvation. Christian and Church - it was too compressed. He also questioned 'God's first good creation'.

Bishop Santer said this discussion was bound to be fragmentary and inconclusive until the discussion of Group 3's work and the Doctrine of the atonement.

Monday, August 27th, 16:00 - 18:40

Discussion of Group 4: Servant Church as Sign and Steward
(ARCIC-JI 27 (a) 84).

From the chair Bp. Santer asked for comments and recalled that earlier discussion showed most people wished to see section 4 preceding 3..

Fr. Tillard: If so there will be need for a final paragraph to state our two Communions agree on the content of 4 (even if they lay the emphasis on different aspects), whereas in studying history both the justification question appeared and that of the role of the Church. That would lead into 3.

Prof. Chadwick was uncertain what question 4 was answering, even though all it says is true. Our quest for unity, the faithful transmission of the Gospel, and the way it is lived -- these seem rather disparate issues.

Bp. Vogel agreeing, said that the first paragraph of presentation might be better as concluding summary.

Fr. Thornhill said that whereas the Roman Church has moved from a rather juridical expression of ecclesiology, the Anglican Communion has kept to an "oriental" living in the mystery, and this paper could provide a statement of the deep ecclesiological realities that Anglicans do in fact hold.

Mr. Charley admitted that the paper might be too condensed, and that a critic might judge our concern to be a selfish two-Church one. This is why 4 starts by explaining that Christ's will is not just for the unity of some but for the faith of all. This is why it stresses that concern to transmit the Gospel does not just include repetition but must spring from a community which manifests the unity and the whole way of life Christ prayed for.

Fr. Tillard said that in RCC dialogue with some other Churches the question of the sacramentality of the Church is very important. Is the Church simply the "fruit" of Christ's work, or has it something to do to "help" realise the goal of the mystery of Christ. We must face this issue, of which justification by faith is part. The question of "works" affects the Church as well as the individual. So 4 studies not a full ecclesiology but how God uses the Church in the service of the world, which is still a burning issue between the Catholic and Anglican traditions.

Canon Baycroft referred to the opening paragraph. The sentence "faithful transmission ... apostolic message" is first part of a statement of which "for the manner.... (2 Cor.9:9)" is the second.

Mr. Charley suggested a full stop after "apostolic message", and a new sentence "The manner...."

Canon Hill thought the average Anglican reader would not grasp that this paragraph was directed at all that Fr. Tillard had stated; it needed further explicitation. The Final Report does use the terms "sacrament" and "instrument". Could the paragraph end by stating, more or less, "and this is what is meant by the Church as sacrament".

Bp. Murphy O'Connor agreed that clarification of Anglican ecclesiology would help RC's who were inclined after each paper to say, "ah, wait till they've dealt with ministry... authority... ecclesiology!" We have decided to tackle the ecclesiological issue in this paper.. Hence its importance.

Fr. Yarnold had different reactions. Could we really satisfactorily treat the two issues (justification and ecclesiology) in one paper? It would become "Church and Salvation" rather than "Salvation through the Church". It must be clear that the Church section should focus on God as saving the world. Can we therefore weave the two sections (3 and 4) together rather more?

Fr. Tillard said that was paper-4's purpose, but Fr. Yarnold thought clearer signposts should be erected.

Bp. Ashby thought that by concentrating on the Church's work in the area of salvation we might seem to clobber our Anglican brethren by pulling back on justification and over-developing ecclesiology. Who are we trying to hammer?

Prof. Wright said (a) RC members might feel this section answered a concern of some Catholics re Anglicanism, but he did not quite see how "sacrament" comes up in the "sign" section, but he did not find it in the first paragraph. (b) p.4, "share in God's work": we need to show what the Church does in the field of justification: the paragraph speaks of the Church sharing the Good News, but we need to speak explicitly of the Church proclaiming justification.

Bp. Cameron thought a latent problem was that ecclesiology had been neglected by Anglicans and was a source of some division between them (divine society, universal society etc.); this paper answers a lack. The paper answers those for whom the presentation of the Gospel is almost independent of the Koinonia -- but is this part of our immediate mandate?

Mrs. Tanner was helped by Fr. Tillard's intervention. Is the Church merely fruit of Christ's work or has it something to do? The answer was "faithful transmission..." as developed in the rest of the paper. There was need for a fuller explanation of the idea after the reference to John 17 in para.1.. But how does one tie in the "work of the Church" with "works" as they arise in the justification problem?

Fr. Soane referred to Mr. Charley's earlier intervention (Minutes p.5 on Thursday Aug.23rd) regarding Evangelical suspicions that the Church was part of the formal cause of salvation. Isn't this why we are discussing the Church?

Bp. Vogel wondered if our approach was a helpful approach. As we see the implications we look for a more theological key. But in our earlier consultation we came to ecclesiology through justification rather than vice versa. 3 shows the need for 4 as giving the reason for an ecclesiological treatment. If too full an ecclesiological treatment is introduced first, people will be lost before they get to justification. Perhaps this section could be entitled "The purpose of the Church".

Fr. Duprey agreed. We should start from an integral concept of justification and then look at its consequences for the Church. Yet we could also start from the Church and look at justification in this perspective. 4, as it is now, is needed because a general view of the Church is relevant also to Eucharist, Ministry, Authority. He was glad to see "sign" and "steward" (as broad equivalent for instrument, organonm words often misunderstood). When justified before Christ we are sent within the Church to serve the redemption of mankind - again a link between ecclesiology and justification.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor referred to Pro.Wright's intervention. The group had consciously decided not to use the word 'sacrament', assuming its meaning is subsumed in 'sign'.

Fr. Tillard, taking up Mrs.Tanner's point, said there can be a temptation (justly criticized by the Reformers) to give the impression of the Church's being a parallel power with God, and "added" power rather than the sacrament of God's power (e.g. some presentations of indulgences).. The notion of sacramentality avoids these extremes. The Church's sacramental life is more than a "useful" aid.

Sr. Boulding said "sign" does not sufficiently express "sacrament" unless the notion of "instrument" is added. She found the idea of sacramentality lacking at the foot of p.3 (liturgical, caring, missionary)- why not teaching as well. In para.1 "Full transmission...." could be more directly linked with "It is with the Church that the Holy Spirit...".

Can.Hill said the recent Anglican/ Reformed Report (para.29) had no difficulty in speaking of the Church as "sacrament, sign, first fruits". Even if one avoids "instrument" in the text, it would be useful to state towards the end "this is what RC tradition means by instrument, sacrament" (terms which ARCIC-I's introduction does use).

Fr. Adappur recalled the notion of "effective sign".

Prof. Chadwick suggested that, in the light of this discussion, a new start was needed for para.1. The Church is not merely a human society; all we say of it as one, holy, catholic and apostolic is an affirmation of faith; it is this divine quality in this human framework that makes it the means God has chosen to communicate the Good News. A revised opening (rather than "bringing our two communions together") should make this clear.

Bp. Santer saw more clearly why we are discussing the Church but asked if the matter was getting too big for one document. Only if we concentrate on the Church as salvific sign. Some Anglicans prefer to see the Church treated first, to avoid seeming to present the Church as those who, being saved, form a convenient club. But this may be a bogey we should ignore. At the foot of p.3 the Church's diaconal role should be added, related to the Lord's costly service and "making up what is lacking... ". The Church does not replace the Lord but should represent him.

Mr. Charley said this was the thrust of p.2 (foot) to p.3(top).

Bp. Santer said the Church's suffering is more than imitation of Christ.

Mr. Charley said that p.3 speaks of "associated with Christ in humiliation and suffering".

Prof. Wright mentioned two further problems: (a) there is nothing on the sacramental life of the Church save a reference to liturgical activities and (p.4) a vague reference to unity being "assumed" in the Eucharist; (b) he found nothing on the Church continuing Christ's work in space and time.

After a short break Bishop Murphy-O'Connor took the chair and invited final comments upon Group 4's paper on the Church.

Mr. Charley believed there was a need to indicate why the section was important. The Introduction should say that the Reformation was not only concerned with justification per se but an unease that the Roman Catholic Church was in some way controlling or dispensing salvation. This section was to educate the constituencies.

Fr. Thornhill agreed. Salvation and justification could not be discussed outside the context of the Church. Too much could be made of terminology. Technical terms raised fears and closed minds. The draft did speak of 'sign' and 'instrument' but in simple and exciting language.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked the Commission to comment upon the work of Group 3 ARCIC II 26/(a)/84 on Justification.

Discussion of Justification

Paragraph 1.

Fr. Tillard had a difficulty with 'partaking in the divine nature'.

Mr. Charley wanted the intelligent reader to see where the document was going - a weakness in the Final Report. Could Group 3 sharpen up its draft by answering the questions raised in the historical section? Prof. Wright agreed.

Mgr. Stewart cautioned about over care, over presentation and links at this stage.

Sr. Boulding called for attention to para.2 if 'partaking in God's nature' remained.

Bp. Santer thought the draft did answer the questions.

Prof. Chadwick asked for the avoidance of the phrase "It is only"

Fr. Akpunonu, in answer to Fr. Tillard, quoted 2 Peter 1 v3 & 4 on partaking in the divine nature.

Paragraph 2.

Prof. Wright thought the first reference to koinonia would need explanation.

Paragraph 3.

Mgr. Stewart asked if anything had been added to the St. Alban's material.

Bp. Vogel noted that Group 1 had only added 'expiation'.

Bp. Santer also added that Group 3 had added the notion of the removal of

condemnation to justification. They had also put in salvation.

But Mr. Charley insisted that salvation was a more comprehensive term.

Fr. Tillard was anxious. Everything was being put on the same level: salvation, sanctification and koinonia were not models. They were basic notions illustrated by images or models. He apologized for being stubborn but he wanted some lines explaining sanctification.

Fr. Yarnold asked if this was the place for something on modern scholarship and justification along Mr. Charley's lines about the equality of the status of those justified. Mr. Charley wanted this but not here.

Bp. Gitari asked for the addition of a reference to 1 Peter 1, 15-16.

Paragraph 4.

Fr. Akpunonu disliked the disclaimer that grace was not a thing. If it was not a thing it was nothing. However, Bp. Vogel liked this and asked for a strengthening amendment.:

"Grace is not to be conceived as a thing or substance; it is a way of describing God's presence in human life. Primarily it is used to characterize God's presence as a free gift totally undeserved on our part. Secondarily it refers to the saving action or effect of that presence in our lives and the gifts of the Spirit."

Canon Hill urged some reference to grace and relationship.

Fr. Duprey asked if it was right to speak of action as a free gift.

Fr. Tillard was perturbed at the equivocation between the 1st and 2nd sentences. Only believers had hope. There were similar equivocations elsewhere in the draft in which the Church and humanity were identified.

Mr. Charley disliked 'primarily' and 'secondarily'.

Paragraph 5.

Fr. Duprey queried 'conveyed' in the 1st sentence.

Prof. Chadwick wanted some indication that faith was not given an unspecified direction. He also wanted to avoid speaking of 'faith not identical with assurance'.

Bp. Vogel wanted 'by faith we accept and appropriate'.

Fr. Soane warned that Trent had spoken of a faith separable from hope and love.

Fr. Tillard spoke of qualifying faith in such a way as to avoid a kind of pelagianism. Attention should be paid to the 2nd sentence.

Bp. Vogel did not like 'appropriate' either: you only appropriate your own.

Fr. Tillard also questioned the reference to baptism. This was important but there was also a daily justification.

Bp. Gitari wanted a definition of faith at the beginning with some reference to Hebrews 11.

Paragraph 6.

Sr. Boulding found "his continuing gift of grace" too vague.

Mr. Charley thought "God's saving action and our response" not quite the same as other items in the list.

Paragraph 7.

Canon Baycroft wanted some expansion where underlining for emphasis had been resorted to.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor noted that inclusive language would have to be attended to at another time.

Mgr. Stewart thought the 1 Peter quotation odd after the "Thus St. Paul" introduction.

Mr. Charley queried the reference to a new humanity. But Bp. Santer reminded him that Colossians spoke of anthropos.

Mr. Charley connected 1 Cor. 7:11 to 6:11

Paragraph 8.

Bp. Santer wondered whether more needed to be said about the atonement.

Fr. Thornhill again asked for the addition of the two kinds of divine justice.

Fr. Tillard questioned the sufficiency of the treatment of justification. It would be thought too clever. It was a delicate ballet where people wanted heavy feet. But Bp. Cameron insisted that the resolution of an issue was not dependent upon the number of lines.

Dr. Gassman doubted whether justification and sanctification could be put together under the polarities of 'once for all' and process. Both were 'once for all' on God's side but their human application was a process.

Prof. Wright sympathized. He was unclear as to which 'action' was being referred to.

Mr. Charley also thought it needed amplification on atonement, justice, judgement and the equal standing of the justified - the last a very important modern insight.

Bp. Vogel also spoke of paragraph 9 because his problem was linked with methodology. He insisted that images did not imply or entail each other. They were complete in their own economy. The draft stated the inter-relationships but did not prove them.

Canon Baycroft sensed a lack of emphasis on the personal and relational aspects of justification and of God showing his righteousness - he cited Luther's comparison of the mastercraftsman and the apprentice. The master shows the faults, the perfect work and makes the apprentice as skilled as himself.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor then moved the Commission on to

Paragraphs 9 - 12.

Fr. Tillard liked the material very much with the exception of the last sentence of 11. What was the link between eternal life and judgement? It reopened the question of merits.

Bp. Vogel preferred 'movements of the person' to 'soul' (11).

Mr. Charley asked for some pin-pointing of issues to show the agreement.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked for general remarks about the relation of the material to the other paper by Group 3 and its position.

Fr. Tillard still likened the whole to a marvellous dance - it lacked sharpness.

Bp. Santer was clear that some historical material was needed to give the draft a context.

Sr. Boulding was concerned that the groups should not go back to revise their material in isolation from the other sections.

Canon Baycroft was relieved the Group had avoided the questions listed at the conclusion of the historical material. He believed they had been answered. If this was so he did not want the questions raised. They were only a check list.

After dinner, the Commission was joined by Bishop Michael Ramsey, the bishop designate of Durham, Dr. David Jenkins, Bishop John Moorman, the Dean of Durham, Professor Sykes and other members of the Faculty of Theology; staff members from Ushaw College and other local theologians, together with the Co-Chairman, Secretaries and a representative of English ARC.

Discussion followed on the work of English ARC, the agenda of ARCIC II, differences in styles of authority between Anglicans and RC's since the Enlightenment and the reception of ARCIC I. (A separate memorandum of this discussion was prepared by the Co-secretaries).

Tuesday, August 28th 1984: 2010 - 2147

Discussion of Group II (historical): ARCIC-II 25(a)(84)

Bishop Santer, in the chair, asked for general comments on the paper.

Fr. Soane drew attention to the drafting note on p.3, and Professor Wright said that a paper drafted by Professor Chadwick (ARCIC-II/29 (84) was pertinent - whether or not the Articles with the Homily established for Anglicanism a position of forensic justification. Many Evangelicals see the Homily on Salvation as in a special category among the Homilies.

Fr. Thornhill drew attention to St.Albans, ARCIC-II 20/(b) reference to the "wider disputes of the sixteenth century". This should be more prominent as the paper's first focus. The second focus should be the phase in which Anglicanism became more involved in Protestant opposition to the Roman Catholic Church. This is why the sixteenth century controversy must be considered, but not in unbalanced detail. The present paper is surprisingly severe in its criticisms of the admitted shortcomings of the medieval church, e.g. as if simony was taken for granted in the selling of indulgences: "traffic" might be a better word, since it was never claimed that indulgences could be "bought". On p.2., line 1, "Catholic doctrine...was being distorted"; some distinction should be made between official teaching and the views etc. of particular circles. The U.S. Lutheran/Roman Catholic Report handles these points more adroitly. - The reference to Luther is too long; enough to state his problem and his finding a solution in the dialectic between law and gospel. This would fit with what Fr. Thornhill had already suggested for the doctrinal section concerning the two senses in which we speak of God's justice.

Canon Baycroft spoke of the need (especially in the light of the SCDF's Observations on ARCIC-I) to be clearer about the status of the Articles; historically they can be compared with Trent, but not from the point of view of the authority claimed for them. Again in the first paragraph "some of us" is vague: SCDF had asked who ARCIC meant by "we" (Commission, Communion? P.2. 1.1 - "Catholic position distorted -" By whom? the whole Church or some members?

Canon Hill agreed; the question had also risen at St.Albans. He added he was uneasy with the section on the medieval Church; recent studies showed that in England the main item of contention was the practical Mass system.

Bishop Cameron said the status of the Articles varied in different Anglican provinces, but, as lowest common denominator, they were accepted as "part of the Anglican tradition".

Canon Baycroft had found very useful Bishop Howe's treatment of the Articles in Highways and Hedges (ACC 1984 pro-MS).

Mr. Charley said we should not play down the authority of the Articles at the time of their production and promulgation, whatever may be the situation today.

Fr. Tillard said it should be noted that Luther's position was not as clear-cut as it seems in the paper, and that there were sharp debates in early Lutheran circles even on his interpretation of key passages of Romans. Melancthon's explanation of justification was not identical with Luther's.

Dr. Gassmann said that, though there were discussions that led to the Formula of Concord, Luther's basic position on justification was a basic Protestant attitude; this was echoed in the English Reformers and was the basis of their criticism of Mass-practices.

Sr. Boulding said Group 2's mandate was to provide sufficient historical background but inevitably members began discussing the theological details. They had tried a simple description of Luther's position as background to the way Anglicanism posed the question. The language of "sale of indulgences" etc. was used as an indication of the emotive factors of sixteenth century discussion, not as a statement of what the Roman Catholic Church taught.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said so many nuances of our debate are historically rooted that we might aim for an historical paper with theological content. The whole style of our document would be influenced by the way we handled paper 2.

Abp. Butelezi noted that any statement of our historical positions must also state the extent to which these positions are relevant today.

Mgr. Stewart agreed history was needed but our emphasis must be on present agreement in doctrine ("forgetting those things that are behind"). ARCIC-I had used less history, but had by no means neglected it, e.g. in Authority I.

Bishop Santer said we must not forget our past.

Canon Baycroft agreed that history was necessary as a back up. Our question was how to solve the problem without going unnecessarily into excessive detail concerning all the differences and difficulties.

Mr. Charley felt the paper gave a somewhat dubious historical interpretation. In the past there was a tendency to see the English Reformation as an Act of State, but now it is appreciated that theological issues were more deeply involved, not least because the leading figures were steeped in continental writings. We must not give the impression that the theological aspect was peripheral, even if the Anglican Reformers took a more pragmatic attitude to the reform of abuses etc. It is misleading to suggest that particular articles were not directed against Rome.

Bishop Cameron said that for this reason the repeated affirmation of paper 2 (p.2, para. 2, and p.3 last para.) that Trent and the Articles "are not mutually exclusive" needs to be

more fully substantiated. There was also need for much more explication of p.3, para. 3, "the Articles...do not assert faith to be the cause of justification".

Sr. Boulding said the shape of an historical-theological paper could be to state our present agreement and then to reply historically to the probable questions Anglicans and Roman Catholics would raise.

Professor Chadwick observed that the Reformers would have been scared stiff to hear faith spoken of as a cause (rather than a condition) of justification.

Mr. Charley thought that in any case the phrase in question would be misunderstood by readers today.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor's intention had not been to lay open our disagreements and then leave them, but to propose a way by which, through showing the development of doctrine in our churches, we could make our points more clearly. A basically historical approach can show how a new emphasis in either Church had led us to mutual understanding.

Canon Hill was unhappy with the methodology of this discussion. Paper 2 seemed to be trying to reconcile history, which is not our task. While this Commission must determine its own method, it could recall that the published statements of ARCIC-I had never set out to reconcile Trent and the Articles (e.g. on Eucharist), but did point out what one or the other said in the light of current positions. ARCIC-I had excellent material prepared, but not all was "statement material". So too we could use some historical material in notes or appendix. Though we need more historical matter for this particular discussion, we must beware of trying to reconcile history.

Dr. Gassmann thought that whereas with earlier ARCIC texts it could be assumed that most educated people had a broad idea of the problematic, this was not so in the case of justification, and so more historical background was necessary to show why we bothered to discuss this issue. We are shaped by a certain historical controversy; in showing this the paper must not dismiss it as a controversy of misunderstanding but make it clear that it touched on a fundamental matter of faith. Then the historical would become enlightening through its relationship to a joint doctrinal statement.

Canon Hill, agreeing, said paper 2 does more and tries to reconcile history.

Bishop Vogel said that in different countries our people's attitudes to other churches rest not only on a basis of history but on many other factors. It is the living attitudes of now that cause our problems. We may need to show the historical roots (attitudes possibly unjustified even at the time) but a full historical treatment would simply create difficulties.

Sr. Boulding agreed with Dr. Gassmann. If the document was entitled 'The Mediatorial role of the Church in Salvation' many lights would flash.

Bp. Santer said the historical material must deal with the role of the Church as steward of the Mysteries of God.

Fr. Thornhill agreed. There was a twofold problem in attitudes to the Church: a protestant unease that Catholic teaching gave the Church a power independent of God; a catholic unease that protestant ecclesiology does not allow a stewardship. Some simple people were pelagian and looked to a power of the Church divorced from the Gospel of salvation.

Mr. Charley thought it was too limiting to say the Reformers were only concerned with a power independent of God. What degree and sort of power?

Fr. Yarnold preferred the Luther quotation in the Commission's own words. It would be better integrated and avoid giving two different starting points for Luther's protest.

Mr. Charley did not think history could be reconciled. But it was essential to set the scene.

Bp. Santer drew attention to the 'shopping list' at the conclusion of 2 - together with the question of imputed or imparted righteousness raised by Prof. Chadwick.

Fr. Tillard said there was no answer to the first question. Were they supposed to be the agenda for Groups 3 and 4?

Fr. Soane and Mgr. Stewart pointed out that the questions were in the earlier outline (ARCIC -II 23/1/84), though they needed to be rewritten in the light of the drafts from Groups 3 and 4.

Fr. Thornhill agreed they needed to be pondered. But there was the more important question of the shape of the whole document. The questions had not received critical attention.

There were two sides to this whole discussion: some felt that proper attention had not been given to justification; others had the feeling that the incarnational wholeness of the Church was being diminished.

Canon Hill did not want 16th century questions but the underlying issue as stated by Fr. Tillard: is there anything to do for salvation?

Canon Baycroft wanted some relation to contemporary questions of spirituality. Reconciliation was important today and the lack of loving relationships.

Mr. Charley still felt the Commission must answer the question set: Salvation with special reference to justification. People must feel the issue has been dealt with but not in these words.

Bp. Santer asked if there was a Catholic agenda.

Fr. Thornhill repeated his emphasis on the incarnational aspect of the Church as one side of the balance.

Dr. Gassmann also felt the 'question should not be in a Report. Nevertheless at the end of the historical section there should be something on what had been achieved and an indication that the appreciation of Reformation history was now more differentiated than in the past. He also pleaded for joint Anglican/RC witness of a theologically creative kind. Justification could be relevant in the secular world where there was pressure for success and achievement.

Fr. Thornhill did not want Group 3's work re-shaped according to the questions at the end of Group 2's draft.

Bp. Santer ^{believed} ~~the~~ plenary had now to consider the overall agenda, aim, method and shape. The reworking of drafts could go no further till this had taken place. But there were contradictory voices. A common mind needed to be arrived at. There was more than enough material but until there was a clear purpose and agreement not much could be done with it.

Dr. Davis agreed. It had been wonderful to hear this. The Commission was on pilgrimage and needed to determine where it wanted to go. He invited the Co-Chairmen to say where this was.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor thought this was for the groups to discuss.

Fr. Duprey spoke strongly of the danger of going back to the 16th century. It was like going back 40 years to his seminary. If people did not think in this way any longer - thanks be to God. The paper could be helpful in the reception of ARCIC-I but not if it appeared in five years time. The Commission simply had to show that the gratuitous action of God was not all opposed to the Church.

Fr. Akpunonu saw the methodological question as opting either for a long historical introduction or something like ARCIC-I where a contemporary formulation was found acceptable to both sides. Fr. Tillard agreed.

Mgr. Stewart had noticed the wavering between method and content. The positive work must not be lost. Could the work done be pinned up? The groups might reflect tomorrow on overall comments as well as on their particular work before a further plenary.

Bp. Santer wanted to know whether a plenary of groups were now required?

Canon Baycroft had had enough discussion!

He suggested two groups should work on two outlines, one with a historical emphasis, the other with a contemporary brief.

Bp. Santer repeated his question - plenary or groups. If there was no unanimity the Co-Chairmen would decide.

Professor Davis felt the plenary ought to decide. But he was not dispondent as all meetings went through a tunnel period.

- 20 -
Fr. Tillard believed it possible to put together the drafts from Groups 3 and 4. But Fr. Yarnold did not think the Commission was ready for this yet.

Bp. Santer asked the plenary to vote on a further plenary or groups. The Commission voted 9 to 8 in favour of a further plenary. In the light of lack of a consensus the Co-Chairmen said they would put proposals to the Commission the following morning.

Wednesday, August 29th, 1984 0930-1000

In a short plenary session Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said he felt we had all the necessary material; the question was how to order it so it could be a launching-pad for the work of a sub-commission in the months ahead. The co-chairmen therefore proposed that the groups should meet for an hour to reflect on their papers (and all the material) in the light of the discussions of the last two days. Each group would then nominate three of its members; the twelve thus nominated would form two groups to make recommendations about papers 1/2 and 3/4. The remainder of the Commission would look at the interim reports of the N. American ARCs (ARCIC II 28/1 and 28/2) and report to the plenary their recommendations for furthering the work (possibly by inviting the cooperation of more ARCs, e.g. England and New Zealand). There would be a plenary after supper to report progress and to determine the programme for the next day.

Bp. Santer thought the emphasis should be on a cohesive presentation of doctrine (3 and 4) with attention to Church as Sign and Steward not just as an abstract theological point, but has a lot to do with reconciliation between our Communion. In looking at 1 and 2, the new group should aim to show why we are discussing these two problems, but should not bother unduly with history save in so far as necessary for this purpose. Other historical material could be taken from the quarry later.

Canon Hill said regarding the group on Growth in Reconciliation (ARCs etc.) that ARCIC must provide a proper ecclesiology to undergrid practical suggestions when making recommendations for further work by ARCs.

Prof. Chadwick noted we had not yet discussed the need for mutual understanding about Purgatory (even if the present problematic was not that of 1500). Should we do this ourselves or commit it to others.

Mgr. Stewart hoped groups might list such items of work that had still to be done.

Fr. Soane said we had not yet started the discussion of moral issues; presume this would need to include questions of pluralism and of authority. Could an ARC be asked to start work on this? As regards work on 3/4, he agreed with Dr. Gassmann on the need to show the current relevance of the question; people today need the message that they don't have to win God's favour; his mercy is infinite and does not depend on ^{our} achievements.

Fr. Yarnold hoped the group on 1/2 would explain the coherence of one subject, not two.

Fr. Adappur reminded the Commission that Monday's meeting with local theologians had shown the need of relevance to the contemporary scene; we are united by common concerns, challenges and opportunities by the need for evangelization in the face of unbelief, atheistic humanism etc. We cannot treat of all this, but it should be in the back of our minds and influence our formulation.

Mr. Charley thought we had not yet reached the heart of the Justification problem. The document, though good, still conveys the idea that it has all been an unfortunate misunderstanding. There is much more work to be done and it is not simply a matter of tidying up and rewriting. For instance, Purgatory is

relevant to an understanding of Justification. We must be seen to have got to grips with such issues.

After the Chairmen had repeated the outline of the plan for the day's work, members dispersed for group meetings.

In a further brief plenary session, 1120-1135, Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked the groups to pass on their reflections on the whole paper. The new groups were then constituted on the basis of the recommendations made.

GROUP 1/2: Fr. Adappur; Sr. Boulding; Prof. Chadwick; Dr. Gassmann;
Fr. Soane; Bp. Vogel.

GROUP 3/4: Bp. Cameron; Mr. Charley; Bp. Murphy-O'Connor; Fr. Thornhill;
Fr. Tillard; Fr. Yarnold.

GROWTH IN

RECONCILIATION: Fr. Akpunonu; Bp. Ashby; Canon Baycroft; Abp. Butelezi;
Prof. Davis; Fr. Duprey; Bp. Gitari; Bp. Lessard; Dr. Pabee;
Bp. Santer; Mrs. Tanner; Prof. Wright.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor reminded the groups they were not preparing definitive texts but material on which a sub-commission could prepare a more unified draft for consideration at the next full meeting of the Commission. He also said that after the present meeting members might have further thoughts on various points in our texts; he hoped they would write to the Secretaries so that the sub-commission could benefit from them.

Prof. Wright and Canon Baycroft hoped that the principles on which ARCIC's sub-commissions are established could be explained more fully.

The meeting then dispersed for group-sessions.

Thursday, 29th August: 20.00

Bishop Santer opened the plenary which was simply to hear where the groups were.

Fr. Soane reported on the work of Group 1/2. Its intention was basically to show what was coming up and the relation between the material. He summarized the contents which would later come before the plenary. It would end with a statement of the contemporary significance of God's gracious acceptance. The group had not included the historical material.

Fr. Yarnold then invited Fr. Tillard and Mr. Charley to speak of the first part of the work of Group 3/4.

Mr. Charley spoke briefly of the re-ordering and amplification of the earlier material. Fr. Tillard said the first part had now taken over the theocentric material and the images of sanctification and justification.

Fr. Yarnold then spoke of the second part. A major change had been made in the substitution of the wider St. Albans B dogmatic material for para. 8, of the old Group 3. There was an exposition of the existential importance of justification. But the new para. 8 was the 'crunch' paragraph. It set out a theology of justification faithful to the two traditions. It did not try to prove a theology of justification.

Sr. Boulding thought the meaning of justification today was in the introductory material, but Mr. Charley thought it better at the end. He questioned the dropping of the historical material.

Bishop Santer thought the historical material had to be used as necessary. Bishop Gitari, however, did not want to lose the history.

Bishop Santer spoke of the historical disputes as the tip of the iceberg.

Canon Baycroft then mused on the fact that icebergs sank ships.

Bishop Cameron asked the Group to watch out for the two meanings of justification he detected in the presentation: demonstrating existence and declaring to be good or right.

Bishop Lessard then presented the catalogue of subjects discussed by the 'Growth in Reconciliation Group'. These might be pursued by ARCIC or ARCs. Canon Baycroft noted that these were in addition to the agenda of US ARC and Canadian ARC.

Mgr. Stewart asked about their undergirding by a theology of partial and full communion. He also asked about priorities.

Canon Baycroft agreed with the necessity of theological underpinning. This was on the agenda of the North American ARCs.

Bishop Cameron questioned the sharing of information: this was for the respective secretariats not for ARCIC itself.

Fr. Yarnold urged work on the next steps. Assuming some agreement on ARCIC-I, what did we do.

Prof Wright spoke of the Syrian-Roman Catholic agreement.

Mgr. Stewart spoke of the International Lutheran-Roman Catholic document about to be translated into English 'Models of Unity'.

Canon Baycroft spoke of the need to decide on ARCIC's agenda.

Dr. Gassmann asked for some exploration of the goal of unity.

Canon Hill strongly agreed. This was implicitly in the mandate.

Sr. Boulding also spoke of the meaning of full communion, especially within the Anglican Communion and Mgr. Stewart said this had been raised at the recent meeting of the ACC.

It was decided to go into plenary after coffee on the following day to allow the groups to take their work further.

Thursday, August 30th, 1984 1130 - 1250

(Lord Ramsey of Canterbury celebrated the Eucharist in the Galilee Chapel at 0800. During the first part of the morning members met in groups).

Bp. Santer, chairman, said that our business was to have a preliminary look at the papers prepared by Groups 1/2 (ARCIC 30/1/84) and 3/4 ARCIC 30/2 and 30/3 84). A few items of "housekeeping" would be dealt with before lunch and in the evening the Commission would look at the paper of the Group on Growth in Reconciliation.

The Groups already had some alterations to make to their papers: each paper would be presented with amendments, and then the observations of members would be invited. The aim of our work was to get the material in such a form that a duly instructed Sub-Commission could work on it and present a further draft for eventual approval next year. Finally he noted that the historical matter had not been forgotten.

ARCIC-II 30/1 (84) Introduction (Group 1/2)

Fr. Soane indicated the changes to be made in this text: (1. = 'line')

- | | | | | |
|---------|--------|----------------------------|--|---|
| Para 2. | 1.1 | <u>omit</u> | (i) | |
| | 1. 4-5 | <u>for</u> | made an initial response | <u>read</u> anticipated |
| Para 3. | 1.1 | <u>omit</u> | (ii) | |
| | 1.1 | <u>omit</u> | also | |
| | 1.5 | <u>for</u> | Protestants | <u>read</u> the Reformers. |
| | 1. 6-7 | <u>for</u> | must be resolved | <u>read</u> cannot be ignored. |
| Para 4. | 1.6 | <u>for</u> | brought to faith and salvation | <u>read</u> called to faith and brought to salvation. |
| | 1.15 | <u>inverted commas for</u> | "sole | man". |
| Para 5. | 1.4-5 | <u>for</u> | an agreed doctrine of the Church and Salvation | <u>read</u> agreement on the role of the Church in Salvation. |
| Para 6. | 1.5 | <u>omit</u> | great | |
| | 1.10 | <u>after</u> | leads to | <u>insert</u> captivity to one's own efforts and |
| | 1.11 | <u>for</u> | revealed himself | <u>read</u> created and freely accepted human beings. |
| | 1.12 | <u>for</u> | every human being | <u>read</u> everyone. |
| | 1.13 | <u>for</u> | both | <u>read</u> the assurance |

Canon Baycroft re the amendment to para 4 1.6. Is one "brought to salvation through incorporation"?

Fr. Tillard and Fr. Thornhill, re para 4, 1.16 "Catholics believe that by separating themselves from the tradition of the Church, Protestants were

Dr. Davis spoke of two human concerns insufficiently reflected in para 6. Does the reference to man's search for meaning and happiness include the feelings of guilt of many people and their internal and external conflicts? There is also the question of how God relates to evil: we cannot deal with this in detail but should make some allusion to God's having to justify his own in face of the pervasive abuse of power, in Church and State.

Fr. Duprey said the 16th century controversies seem to have presumed that to affirm the totality of God's power we have to deny man and vice versa. Hence

the feeling today that to free man is to deny God. It should be made clearer that through justification man is brought to full freedom.

Bp. Cameron spoke to para 6. (a) There seems a logical flaw in the development of the argument. The second sentence does not make clear how contemporary concerns relate to the problems of the past. (b) It is hazardous to describe the aspirations of our contemporaries; our own are not always universal! (c) Line 9, "human need of some kind validates"; people will ask what this means.

Dr. Davis: Para 6, 1.8. The use of the word "secular" should be looked at.

Fr. Adappur said that basically the same issue (How am I to get rid of the anguish of existence?) faced the Reformers and our contemporaries even if different answers were given (faith - atheism). This is a basic human problem, not in itself the result of cultural conditioning.

Bp. Vogel: Para 4, 1.6. "The individual is called to faith through the believing community and brought to salvation through incorporation into it." This was the Group's meaning.

Fr. Yarnold: Group 3/4 suggested that the first sentence of para 5 be omitted, and the remainder should read: "We are nevertheless convinced that it is possible to expect"

Bp. Santer thanking members, reminded them they could write to the Secretaries later.

ARCIC-II 30/2 and 30/3/(84) Church and Salvation (Group 3/4)

Fr. Yarnold introduced the amendments to these papers. Para 8 (page 4) of 30/2 becomes para II.3 of 30/3 (= page 2) with consequent re-numbering of subsequent paras and pages.

Amendments to the text:-

30/2

Para 3, 1.4 for encompasses read embraces
1.5 for as well as read and its ability
1.12-13 for together with its privilege and dignity
read in addition to the restoration of fallen man to his original stewardship over creation.

Para 5, 1.7 omit even

Para 6, 1.9 for its effect in the heart read the effect in the hearer
1.13 nurturing
1.15 omit effectively

30/3

II.1, 1.9 after Faith insert in the New Testament sense
II.1, 1.11 for Faith read It
II.1, 1.13 before Faith insert This
II.1, 1.13 omit /is
II.2, 1.1 for this merciful action read the merciful action of God

II.2, 1.3 for Grace read It

II.2, 1.5-6 for sons and daughters read children

(30/2 para 8 becomes 30/3 para II.3)

New II.3 1.23 individual

New II.3 1.26-8 omit sentence "In fact the polemics individuals."

(Old II.3 becomes new II.4.)

In this para 1.1 for The read These and omit "we have spoken in para 3"

(Old II.4 and 5 become new II.5 and 6).

II 6 becomes II 7.

In line 3 after declaration is add forensic but

In line 8 after sanctification omit is salvation; that

II.7 becomes II.8

In line 9 for recognize read recompense

(Old II. 8, 9, 10, 11 become respectively, II 9, 10, 11, 12).

Fr. Yarnold reported that Group 3/4 had not had time to discuss the last five paragraphs in any detail.

Prof. Chadwick hoped for a more explicit reference to the Cross in 30/3 in Para. II.1.

Discussion of these papers was then deferred until the afternoon.

Bishop Santer then asked the Commission to give its attention to 'housekeeping'.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Mgr. Stewart reminded the Commission of the dates proposed last year for the following two years:

1985: August 27th - September 5th

1986 August 26th - September 4th

He noted that this pattern would cause problems for those involved in the Patristic Conference in 1987. Canon Baycroft observed that this year's meeting had been put earlier for academics and now a later date was proposed. Bishop Vogel did not want to run on too late in September because of visitations. Bishop Cameron said the Australian General Synod met in the last week of August, but only once in every five years. He would leave the Synod early next year and arrive two days late for ARCIC. Professor Chadwick thought he could survive the row if he were not at the Patristic Conference, though he was a President. He would, however, prefer later dates.

It was therefore agreed that the 1987 meeting should be:

1987 September 1st - 10th

Mr. Charley wondered whether arrival and departure times were right - departure after lunch? But it was agreed some would then leave after breakfast.

It was therefore agreed that all arrivals ought if possible to be in the late afternoon and all departures after breakfast.

Bishop Santer then explained that the place of meetings had been largely determined by costs. This had limited the places to the British Isles or Continental Europe. However, Bishop Lessard had suggested that next year's meeting might take place near New York and the extra cost could probably be made up outside the budget for both Churches. He had a retreat house in mind on the Hudson River. Professor Chadwick was in favour and Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said the USA was not just another place but an important part of the constituencies. But Mr. Charley wondered whether it would be as conducive to work as a place such as Durham.

Fr. Tillard was worried about air conditioning. Bishop Lessard assured him of the meeting rooms but Fr. Tillard had slept little with the Disciples.

Bishop Santer asked whether the USA should be explored if financial matters could be resolved.

Canon Baycroft said groups in Retreat Houses could become stir-crazy.

Bishop Cameron said it should be left to the Co-Chairmen and the Secretariats: the real criterion was where the work could best be done.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor suggested a show of hands.

13 felt positive towards the proposal

5 felt negative and 5 were easy either way

Bishop Gitari also spoke of the possibility of ARCIC going to Africa. Canon Hill said the differential on Anglican fares between New York and Southern Africa was considerable, about £5,000. But if ARCIC went to the USA a commitment would have to be made to looking for extra money outside the budget. The difference between fares to London and New York was about £1,500.

Thursday, August 30th 1984: 16.00 - 18.30

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor took the chair and asked for matters of substance on the work of Group 3/4 (ARCIC-II 30/2 and 3 (84))

Bishop Santer made four points: 1) With Professor Chadwick he wanted more on Atonement and the cost of forgiveness; 2) the question of imputed and imparted righteousness also needed to be made more explicit; 3) Purgatory and prayer for the departed might need some treatment to satisfy evangelicals - especially in view of the Articles - and this might call for a paper on what the Roman Catholic doctrine now is; 4) there was still a need to have the historical side properly expressed - footnotes or a separate supporting chapter?

Fr. Duprey said that purgatory was at first linked with the conception of redemption. It was not emphasized in the East, where other images were used to express the same reality. On the main text he was very happy at what had been achieved and the Introduction.

Canon Baycroft was anxious that the servant aspect of the Church as sign and steward was not diminished.

Canon Hill and Sr. Boulding felt the historical material might be dealt with in a series of running footnotes or commentary. The trouble with an Appendix was that people either concentrated on them or ignored them.

Fr. Adappur felt it better not to go into the details of history. Whatever was said was an interpretation.

But Bishop Gitari wondered why there was a fear of history. US Lutheran-Catholic material did so with ten pages. Professor Chadwick's paper was fifty pages! A historical statement would be very useful.

Professor Wright supported this and also the idea of a running footnote. Even so the present text was a considerable improvement in bringing in history to the text. The text could be annotated at specific points with historical background.

Bishop Vogel, however, preferred an Appendix: a commentary would be too long.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for the mind of the Commission on this issue: how many members thought the historical material best left out of the main text?

Mr. Charley wanted it in the main text, but in very abbreviated form.

Bishop Santer sensed that more than scene setting was required - he preferred an Appendix.

Mr. Charley did not think the present text really did set the scene. He still wanted this but more than the present draft.

Fr. Adappur found it difficult to express a view when the material was not to hand.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor decided that the future Sub-Commission would have to take account of the variety of views expressed. What of purgatory?

Mgr. Stewart spoke of the vagueness in talk of purgatory. Did the Commission need a succinct paper setting something down on either side?

Canon Baycroft thought this would be a waste of time and Mr. Charley agreed it could come in the scene setting.

Sr. Boulding wondered about something on Indulgences as there had been an authoritative change in recent years.

Fr. Tillard found it difficult to take seriously something which was not very important. It could squander the consensus on greater things. Fr. Yarnold agreed - if necessary there could be an Elucidation.

Sr. Boulding was not sure. She did not want things swept under the carpet, but perhaps enough could be said in the scene setting to show the matters were peripheral. Unfortunately people loved to talk about peripherals and forgot about essentials like justification. Perhaps an allusion was required and then the document would speak for itself. Bishop Murphy-O'Connor agreed.

ARCIC-II 30/2 (84)

Para. 1 - no comments

Para. 2

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor questioned 'theocentric' (line 2).

Fr. Soane whether the 'difficulties' stemmed now or then (line 5).

Para. 3

Professor Wright asked who the 'all' was who agreed (line 2). Usage differed later in the document. Mgr. Stewart suggested the Sub-Commission look at this throughout.

Bishop Santer found 'was marred' mythical (line 6).

Bishop Vogel found 'embraces' weak (line 4), but Fr. Tillard explained that it meant the two parts belonged to God. Bishop Vogel said this was not clear.

Fr. Duprey said the 'new Isreal' was not biblical (line 11). He proposed 'Israel of God'.

Paragraph 4

Bishop Santer proposed an addition before the last sentence: "Rather, it helps to manifest the glory of God who works through his creatures and not apart from them."

Para. 5

Canon Baycroft felt the 'had' (line 9) diluted Christ's voluntary emptying of himself

Bishop Vogel doubted whether 'achievement' was the right word (line 2).

Para. 6

Bishop Santer felt the sentences beginning 'However...' and 'Its presentation....' (lines, 9 and 11) collapsed two problems into each other which needed to be distinguished more clearly.

Bishop Gitari disliked the suggestion that the sacramental and pastoral activities of the Church were not missionary (line 14).

Para. 7 (no comments)

Paragraph II.1 (ARCIC-II 30/3 (84))

Fr. Thornhill missed here and in general any reference to the message of the Gospel. Evangelical concern was linked to the impact of the message of the Gospel.

Fr. Duprey called for some qualification of the references to faith such as "In the New Testament...".

Fr. Akpunonu was still perplexed by 'grace is not a thing or substance'. Fr. Yarnold said it was personal all the time. But Sr. Boulding agreed that the explanation of grace was not sufficient. She had liked Bishop Vogel's earlier suggestion (Minutes page 32).

Fr. Duprey did not want a discussion of created and uncreated grace. Fr. Tillard said this was dealt with in the sentence "The power to respond ..." (line 6).

Fr. Thornhill said that Fr. Tillard had wanted a quotation from Pascal and Fr. Tillard spoke of where Pascal said faith is always believing two things which seem in contradiction: Christ as God and Man, the Eucharist and grace. It was wrong only to say grace was of the Holy Spirit and it was also wrong to say grace was only something in us.

para. 3 (Original I:8)

Mrs. Tanner asked for some mention of God's saving activity in the Old Testament, as most of the images were from the Old Testament.

Bishop Gitari asked for the references to be carefully checked. He wanted John 3 added on 're-birth' and I Peter 1:15-16 on 'holiness'.

Para. 4

Para. 5

Mgr. Stewart did not want underlining.

Para. 6

Professor Wright said the footnote should be governed by what was eventually done with the historical material.

Para. 7

Bishop Santer detected degrees of rigidity in the second sentence. He proposed: "This declaration is forensic but not impersonal, nor is it to be divorced from Christian life in the Spirit". But he recognised that more work needed to be done. Mr. Charley agreed. The revision helped but the whole para. was a shambles. It contained a lot but there was also a lot missing.

Professor Wright and Fr. Soane thought 'forensic' too technical.

Para. 8

Bishop Santer associated 'movements' with his bowels! (1.4.)

But Bishop Vogel still objected to the anthropology implied the earlier 'movements of the soul.'

Mr. Charley thought the I Cor. 4 quotation inapposite (1.7).

Bishop O'Connor preferred the typographical error 'recognized' for 'recompensed' in the last line. But Fr. Yarnold pointed out that Matt. 25 and II Timothy spoke of rewards. Fr. Akpunonu agreed.

Para. 9

Mr. Charley questioned the meaning of 'eternal reward' in the first line.

Para. 10

Bishop Gitari asked for a conclusion quoting 'may he who has begun a good work in you bring it to completion'.

Fr. Adappur found 'continues to fall repeatedly' too strong. He offered 'may continue to fall' (1.4.). Bishop Murphy-O'Connor agreed. Fr. Akpunonu, however, felt the original was realistic.

Fr. Tillard now felt a preceding para. was necessary explaining the differences between the Anglican and Roman Catholic language of obtaining and meriting. Roman Catholic language usually meant obtain by merit.

Mr. Charley was unahppy at 'may even depart from the grace God has given' (1.5). This was a difficult debate.

Professor Wright thought many would not understand the meaning of 'final perseverance' (1.7), though Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said it was very Catholic and Mr. Charley very Protestant.

Para. 11

Professor Wright doubted the logic of equating the 'passion' positions were held with their 'lasting importance' (1.9 & 10).

Mgr. Stewart found the use of 'saying' curious (1.3.).

Fr. Thornhill noted the omission of Jesus as our justice. He suggested: "Our Churches can be united in a common faith when they confess that Christ Jesus is 'our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption' (I Cor. 1:30)'"

Para. 12

Professor Wright and Fr. Adappur called for the correct quotation as the conclusion.

Bishop Vogel declared that 'issues' could not be eternal (1.5-6).

Fr. Soane queried the logic of the sentence "To show that.." (1.10) as the next sentence was about unity.

Bishop Santer asked for the original (plural) Nicene Creed to be quoted (1.10): "We believe....".

Mr. Charley found the whole para. weak. It needed more teeth.

Mrs. Tanner again wanted some recognition of God already at work in the world.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor then asked if there were any more substantial points on the whole draft.

Professor Wright noted the methodology of Scripture and Tradition in paras. 4 and 9. Yet the only Father quoted was Augustine. Should there be an Eastern?

Mr. Charley was sure something ought to be said about the equal standing of the justified - as demonstrated in recent New Testament scholarship. St. Paul had, until recently, been looked at through Lutheran spectacles. The thrust of Romans was that if both Jew and Gentile were justified then they were not only equal in the sight of God but also of each other. Bishop Cameron agreed. Such an emphasis would put the text in the context of community.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor felt the documents as a whole were a very hopeful start for an Agreed Statement next year. He then asked the Commission to look at the draft Press Release (ARCIC-II 32/(a) (84)) which was introduced by Mgr. Stewart. A number of modifications were made which were incorporated into the revised and final Release (ARCIC-II 32/(b) (84)).

Bishop Santer took the chair and said that this matter would now be referred to the sub-commissions. The Co-Chairmen would check on available dates and find members of the Commission who are available (at reasonable cost), making sure of the involvement of representatives of the various groups involved in the preparation of the different parts of the Report.

Bishop Santer then asked the Commission to give its attention to the work of the large Sub-Commission:

Growth in Reconciliation (ARCIC-II 33 (84))

Canon Baycroft presented the paper.

Mrs. Tanner noted that on page 2 the last three items under "Papers" should be under "Collections".

Sr. Boulding asked if, where there was no active ARC, contact might be made with some active group.

Fr. Duprey: I(a) (ii) last line: the Roman Catholic agreements with the Syrian Orthodox Church - p.2: on bilateral agreements he recommended "Growth in Agreement", edd. Meyer and Vischer (WCC and Paulist Press, N.Y.) - p.3: Models of Unity was an LWF/R.C. paper.

Professor Wright noted that "Growth in Agreement" contained only the papers of international agreements.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked if it was proposed that the Chairmen should commission various pieces of work from the ARCs mentioned in the paper.

Canon Hill said ARCs are not responsible to ARCIC; we could not "commission" work.

Bishop Ashby said we want to help their pastoral consciousness and should use all the kid gloves necessary.

Canon Baycroft pointed out that US and Canadian ARCs were already at work: English ARC was willing; and so was New Zealand.

Archbishop Butelezi pointed out that the Malta Report came from a rather different context.

Bishop Gitari spoke of African difficulties regarding recent documents - their availability, their cost, and their intelligibility for average African clergy and church-members.

Fr. Akpunonu said that the main difficulty in Nigeria was that of foreign exchange.

Mr. Charley asked about the possibilities of some re-writing of papers in the African context.

Bishop Gitari said that extracts containing important recommendations would be of great interest.

Canon Hill suggested the need for a pilot African ARC to consider the whole issue (illustrating the work of translation, etc. in Japan). ACC-6 had also considered this problem.

Canon Baycroft supported this. In Africa and elsewhere regional differences might well prompt different first steps to those which proved suitable in Europe.

Archbishop Butelezi said a continental meeting would be hard to convene; perhaps local study should come first. Further, some selection of documents was needed; it was easy to overload people.

Bishop Vogel spoke of the expectations of US-ARC. (a) The experience of covenanted parishes, joint pastoral letters, retreats, clergy conferences, statements concerning mixed marriages etc. were examples of unity by stages; yet there was a lack of enthusiasm since people felt they could get no further when two liturgical Churches were still divided on matters of ministry. Hence ARC's determination to work on the question of Anglican Orders. (b) US-ARC had enthusiastically received the information that ARCIC-II spoke of reconciliation of ministries rather than orders. It hoped to start work by considering baptismal ministry and thus moving to the wider concept of apostolicity, providing a context for the study of 1896.

The Commission agreed that the respective issues recommended in the paper be referred to US-ARC and to NZ-ARC, but Fr. Tillard was less sure than Canon Baycroft that the question of Partial Communion should be referred to Canadian ARC; something on "The theological understanding of reconciliation and unity by stages"

would be more suitable. It should be remembered that what was to be asked for were preliminary papers on which ARCIC could work, not a final agreement. The Commission then agreed that Canadian ARC should be invited to undertake this.

Thursday, 30th August 1984

20.05-20.55

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor resumed the discussion of Growth in Reconciliation by asking about referring Mixed Marriages to English-ARC which had already done a good deal of work on this topic. Perhaps English-ARC would be happier with some study on the Malta Report.

Sr. Boulding said English-ARC had already done some work on Malta and would welcome encouragement in its work on Mixed Marriages.

Mgr. Stewart reminded the meeting of ACC-6's recommendation to refer the whole issue to SPCU.

Canon Hill thought it inopportune to involve the Irish at this stage.

Fr. Duprey said the Malta Report needed to be studied with Cardinal Bea's official letter on the subject (June 1968).

Fr. Tillard thought Canadian-ARC would work better on this subject than on partial communion.

Canon Baycroft said this had been discussed in other countries too (and many other members concurred, though the subject seemed to have proved marginal in Australia). All this could be fed in to English-ARC with a request to put it into a form ARCIC could consider.

Sr. Boulding agreed that English-ARC could pick up any available material from elsewhere.

Mgr. Stewart was hesitant about overloading the agenda of ARCs.

Canon Baycroft said that to ask for work on issues we cannot at the moment handle is not necessarily to overload them. A step forward in the field of mixed marriages would be an obvious but modest step for which people would rightly look if a positive response to ARCIC-I was given in 1988.

Bishop Vogel said this was the one sacramental area in which progress could be made to rekindle some of the fire that has been lost.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said it would help ARCIC to know what national ARCs see as the way ahead as part of our study of Growth in Reconciliation, but we should not invite work in such a way as to suggest we were to tackle it all. On marriage there is no theological divide, and so it is not directly our task. We should ask English-ARC to work on this to the extent it would help our deliberations on reconciliation.

Sr. Boulding said English ARC would next meet on October 19th.

It was agreed to invite the various papers proposed, though Mr. Charley thought it wrong simply to allocate papers when we need something as a Commission. There are many real needs on which this Commission can never touch. Mgr. Stewart said the Co-Chairmen's letter to ARCs had stressed the idea of inter-action of ARCIC and ARCs; this should be the spirit of the approaches now recommended to ARCs.

The Goals we Seek (p.2 of Growth in Reconciliation)

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked whether the group was setting out principles or asking for papers.

Bishop Ashby said the Growth in Reconciliation group stated it wanted things to happen. Yes or No?

Mrs. Tanner said all three areas proposed were none too difficult, but all were important.

Bishop Santer asked how soon it was proposed these papers should be produced.

Canon Baycroft said the group had set no time-scale, but suggested two years (with the pieces of work agreed earlier within one year). Prof. Wright agreed.

Canon Hill suggested that the pieces of work under (i) and (ii) at the top of page 2 could be combined in one more substantial paper.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said that we had been mulling over the question of the goal we seek all the time. Was now the time to set it out more explicitly on paper? The points made in this discussion would be noted and the Chairmen would see what could be done.

Bishop Ashby observed "Alleluia".

Prof. Wright raised the question of dissemination of available material.

Canon Hill said the Secretaries would do what they could, within the limits set by their respective budgets.

Archbishop Butelezi reminded the Commission that the dialogue involved not individuals but churches. That was why there was need for a clear goal. Dr. Cassmann, involved both in WCC discussions and bilateral dialogues, would be the ideal man to ask for a paper of the kind required.

Canon Hill thought that, as members were tired, the discussion was becoming rather circular. Could it be left to the Chairmen and Secretaries to put things together in the light of the paper and the discussions, and to act accordingly.

The Press Release (ARCIC-II 32/(b) (84) Final Text) was distributed, and also the recent (still embargoed) Report of the Anglican/Orthodox Theological Commission.

As the meeting ended Bishop Murphy-O'Connor extended the Commission's thanks to the Secretaries (Anne Tyler, Josette Kersters and Sister Damian) for their efficient work and their companionship on our journey. He thanked Mgr. Stewart and Canon Hill for their services to the Commission between meetings as well as when ARCIC was in session. He particularly thanked Canon Hill and Anne Tyler for the preparations here at Durham which had contributed so much to the happy way in which the meeting had proceeded. Finally he thanked all the members; this year we had really begun to feel the riches of having membership from all five continents.

Canon Baycroft expressed the Commission's thanks to the Chairmen for their leadership.

Bishop Santer led the final prayers and gave the blessing.

CORRIGENDA

Page 5 1.11 experience of grace
Page 16, 1.24 five bits
Page 17 1.3 proffered four points
Page 17 1.7 linked to freedom
Page 27 1.13 the conflation of Salvation, Christian and Church
Page 33 1.21 Mr. Charley corrected
Page 41 1.16 but as a lot to do
Page 43 1.1 Wednesday, 29th August