

ANGLICAN - ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION
Third Meeting, Graymoor, Aug. 27 - Sept. 5, 1985

MINUTES

Tuesday, August 27th, 7.30 p.m.

The Co-Chairmen opened the third meeting of ARCIC-II with prayer. Fr. Emmanuel Sullivan then gave a short paper on the 'Graymoor Story'. The session concluded with a discussion on the working time-table. Professor Oliver O'Donovan was welcomed and Bp. Brian Ashby's resignation for reasons of ill health regretted.

The opening Eucharist was to be a R.C. Mass of the Resurrection for Mgr. Dick Stewart.

Wednesday, August 28th, 9.30 a.m.

From the chair Bp. Santer read a letter of welcome from Bishop Paul Moor of New York, followed by Bp. Murphy-O'Connor reading a similar message from Cardinal O'Connor of the Archdiocese.

Bp. Santer delineated three major areas of discussion on the Church and Salvation text: the Revised Pleshey Draft (36/2); Brendan Soane's request for the treatment of unbelievers (42/2); and the question of Purgatory (40/1 + 2).

Bp. Vogel hoped 'unbelievers' and 'purgatory' would be addenda.

Dean Bayeroff sought substantial agreement, not uniformity in fanciful ideas - he feared an ecumenical quagmire.

But Mr. Charley felt that any statement which didn't allude to such matters would not convince.

Bp. Murphy O'Connor reminded the Commission that they had to decide whether both subjects were matters for the main text or as an appendix.

Bp. Santer thought one for the text and one for the Appendix (Purgatory)

Dean Bayeroff saw parallels with the Lutheran dialogue where background papers played an important role.

Sr. Boulding was of the opinion that ARCIC-II differed from ARCIC-I in its statements having some practical application.

Bp. Lessard cautioned on too early a decision about 'fanciful questions' as they had not yet been discussed.

Fr. Soane noted that modern writing about faith was distinguished from religious belief. Many ordinary people were concerned about the salvation of unbelievers. God had surely taken steps to ensure the salvation of all mankind. There had been a real development in Catholic thinking in Vatican II and the Commission needed to address deep concerns.

Professor Pobee argued for a missiological *raison d'être* for the Church. There was an obligation to treat this issue in the body of the text. Christians from Africa and Asia were obliged to try to answer the question.

Fr. Tillard apologized for repeating what he had frequently said before. The Commission did not have to deal with the whole problem but only where issues divided the two Churches. Unless only this was attempted there would never be an end.

Bp. Santer cautioned the Commission, however, against buying an incredible Augustinian-Christendom peace.

Mr. Charley was equally worried about negative reactions to any suspicion of universalism.

Fr. Yarnold wondered whether a negative formulation would suffice.

Prof. Wright urged an examination of the text before any final decisions were made.

Bp. Santer asked whether the shape of the main text was satisfactory. Was the integration of the Church in balance?

Fr. Yarnold requested an explicit cross-referencing of the answers to the three questions set out in the opening paras. (4 - 7).

Professor O'Donovan commented on his first reading of the text with 'ferociously Protestant eyes'. While admiring the material he found two points missing or underemphasized: (1) an emphasis that justification is incorporation into Christ; (2) the eschatological theme that God's final favourable verdict on man is brought into the midst of time.

Fr. Tillard agreed on the crucial significance of incorporation, but some had disagreed.

Bp. Gitari was uncomfortable that the only metaphors of the Church were 'sign', 'instrument' and 'steward'. Why not 'body' or 'bride'? This was important in view of Professor O'Donovan's stress on incorporation.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor still felt that the Church was only to be treated as it related to justification.

Canon Hill felt para. 9 inadequate. More was needed to explain what was being said about the Church and what was not.

Bp. Vogel thought such explanation should be in the preface.

Fr. Tillard reminded the Commission that he had asked for a section on incorporation between paras. 10/11.

Fr. Duprey was conscious that there had been two questions put to ARCIC-II. Anglicans had asked for an explication of justification, whilst Catholics had asked for a treatment of the Church as sacramental. The link between these two was therefore the Commission's proper subject.

Bp. Santer warned the Commission against the danger of a 'pantomime-horse': De Justificatione - De Ecclesia.

Professor Chadwick did not think Sola Fide meant Sine Ecclesiae

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor wanted to agree with the stress on incorporation into the Body made by Professor O'Donovan, Fr. Tillard and Bp. Gitari.

Bp. Santer agreed. This would link with Baptism.

Fr. Tillard was anxious that ground gained at Durham should not be lost. There the question had been asked whether the Church had something to do for salvation. Something was needed from the Church. Anglicans were not the same as Lutherans as the sacraments had always been important even for Evangelicals. He cited Roger Beckwith.

Mr. Charley was aware of ARCIC-I's assumption that nothing needed to be said about Baptism. This was perhaps a mistake. He also felt the document held together till para. 22 - then it became a rag-bag.

Fr. Duprey stressed again the importance of something on the Church as the Sacrament of Salvation.

Fr. Yarnold defended the logic of the text. The third opening question was in fact answered in para. 22 ff.

Bp. Vogel suggested that para. 8 could be expanded on incorporation. He pleaded for some Old Testament reference to the salvation of a People where individualism was contrasted by the community.

Sr. Boulding and Bp. Gitari asked for the deletion of para. 9.

Bp. Vogel thought para. 19 the place to adumbrate incorporation.

Professor O'Donovan found the 'relevant' conclusion somewhat timid. The problem was set up in terms of the verbs dikaioo and iustificare. But the conclusion was a noun. The potential significance of this had not been brought out.

Fr. Thornhill asked what audience was being addressed. It was a mistake to turn from those with a technical formation to ordinary people. The real issue was not as seen in the 16th century. The Pauline experience was of a new freedom which removed all barriers. The whole of humanity was open to faith in Jesus Christ.

Professor Chadwick did not want to see only professionals addressed. The diagnosis of what man is was relevant to justification. Modern man saw himself in the light of Freud and Marx, Darwin and even Copernicus. The Gospel had something to say to this which was foreign to modern ears.

Fr. Addapur asked whether the Statement was directed to each other or to a common preaching to the world.

Sr. Boulding & Bp. Santer saw it as answering whether the issue constituted a reason for remaining out of communion.

Mrs. Tanner argued, however, in favour of a conclusion to a doctrinal agreement which looked out to the world. She was not happy with the existing paras. 30-36.

Bp. Vogel also pleaded for something which spoke of the 'faith and fire' of the Christian life, even if it was aimed at leadership.

Bp. Lessard stressed the need for eschatology. The Kingdom was made present - it was already anticipated whilst the Church struggled more and more to realize it.

Mr. Charley applauded the Anglican-Reformed Statement with its grounding of the Church in mission. The real question was how far could the Churches engage in evangelism together.

Fr. Kevin McDonald observed that the papers on reception indicated the need for reception by the totality of the Church. There was therefore a need for a living document.

Fr. Duprey felt the text so far had not sufficiently underlined justification as being of the New Creation. Both a forensic notion of justification and the Church needed to be overcome.

Fr. Tillard repeated what he had said at Durham - there was a distinction between the role of Christ and the role of the Church. But how was the Church associated with Christ in salvation? The Evangelical stress on mission was due to their stress on salvation.

Sr. Boulding was struck by Fr. Duprey's criticism of a forensic notion of the Church. All too often the Church was "wheeled in" from the outside when it was in reality in us the baptized.

Professor Pobee underlined the insights of BEM.

Professor Chadwick detected a change of direction. It had been a mistake to start with the past as in Durham and Pleshey.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor agreed. It was too late to bring in relevance.

Mr. Charley pleaded for the keeping of the historical material in some form, but at para. 10.

Bp. Vogel was delighted at the change of mind. One went to the future, from the present, through the past.

Canon Hill said this was ARCIC-I's methodology - but it had been achieved by experience.

Fr. Thornhill also approved of the new mode which would call people to mission together.

Professor Chadwick was sure the historical material in the first part of the text could be incorporated by an apparatus, especially at paras 20-21. There was still the common problem - the role of the Church. Bp. Vogel agreed.

Bp. Santer saw the order as 1-2 then to 8.

Professor Chadwick still urged the Commission not to see justification and sanctification as successive. Hooker had seen this.

Mr. Charley entered a historical caveat. While there may have been differences between the Lutheran and Anglican Reformations, today Evangelicals looked at the problem with Lutheran eyes. But Fr. Tillard did not think contemporary Evangelicals used the word justification very much. Mr. Charley said they did with R.C.s!

Fr. Duprey was content to underline the total gratuity of God's action. There was debate about justification within the R.C. Church. But there was agreement on the total gratuity of the whole process of sanctification. This had emerged in the century after the Counter-Reformation. Salvation as a whole was totally gratuitous, not simply justification. This was accepted on both sides. The question was what were the consequences for the Church. For the Reformation traditions the question was one of the reality of the sacramental aspect of the Church.

Fr. Akpunonu believed that the way to understand the problem was to see Jesus Christ as the gift of the Father to mankind. The Church was Christ in time and space, to be consummated eschatologically. Signs were means by which Christ continued salvation. How was this worked out in the Church?

Fr. Tillard saw this gratuity as realized through incorporation. Faith was typically Christian, everything was through and in faith.

Fr. Soane heard two contemporary questions. Why was it necessary to have a Church at all? What of the salvation of unbelievers?

Fr. Adappur asked whether Anglicans differed from Catholics on these questions.

Professor O'Donovan shared Fr. Soane's anxiety. The quicker one centered on the Church the quicker was the danger of limiting the universality of the work of Christ. All mankind was claimed by Christ to God. Then one moved to the Church.

Fr. Yarnold wondered whether a move in this direction would satisfy Evangelicals.

Mr. Charley also saw a danger in saying too much about the Church. The text was very slender on faith.

Bp. Santer claimed it was inadequate to talk about the Resurrection and then to move to the Church. There must be a stress on incorporation. Christ uses human means. Jesus to the Church was an oversimplification.

Sr. Boulding feared the danger of speaking about universality without a full ecclesiology. She stressed faith.

For Bp. Vogel the problem was that the non-sacramental Churches led more salvific lives. The sacramental Churches needed to stress what was theirs was gift, not possession.

Professor Chadwick spoke of Luther's stress on simul justus. It was there in Augustine and applied to the Church by Origen. People saw the Church as power-hungry prelates and a neurotic laity. So the peccatrix element was obvious. Jansenists as well as Evangelicals stressed this. Was there a bridge between the Church as the Body of Christ and sinners? Justification was this.

Wednesday, 29th August, 3.30 p.m.

From the Chair, Bp. Murphy-O'Connor invited discussion on five areas:

1. A new introduction, beginning with contemporary faith.
2. The role of the Church and incorporation into Christ and the Church as the Sacrament of Salvation.
3. Faith - including the question of the salvation of unbelievers.

4. The Conclusion.
5. Purgatory etc.

He asked for further discussion in order that the drafters had a clearer picture of their task. Were any essential elements left out?

Dean Baycroft stressed the need to add an eschatological emphasis.

Fr. Thornhill reiterated the change in mode by a call to common mission.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor felt this was material for the conclusion.

Mr. Charley wanted a Trinitarian introduction. Faith also came in two sections in the present text. He also wanted Professor Chadwick's *justa et peccatrix*.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked for comment on an introduction.

Professor Chadwick urged a plunge into what was the question. God requires righteousness but is also the God of love and mercy and has acted to redeem us. Man is sinful and fallen and suffers from finitude, ignorance, weakness of will and resistance. Christianity is a religion of salvation and brings hope and forgiveness to human beings - though they rarely practise it. The doctrine of grace and forgiveness is foreign to modern man. There is the possibility of a new creation. The historical setting seemed remote.

Fr. Akpunonu pleaded for some historical explanation of why the subject was debated.

Bp. Vogel thought that history could come after Church and Salvation.

Mr. Charley was content with historical allusion, with detail elsewhere.

Bp. Santer agreed. The Commission should begin with the heart of the Gospel. Were we agreed?

Fr. Yarnold proposed two Introductions - there was the device of the Co-Chairmen's Preface.

Mr. Charley questioned its status.

Fr. Tillard cautioned against the suggestion that there was division on the heart of the Gospel. There was difference on interpretation.

Bp. Santer did not find paras. 1-2 sufficient.

Fr. Kevin McDonald was unhappy that justification should be thought of as the heart of the Gospel alone.

Professor O'Donovan saw the problematic as justification as the way into the heart of the Gospel. It manifested the righteousness of God.

Fr. Tillard believed the most basic point was God's mercifulness. Could we also say something about creation.

Fr. Thornhill put the two together in "God's saving justice".

Sr. Boulding said this debate illustrated the danger of starting with time-conditioned terms.

Professor Pobee thought the crucial question was what God required.

Bp. Santer affirmed the importance of the Gospel speaking about death and resurrection. He did not want a psychologized Gospel.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor found an inadequacy in the role of the Church. There was no mention of incorporation or the sacrament of salvation.

Dean Baycroft wanted incorporation as the lead in to the role of the Church, rather than as a subsection.

Bp. Vogel pleaded for reference to the Old and New Israel.

Mr. Charley repeated his plea for a Trinitarian start.

Bp. Vogel rather wanted it as a summary.

Mr. Charley wanted the accomplished salvation of Christ first, then incorporation.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor and Sr. Boulding questioned whether Christ could be experienced without incorporation.

Mr. Charley agreed but Sr. Boulding was still unhappy at their separation.

Bp. Santer said the point of being in the Church was incorporation in Christ.

Bp. Gitari wanted to avoid the impression that all that was needed was to join the Church, rather than starting with a commitment to Christ.

Fr. Akpunonu asked if one could be committed to Christ without the Church.

For Mr. Charley and Bp. Murphy-O'Connor the problem was those committed to the Church and not to Christ.

Professor Pobee pleaded for the inclusive Pauline 'in Christ'.

Professor O'Donovan wondered whether the problem would be partially solved if there was more stress on the Church as Sign. This was ontological. It was better to start with 'Sign' than with 'Instrument', which had difficulties. The Church as sign of the Kingdom was an easier place to begin.

Bp. Cormac was happy with a re-ordering.

Abp. Butelezi did not want the omission of instrumentality.

Fr. Adappur agreed. The question was whether Christ wanted his salvation to be mediated through the instrumentality of the Church.

Fr. Tillard could not deduce this directly from the Gospels. That was the problem.

Mr. Charley wondered whether other words could be found for instrument/instrumentality.

Bp. Vogel agreed they had materialistic connotations.

Dean Baycroft reminded the Commission of a suppressed Durham phrase: the Servant Church as sign and steward.

Canon Hill noted that Professor O'Donovan had asked for a re-ordering not a deletion.

Professor Chadwick defended 'instrument'. Though it might convey the sub-personal, the Word and Sacraments were not purely intellectual. There was no English alternative. Bp. Murphy-O'Connor was attracted by the richness of the word.

Fr. Adappur agreed it could be inanimate. But it was properly used analogically. He could be an instrument in God's hand.

Bp. Santer wanted it beyond doubt that God uses human beings as means.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor then asked for a discussion of faith.

Fr. Tillard explained that faith was characteristic of the Church because it was linked to the gratuity of God. In it was the transcendence of God and the frailty of man.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked whether para. 23 was adequate. Fr. Tillard found it insufficient.

Bp. Vogel noted para. 20 as well.

Fr. Yarnold pointed out that the paras. on grace and assurance were also relevant (23+25) and Professor Pobce felt the headings of all the latter paras. should be deleted as all were related to faith.

Bp. Santer reminded the Commission of Bp. Cameron's anxiety at the late treatment of faith (42/3) (Bp. Cameron had not yet arrived.).

But Mr. Charley was convinced that faith could not be dealt with until after Salvation and Justification.

Fr. Soane asked to what extent the Commission was presenting a contemporary statement on faith. In current theological debate there was discussion about degrees of explicitness. Faith could not be tied to intellectual consent. This issue was linked to the question of the salvation of unbelievers. This could be put in negatively at para. 15 or positively at para. 23. There was a distinction between faith that saves and intellectual assent to the Gospel which makes explicit saving faith. But he agreed this was not a matter of disagreement.

Sr. Boulding called for the unpacking of "faith" as had been done for "justification".

Professor Pobee agreed with Fr. Soane. He also made a plea for "justification by grace through faith" throughout the document.

Professor Wright said that people today wanted to know what faith involved in concrete terms.

Bp. Santer asked for rewriting to avoid needless misunderstandings. There were two quite different problems over faith. The problem in James - minimal assent. Fr. Soane's problem was maximum assent.

Bp. Gitari also echoed Bp. Cameron's question whether faith should come at the end.

Fr. Thornhill agreed they must confine themselves to Church-dividing issues. But perhaps in an introduction God's universal will to save mankind could be emphasized, followed by the Church as the Sign of this (as in Gaudium et Spes).

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor agreed. The vision of the Church as Sacrament and Sign shows how salvation is offered to unbelievers.

Fr. Tillard was certain that for the two Churches faith was included in Sacraments. There was no true sacrament without faith, and no true faith without sacramental life. This was a common Augustinian heritage: an osmosis of sacraments and faith.

Bp. Butelezi saw the Old Testament theme of election as helping. God chose a People not for themselves but for the salvation of the world.

Abn. Vogel recounted a phrase of John Maquarrie to complement "anonymous Christians": "anonymous atheists within the Church".

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor summed up the general discussion as indicating work on: Purgatory, eschatology, mission, and the Church as Sacrament and simul iusta et peccatrix.

Thursday, 29th August; 9.30 a.m.

Bp. Santer asked whether we needed to resume discussion on the question of faith.

Fr. Soane replied that we did since we have not yet clarified our approach to the question of unbelievers. Should this be treated in the context of the universality of salvation. Fr. Soane suggested that we should mention the universality of salvation early on and then be content with a negative remark to the effect that this is not intended to exclude from salvation those who have not heard the Gospel or who have not heard it in such a way that they could respond to it.

Fr. Thornhill said he would prefer a positive rather than a negative remark, showing how unbelievers are part of a saving mystery.

Fr. Soane said in that case the question arises of where to locate it in the document.

Prof. Wright noted that the thrust of our discussion is now to remove or transfer the first eight or nine paragraphs, the ones that deal with our differences. The question now arises: what are we trying to do in the document? Are we going to address differences, or is there a new statement of the gospel that we wish to make. It's not altogether clear what we are trying to do in the document.

Fr. Tillard asked, did we not agree to deal with justification in the context of salvation? We need to stick to that; justification in salvation and salvation in the Church.

Prof. Wright asked if Fr. Tillard was proposing a logical outline: one topic following from another?

Fr. Tillard replied that we must start with salvation and think of justification after that.

It was agreed that there was a need for some lines on baptism in this general context.

Bp. Santer said that we still need to determine where the treatment of faith is going to be; how is the Pleshey draft to be reordered?

Prof. Wright replied that the question is: in the sixteenth century was our agreement/disagreement about faith or about justification.

Mrs. Tanner said the drafting question all depends on how we intend to use paragraphs 4 - 7.

Sr. Boulding said that as far as drafting is concerned, Prof. Wright's point is that agreed material should precede controversial material.

Fr. Thornhill asked whether Fr. Tillard would not agree that faith is a correlative of justification.

Fr. Tillard said it was ~~and~~ that we agree on faith. Our disagreement is about the impact of faith in our lives. My synthesis of what we agreed on yesterday is this: The Churches agree on salvation; it is the heart of the Gospel; it comes from the mercy of God; it is gratuitous, given through Christ. Our incorporation into Christ is realised by faith and baptise. Our disagreement is about how the Church is used by God as an instrument of salvation.

Mrs. Tanner: you ~~now~~ did disagree; not disagree now.

Fr. Tillard: Yes, but nonetheless we need historical paragraphs at the beginning of our paper, not as a footnote.

Prof. Wright: If we did disagree on that point, let's note that our disagreement was specifically about the role of the Church.

Fr. Tillard replied that Church and justification are the same question.

Sr. Boulding replied that in the past our disagreement was perceived as being about justification; now we perceive it differently.

Mr. Charley said he felt there was a problem about justification in itself, e.g. para.20: it has barely any mention of the atonement as what makes justification possible. We need to speak here about atonement and the cross. Cf. the Romans phrase "justified by his blood". This is crucial and unless we go into it, the Reformation problem still stands.

Prof. Chadwick asked whether para.20, line 7 didn't say something about this.

Mr. Charley said yes, but it did not say very much about it.

Fr. Tillard pointed out that there are parts of the New Testament where salvation is explained in other terms than justification by faith.

Mr. Charley said that nonetheless justification must be dealt with.

Canon Hill agreed that we have to deal with justification but pointed out that the Commission may find itself discerning other issues that lie behind justification, such as the Church.

Fr. Yarnold disagreed with Fr. Tillard that we should start with disagreements, and said that many of our readers will need a lot of convincing that our disagreements are not about the nature of the Church. Fr. Yarnold proposed that since we have been asked to speak on justification, what we do is to say that we have put this problem in the context of God's salvation in Christ, and then move on to our exposition.

Fr. Tillard agreed and pointed out that the problem about Trent is justification by faith alone.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said that some of our discussion is going back to things already discussed over the last two years. We have in fact already reached a general agreement about justification.

Mr. Charley agreed with Fr. Tillard about faith alone, but said the problem is the relation of faith to the cause of justification.

Sr. Boulding suggested we should use the phrase "justification by grace, through faith".

Fr. Soane pointed out that some theologians distinguish faith from religious belief. What we have done is to accept a more traditional terminology.

Dean Baycroft asked whether Bp. Cameron's amendment of para.23 did not take care of that.

Fr. Soane said that that was a different question; his concern was about those who had never heard of Christ or God; maybe that issue is too wide for us.

Sr. Boulding asked whether this issue did not come down to the question of the universality of salvation. Isn't that its right context?

Prof. O'Donovan said that para. 23 is expressed in a very serious kind of way. We need to mention the joy and delight of faith. As it is, the paragraph simply is about believing what is right and setting out to do it.

Prof. Wright said that Fr. Soane's concern needs to be taken up in the context of faith as a correlative of salvation.

Abp. Butelezi agreed that it should be included, and included in relation to Christ's universal mission of salvation.

Bp. Santer felt this area could be misleading if not dealt with very fully.

Bp. Vogel felt this was a nuance of the main theme that could come out in the development of the main theme.

Bp. Santer moved on to a discussion of the conclusion of the document. He asked whether or not we need to mention of the Church "simile iusta et peccatrix". Is there enough on this in para. 15 or do we need more colourful development of this point.

Bp. Lessard said this point needs to be handled carefully. When speaking of the Church's struggle with sin, we need to make the point that the Church is sinful because of its members, not insofar as it is the Body of Christ. Otherwise the Orthodox would certainly be unhappy with it.

Mr. Charley said we need more than is in para. 15 and he would like to see it in the context of grace.

Prof. Wright, referring to Bp. Lessard asked was there not a disagreement between the churches about whether and how a church can be called sinful. Anglicans would be inclined to see the matter differently from Bp. Lessard. Prof. Wright made a distinction between Pope Paul VI's view of this matter and that of the Council Fathers.

Prof. Chadwick said the Council's phrase for the Church was "Sancta et simul purificanda".

Bp. Lessard said this formula was proposed to and adopted by the Council Fathers; it was not imposed on them.

Fr. Duprey corroborated this.

Prof. Chadwick said that in 16th century, the Catholic Church was very conscious of being in continuity with the apostles, whereas Protestants saw themselves as in continuity with the people of the Old Testament who had an unrivalled propensity for apostasy.

Bp. Santer said that Anglicans could certainly assent to Origen's formulation "simul iusta et peccatrix". Could Catholics?

Prof. Chadwick said that the meaning of Origen's phrase is that in the church we are forgiven sinners who remain in conflict with sin.

Fr. Addapur said that this left Bp. Lessard's problem still unresolved.

Sr. Boulding said this is a doctrinal problem. Vatican II had to deal with the formulation of Pius XII in Mystici Corporis in which he presented the Church as not sinful at all. Could Anglicans accept the formula "sancta et purificanda"?

Mr. Charley said that we have not in fact dealt with faith and grace sufficiently. The notions of assurance and perseverance need to be linked with faith. We present grace as a rather abstract concept which lacks the dynamism of the Greek and Hebrew vocabulary found in the bible: the biblical words express God's covenantal activity. For this reason it would be good to mention election, and to mention predestination in the context of perseverance: God bringing His work to fruition.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said he thought we had been careful not to mention predestination. The sense of it comes in para. 25 where it is put in a different way so as not to suggest a passive acceptance of salvation.

Mr. Charley said that we were being selective.

Bp. Vogel said predestination is a flag word. We can make the point without bringing ourselves into new problems.

Prof. Pobe said it would be good to stress the eschatological dimension and so speak of God's "bringing to fruition". Also if we are silent about the gifts of grace; grace is not something static and we need to include this if we're concerned about the role of the Church.

Bp. Santer said he did not like the phrase at the end of 22 "grace is not a thing". Who is the Aunt Sally?

Bp. Vogel said 22 could be written more positively.

Fr. Yarnold felt there was an Aunt Sally.

Fr. Akpunonu said he disagreed with this sentence in 22 since if grace is not a thing, it is nothing at all.

Canon Hill said that some non-Roman Catholics do accuse Catholics of having a materialist view of grace.

Sr. Boulding said we need to say something about the effects of grace.

Fr. Yarnold said this last sentence would be better if the two halves of it were reversed.

After the break Bp. Santer resumed, reminding the Commission that since we have a basic draft we should now move to the conclusion.

Mr. Charley said he was not yet ready for that, since he felt that section 20 on judgement was very inadequate. Judgement means separation and division. This separation is very important : it underlies divine sovereignty and human freedom. It underlies the essential nature of faith and that what divides people is whether they have responded in faith.

Fr. Akpunonu found this a minimal approach; grace produces good works which are more than just evidence of grace.

Fr. Yarnold said that on grace, he hoped the drafters would look at his paper and that they would decide between the alternatives presented there.

Bp. Santer said that any differences on this matter were now clear and would go before the drafters.

The discussion then moved to the conclusion of the document.

Fr. Thornhill said that two elements should be included in the conclusion of the document as it addresses itself to the relevance of this topic for today. One is the issue of human existence before God and God's love. The other is that in Christian existence all barriers are removed as we stand before the goodness of God.

Bp. Santer asked would this involve keeping 34-36.

Fr. Thornhill: Yes.

Prof. O'Donovan opposed Fr. Thornhill's suggestion since the implication of following his advice would be to enhance a troubling individualism in the document: there is very little about human community and its ordering. 33 contains the foremost thing we need to say but we need to add that God has relativized the search for justice in human community. We must say this.

Prof. Wright said we should state the relevance of this topic, not plead it. 30 and 31 (1st sentence) plead relevance.

Bp. Lessard said that by strengthening the eschatological basis in the early parts of the document, we would provide a better basis for our conclusions.

Prof. Wright said that we need in the conclusion a sentence that shows that we now agree on what we previously disagreed over.

It was agreed that material on Catholic Practices be in an appendix.

Fr. Yarnold said the review of our historical differences should be in the Chairmen's preface (i.e. 3-7).

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said he thought we had agreed that it be in the main text.

Bp. Santer said he thought we had simply agreed that the text begin with a positive statement which refers to the historical material.

The discussion then moved to material not yet dealt with.

Bp. Santer said that the background to papers 40/1 and 40/2 was Julian's concern that some people will say that our agreement is worthless if it contains no reference to indulgences, etc. The Catholic mind identifies these problems in relation to the Church; the Protestant in relation to justification.

Sr. Boulding said the O'Donovan/Soane document is good and virtually solves the problem.

Fr. Soane said he agreed that topic should not be dealt with in the main text.

Prof. O'Donovan, introducing 40/2, said that the hermeneutical principles on p. 1 are important in endeavouring to prove the universe of the dead; this is important for non-Catholics. The problem is divided into prayer-related and dead-related aspects. They felt that having done this, they were able to think alike. Having done that they felt that prayer for the dead and invocation of the saints need not be things about which ARCIC need take up a position.

Fr. Soane, referring to hermeneutical principle 3 said that Catholics need to be aware of the variety of theological explanations of this issue in the Catholic Church.

Fr. Thornhill said this leaves us in a very happy position since what we have to accept is very elemental.

Sr. Boulding said the Church does release documents that affirm particular practices and a theology which is a background to it.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked how people thought we should tackle the question.

Fr. Tillard said that the way 40/2 has tackled the problem is both prudent and intelligent.

Bp. Santer said that on this, Trent settled for much less than the abusive piety that provoked the Reformation. We need to make it explicit that this is an area where others can do things we may not want to do.

Sr. Boulding referred to a 1965 statement on indulgences and a 1979 statement on prayers for the dead. We have to ensure that what we say does not contradict the CDF.

Prof. Wright suspected that the definition of indulgences on p.2 of 40/2 is not the official understanding. He also questioned the use of the word "saints". Who does this mean?

Fr. Duprey said that Pope John Paul in a speech on indulgences in the last Holy Year put this problem in a new dimension when he spoke of "always needing the indulgence of God." Note also that in the last twenty years he has never been asked about indulgences: most Catholics don't know what they are, so don't let's give them an importance that they no longer have.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor stressed the importance of the shift from indulging to indulgence.

Revd. J. Charley said he liked the 40/2 approach: but it needs to be abbreviated and simplified. It is "dunnish" as it stands. Also, what about the fact that these practices appear to contradict what has been said about indulgences. we need to show that they do not.

Professor Chadwick expressed gratitude for 40/2. He noted however that the document says that indulgences are about the forgiveness of sin, whereas in the Middle Ages they were about remission of punishment. By talking about indulgences as being to do with the forgiveness of sins, we recognize the popular misconception that indulgences forgive sin. Note, too, that the treasury of merit is a way of saying "sola gratia".

Mr. Charley accepted Prof. Chadwick's remarks and said the problem is the great diversity on this among Roman Catholics, the problem is of knowing what people mean.

Sr. Boulding took issue with Bishop Murphy-O'Connor saying that the documents she referred to are actually talking about remission of punishment after sins.

Fr. Thornhill said the essential issue here is the removal of obstacles between man and God. It's all to do with healing, not with a punitive process.

Professor Wright said the appendix should say what is the relation of indulgences to justification. 40/2 doesn't refer to justification. If this (40/2) is what indulgences mean, it could be very positively integrated with justification.

Sr. Boulding said she felt her thesis did just that.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor noted that the plural word 'indulgences' has different meanings in the Catholic Church. We need to link this word to the doctrine that underlies it.

Mr. Charley was concerned that we were talking as if indulgences was the only issue.

AFTERNOON SESSION: 3.15 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor introduced the topic of prayers for the departed.

Bishop Santer noted two principles. What Christian tradition has tried to cope with is that many Christians are not ready for the vision of God when they died. Believing that doesn't commit you to a particular doctrine of purgatory.

A thousand years separate prayer for the dead from the doctrine of purgatory. We need to have an eye to the traditional Orthodox objections to purgatory. They see it as a covert universalism.

Sr. Boulding : We've tended to put purgatory in terms of punishment though this itself is not dogmatic; we may see it as purification.

Dean Baycroft asked whether our purpose here is to reach an agreement or to say why we feel we don't need an agreement on these issues.

Prof. Wright said that in the English tradition of Anglicanism there has been a debate about whether we should pray for the departed. We have to settle whether this is a Catholic practice.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked whether there was any Anglican formulary that cast doubt on the practice of prayer for the dead.

Bp. Cameron said that in their prayer book revision, this was specifically excluded by a deliberate Synodical decision. It was thought inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer.

Canon Hill said that there were prayers for the departed in the first prayer book; they were excluded in the second. 1622 had prayers that blessed God for the departed. In the ASB they are not mandatory but there are options of praying for the dead.

Mr. Charley said it was difficult to reconcile prayer for the dead with the confident hope of a happy death. There is a contradiction between "purification" and this confident hope.

Prof. O'Donovan said that the doctrinal commission in 1969 which paved the way for ASB, put prayer for the dead in the context of prayer for the Kingdom and for the resurrection of the dead.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said this is a pastoral problem; how you remember your loved ones in Christ is a pastoral, human, and theological problem. Purgatory meets a need here.

Fr. Soane drew attention to their second hermeneutical principle. The most imaginative construction, e.g. of Dante, is not to be taken literally: we have to be rather agnostic about what actually happens.

Canon Hill restated Dick Stewart's point that only the justified get to purgatory.

Bp. Cameron in relation to I John drew attention to complementary and paradoxical strands in the N.T. Also, we must be careful about "pastoral needs" in this area. Some say it is "psychologically helpful" to pray for the dead, but pastoral practice must be based on dogma.

Sr. Boulding said that Mr. Charley's idea of "being in the presence of the Lord" is precisely what purgatory means.

Bp. Santer said that it is clear from Sr. Boulding's paper that we cannot take the N.T. on its own. He suggested three principles: (1) A strong affirmation that we are talking about sanctification and not justification. (2) This prayer is an application to one person of the prayer "Thy Kingdom come". (3) The ecclesial dimension of bearing one another's burdens needs to be clearly stated.

Fr. Tillard mentioned the idea of Isaac de l'Etoile that when someone dies, God has already taken account of the prayers we will offer for them afterwards. This is naive but true.

Fr. Yarnold referred to the places in Trent which mention purgatory. In the Canons on justification, the point is made that justification must work itself out in the human body: and if this is not completed in this life it will be beyond it.

Fr. Duprey said that this is a problem of time and eternity. The Orthodox do pray for the dead and have their "customs" theory: the different customs you must pass as you progress to God. This is symbolic language. Note that the Council of Florence, even, does not go into great detail on them.

Prof. O'Donovan said he was not reassured by Sr. Cecily's idea of casting purgatory in terms of growth. The categories of growth and process don't express the reality of justification. People are usually less saintly at the time of death than before: so it's not a process. Should be more apophatic about it all.

Canon Hill said that the fuller experience of God at death will be both joy and pain. This is relevant. Also we must see prayer for the dead in the general context of intercessory prayer.

Prof. Wright drew attention to Pleshey 21 on sanctification. He asked whether all the statements on sanctification were consistent with one another. 40/2 agrees that there can be prayers for the dead; also Sr. Cecily has said that praying for the dead does not imply that justification is incomplete. If that is RC doctrine then it meets Anglican anxieties.

Sr. Boulding referring to Prof. O'Donovan's point said that the growth we are talking about in this context is not the kind that can be observed. She had presumed that at Pleshey it had been agreed that sanctification is an ongoing process.

Bp. Vogel affirmed this notion of progression.

Fr. Thornhill said that we are concerned with removing obstacles that stand between us and God. Purgatory must be seen in this context. It's about relinquishing those things that hold us back.

Archb. Butelezi said that progress could be made if we examined carefully the question of "growth". At death something definitive occurs: afterwards is a more speculative matter.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said we mustn't be too hard on those who don't want to be agnostic. Must take seriously the ways in which people have thought of this historically.

Bp. Vogel took that point but said that we may not allow people to project into the next world in a way that lessens the demands of the gospel now.

Prof. Chadwick said that to plead in intercession - especially eucharistically - the mercy and grace of God for fellow believers, living and dead is to supremely focus our faith on the sole grace of Christ. It is to acknowledge that in creation, souls are everlastingly endowed with freedom; and it is to imply that Christian souls which are not perfected at death may experience a passionate and fervent longing to enter into the love of God more fully. We may pray that the good work begun by God in their lifetime may be brought to perfection through the redeeming love and mercy manifest in Christ and his cross.

Dean Baycroft said he was happy with the 40/2 formulation since it makes clear that we don't need agreement on all practices.

Fr. Duprey said that we should not try to reach complete agreement on this. But we must be able to say that the Catholic doctrine of purgatory does not contradict our agreement on justification.

Sr. Boulding said that the CDF statement of 1979 said that prayer for the dead must not be so stated as to impugn the special place of BVM.

Mr. Charley expressed anxiety that this appendix would not carry conviction. To say that purgatory is only for the justified does not help the evangelical. Are we not stipulating things in an area where we must be agnostic.

Prof. Wright: A good test would be to ask if we can say 'Amen' to RC prayers for the dead.

Bp. Santer said again that we cannot limit ourselves to Scripture. Prayer for the dead is found from the second century.

Fr. Soane said that the prayer in the liturgy was conservative and restrained. It is also part of our doctrine that charity doesn't grow after death. In our preaching of purgatory, there is no question of a "second chance". Rather, that the pain of purgatory is much worse than the pain in this life: it is to be avoided!

After this it was agreed to leave the work to drafters.

After the break two important letters were put before the Commission and there was preliminary discussion of them.

7.00 p.m. Thurs. 29th August.

From the Chair, Bp. Santer opened discussion on the Pope's letter and that of Cardinal Willebrands. (The Church & Salvation Sub-Commission not being present).

Sr. Boulding felt the Pope's letter closed the issue more than Inter insigniores.

Dean Baycroft welcomed the fact of the letter as an example of universal primacy.

Mrs. Tanner was grateful for its insistence that the ordination of women was a theological matter. It was the right time to take up the issue.

Bp. Vogel commended the ARC/USA Statements where both positions were seen as fulfilling tradition.

Prof. Pobe admitted the difficulties with Anglican dispersed authority.

Abp. Butelezi did not believe the Orthodox would move but noted that Anglican diversity did not break communion.

Fr. Addapur did not see the letter as a novelty. There had already been a dialogue between Paul VI and Archbishop Donald Coggan.

Sr. Boulding would welcome some explanation of Anglican diversity and communion.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor stressed the importance of the present stage. Did the letter mean 'go back', 'go away' or 'go easy'? Clearly the last. So what did ARCIC suggest the Churches did?

Fr. Akpunonu hoped ARCIC could offer the Archbishop of Canterbury its very serious thought.

Bishop Malone (President of the USA Conference of Catholic Bishops - present for the day) wondered whether ARCIC-II would change the Elucidation of ARCIC-I (FR p.44).

Fr. Duprey understood ARCIC-I to be saying it did not wish to deal with the matter.

Bp. Vogel affirmed that in the U.S. no departure from the Catholic concept of priesthood had been intended.

Bp. Lessard felt the timing good (against Sr. Boulding). Both Churches needed to discuss the women's issue. There was a need to 'satisfy' R.C.'s on priesthood and eucharist. The issue also raised questions about the Sensus Fidei and the Orthodox.

Prof. Chadwick sensed the letter asked the C. of E. how much it really cared for unity. Would communion with Rome diminish diversity? Did restoration of ecclesial communion not call for sacrifices - as in a marriage relationship as opposed to being engaged. Was the letter saying that if Anglicans maintain the ordination of women they could not expect Rome to change Apostolicae Curae. OR if communion was established, women priests could not expect to be part of it.

Dean Baycroft argued for the place of women in the Church to be faced together. He did not think 'how much did Anglicans care' the right question. They also cared about the relationship between women and men.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor sensed that the ministries of women had to be discovered in both Churches. In some ways the R.C. Church was more advanced. Could we help each other - but slowly.

Fr. Duprey agreed the question was doctrinal. But disagreement was in a different category from other doctrinal disagreements because of the point of fact of the ordination of women.

Sr. Boulding wanted to see the whole question of women's ministry tackled first.

Bp. Vogel saw a major ecclesiological difference between the R.C. Church as a universal Church and the Anglican Provincial Churches. Could there be moral relativities?

August 30th: 9.30 a.m.

From the chair Bishop Murphy-O'Connor continued the debate on the two letters.

Bishop Lessard asked about the ordination of women and Anglican-Orthodox relations.

Bishop Santer said this had been very painful indeed. There were deep cultural and social divides and little direct interface. ARCIC itself had caused problems.

Canon Hill thought one reason for the sharp reaction had been a partial presentation of Anglicanism in the past.

Fr. Duprey noted that only some Orthodox reacted strongly to a universal primacy.

Fr. Akpunonu asked whether the Orthodox reaction was social, theological or traditional.

Professor Pobee and Canon Hill thought all three.

Fr. Adappur saw some good in women's liberation but also some extremes. The Orthodox over-emphasized continuity. The Reformed were too enamoured with the contemporary. Perhaps the Roman Catholic Church had a balance!

Bishop Vogel saw the problem as the inability to categorize between social, theological and traditional arguments.

Bishop Santer thought that the Roman Catholic understanding of Tradition was more in terms of a living voice than the Orthodox, which was only what had been 'handed down'. Which arguments resonated?

Bishop Lessard thought Inter insigniores was content to say there was not enough reason for changing the tradition.

Bishop Vogel saw positive argument in terms of the New Creation and a realized eschatology.

Professor Pobee hoped the ordination of women would be discussed only in the context of the community of women and men in the Church.

Mrs. Tanner reflected on the multilateral context. There seemed to her to be a new time now when some Orthodox, at least, could engage the question. The ARCIC debate might help the Orthodox.

Archbishop Butelezi felt the wider study took the venom out of the power politics.

Fr. Duprey explained that the unchanging tradition was the deepest link between autocephalous Churches. Nor could the Orthodox teaching authorities always express themselves freely. The ordination of women could have two interpretations: sociological or a sign of the will of Christ for his Church. Change could not be risked until it was clear which.

Bishop Gitari asked the Roman Catholic members whether the Lambeth 1978 solution might be applicable - diversity whilst remaining in communion.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor felt ARCIC-II needed to say what kind of an obstacle the ordination of women was.

Bishop Santer saw Inter Insigniores as declaring no change until there were compelling reasons. The Orthodox position was that there could be no compelling reasons. For the Orthodox there was the problem of no organs of communion which could make decisions. The Papal letter certainly had ecclesiological significance. For him Lambeth '78 was something of a 'cop out' as it retreated from the universal acceptance of ministry.

Sr. Boulding's problem with Bishop Gitari's question was that if she knew whether the ordination of women were God's will she would know whether she could be in communion. But if a way forward could be found, Anglicans and Roman Catholics should not hold back for the Orthodox. It was very important for the Roman Catholic Church to make more use of its women.

Bishop Vogel insisted the real issue was ecclesiological. If there were good arguments on both sides, could the issue be judged as disciplinary? Could it be right for Anglicans and not for Roman Catholics?

Canon Hill reminded the Commission of the letter from ARC New Zealand (44/2 Addition).

Dean Baycroft saw the Lambeth 1978 decision as interim. There was other discussion in the Anglican Consultative Council. He agreed that better organs were required. A way of doing interim things was required. Would women bishops break communion? A feminist critique was needed.

Canon Hill said Lambeth 1978 had not been a theological agreement.

Professor Chadwick agreed. The Conference had avoided schism but not solved the question. He wondered how Catholics assessed theological voices in favour. There was need for common counsel.

Fr. Adappur posed the possibility of those ordaining women having taken the wong step.

Bishop Gitari welcomed the Pope's letter as it implicitly took Anglican Orders seriously.

Sr. Boulding regretted that a serious case was obscured by the lunatic fringe. But she could not yet see what decision could be made jointly.

Bishop Lessard was anxious to include Orthodox and Lutherans in the discussion.

Bishop Santer castigated the absolutization of provincial autonomy and jealousy with regard to rights. Organs of communion and decision making were needed. Nor was inopportunist wholly unrespectable or abstinence for the sake of community.

Mrs. Tanner felt for women in the Church of England who could be patient for ten years or so - the present time-table - but not much longer.

Fr. Duprey admitted that the Roman Catholic position could only become credible when women's ministry had been broadened, with real specificity for the role of women.

Bishop Vogel urged realism. Episcopalians were less aware of universal communion, and the need for restraint, than Catholics.

Fr. Akpunonu was perplexed ecclesologically at national Churches going ahead.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor remained unconvinced but was convinced at the urgency and importance of working together on women's place in the Church. But urgency did not mean rush. Was ARCIC the place to begin talking about this as well as the impediment of the ordination of women. Did the issue affect the question of sacerdotium, absolutism and eucharistic presidency?

3.30 p.m.

From the chair Bishop Santer invited a contribution from the WCC Observer, Dr. William Rusch, of the Lutheran Church of America.

Dr. Rusch reminded ARCIC that for Lutherans polity was less important. Nevertheless Lutherans were divided about the ordination of women on biblical and confessional grounds - e.g. in the USA. They did not claim to have the answer. Even so those that did would affirm their decision. There was the suggestion of an answer in the diverse character of the Christian tradition. Was there hope in the partial communion between Catholics and Orthodox and Syrian Orthodox (with the latter surely Christology was higher than Church Order?) He wanted to explore 'Reconciled Diversity' and the Fries-Rahner 'suspension of judgement' on key issues.

Professor Chadwick asked of the Catholic-Lutheran dialogue in the U.S.A. and Germany.

Dr. Rusch said that the U.S. agreement on ministry had been before their ordination of women and the International Conversations had not dealt with the matter at length (Fr. Duprey agreed).

Mrs. Tanner informed the Commission of a planned Faith and Order Consultation on the subject.

Bishop Gitari asked if there were women bishops in the Lutheran Churches.

Dr. Rusch said not but they would come.

Mrs. Tanner asked for an explication of the Versailles Consultation.

Fr. Duprey and Canon Hill explained that a late sentence had afterwards been seen to be capable of two meanings. On the Anglican side it had not been felt possible to alter the agreed text. Consequently it became difficult for Rome to own.

Canon Hill asked whether the method of Versailles still had any mileage. Where was the non-ordination of women in the hierarchy of truths.

Dr. Rusch queried whether it was church dividing.

Dean Baycroft and Professor Chadwick (the latter citing Congar) were not convinced the 'hierarchy of truths' would help.

But Bishop Cameron saw it as behind much Anglican theology.

Bishop Vogel was wary of gradations of truth. He preferred a circle. Was the ordination of women close enough to the center to divide?

Sr. Boulding saw the Lambeth decision as an implicit doctrinal judgement that the issue was not a sufficient reason for breaking communion.

Bishop Santer recognized two questions: were women capax ordinis and the effect on communion by not accepting ministries. From the Chair he then moved the discussion to Cardinal Willebrands' letter.

Fr. Adappur was not clear from Fr. Tillard's article whether succession or intention was the real issue. Cardinal Willebrands' letter spoke of the nativa indoles.

Prof. Chadwick noted Apostolicae Curae had been careful to avoid saying the succession had been broken. Duschene's Note had advised the avoidance of this. The argument was doctrinal. It alleged a break of continuity due to lack of proper intention.

Fr. Akpunonu asked whether the lack of intention was due to a denial of the eucharistic sacrifice and sacrificial priesthood. Was this the case?

Prof. Chadwick cited Articles 28 and 31. But 28 was actually against Zwingli (Bp. Guest) and 31 against Caterinus. Cranmer had wanted to replace propitiation by communion. Some Anglicans in the 16th and 17th centuries doubted the sacrificial character of the eucharist. Others did not.

Bishop Santer said the issue centered on what kind of sacrifice.

Fr. Duprey warned that the Reformers' reaction had to be seen against the terrible writings of some Catholics.

Fr. McDonald explained that Fr. Tillard's point had been the insufficiency of a simple consideration of formularies without an examination of the faith of the whole Church. Was faith in the C. of E. between 1552 - 1662 really inconsistent with Catholic doctrine?

Fr. Akpunonu noted the Nigerian Anglicans now used the word 'priest' more frequently and praised their new ordination rites.

Canon Hill insisted that as the Willebrand^s' letter pointed to ARCIC-I's new context, ARCIC-II did not have to solve history

Dean Baycroft found the liturgical reference helpful. It would be very practical to have a comparison of ordination rites to hand. It was also good to put the question of succession on one side for the moment, especially in the light of Catholic-Lutheran developments.

Bishop Santer was encouraged that Apostolicae Curae was judged more fundamental than the ordination of women. But any study of ordinals would presumably be done by Rome.

Fr. Duprey insisted that this would not be without consultation this time.

Sr. Boulding & Bishop Lessard pointed to ordinal studies by their ARCs.

Bishop Cameron noted the contemporary diversity of revised ordinals.

Fr. Duprey reiterated the implications of the letter. The R.C. Church would look again with a favourable light at the Anglican ordinals if the Windsor and Canterbury Statements are accepted.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor heard the letter as saying the R.C. Church had to bear in mind: *Apostolicae Curae*, the ordination of women, and the Observations.

Canon Hill reminded ARCIC-II that it would eventually need to look at Eucharist and Ministry again in the light of official criticism.

Fr. Yarnold was anxious at Stephen Sykes' disavowal of an Anglican profession of faith. Sr. Boulding echoed his doubts about verbal agreement.

Canon Baycroft reassuringly saw Anglicans growing into this.

Bishop Cameron felt bound to say that Australia would be "some" and "others". The question was how far different understandings would be acceptable?

Fr. Akpunonu still felt he needed to know what the other side thought.

Fr. Adappur pointed to Catholic diversity. But there had to be limits - unlike Hindus.

Bp. Vogel said that conciliar clarity had never been evident at the time. All meaning was contextual.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor found lex orandi lex credendi a clue in the Willebrands letter.

Professor Chadwick thought the discussion related to goals. There was diversity on both sides of the house. In the Church of England's Response no Evangelical participant dissented.

Dean Baycroft reported Canadian flack on authority but saw the immediate task as consolidating eucharist and ministry.

Bp. Santer commented upon the modification of mutual perception which accompanied the process of reconciliation. There was always the problem of the individual subject of ecclesial belief. If the Church of England said Windsor and Canterbury were consonant in faith, this modified our reading of the past.

Professor Pobee was glad of the recognition that both letters related to Anglican identity. Worship was the common denominator and this was important for Africa.

only

Fr. Soane said the Catholic Church accepted a great deal of diversity. It was when a point of view undermined doctrine that a definition was required to exclude it. The Statements encompassed this.

Fr. Yarnold was disappointed the letter seemed to say no bypassing of *Apostolicae Curiae*.

Fr. Duprey assured him it bypassed the Bull's method. It pointed to a healing of the origins of the Ordinal.

Fr. Yarnold was also anxious at its prescinding the question of the succession.

Dean Baycroft was content that for the moment it did not ask the Anglican Church to refuse its Ordinals.

Bishop Santer also understood it to be not raking up a judgement on 1559.

EVENING SESSION, 7.00 p.m.

From the chair Bp. Murphy-O'Connor invited a continued discussion by speakers of 'Growth in Reconciliation'. After 1988 could there be some partial communion and a new stage. The baton would indeed be passed to the office bearers. But there would be different relationships in different countries. The Malta Report was still worth reading. What ought the content of a new stage to be.

But Bishop Vogel spoke of U.S. disillusionment because nothing more could be done short of sacramental interchange. Dean Baycroft concurred for Canada.

Mrs. Tanner asked what kind of eucharistic hospitality was appropriate if Anglicans and Roman Catholics approved Eucharist and Ministry.

Bishop Santer saw the problem as reciprocity - which Dean Baycroft was prepared to abandon.

Fr. Duprey saw the first significant step as the solution of the problem of Order.

Bishop Santer asked if this could be done if/as Anglicans ordained women.

Fr. Duprey could not say yes or no.

Bishop Vogel hoped for a model which allowed movement in some countries.

Fr. McDonald saw one way as looking at agreements. Another was to look at present disciplines and develop them.

Professor Wright noted that for the Cardinal the most fundamental problem was Anglican Orders not the ordination of women. Was doctrinal 'difference' stronger than 'divergence'. Fr. Duprey assured him not.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor wanted to work for a development in sacramental sharing. This was wider than the Eucharist alone.

Bishop Santer agreed. Sacramental communion was symbolic of shared life. It required shared decision making.

Fr. Duprey agreed with Bishop Murphy-O'Connor. There could be some pastoral provision. Shared decisions would be gradual. That was easier at the local and national level.

Fr. Akpunonu urged caution. Shared communion would not yet make sense in Nigeria.

Canon Hill thought of both temporal stages and geographical areas.

Archbishop Butelezi did not want to discount central initiatives. Fr. Duprey cited Canterbury's visit to Uganda and then commended the SPCU document: Ecumenical Collaboration at Regional National and Local Levels.

Dean Baycroft objected to a Canterbury centrality. He wanted an universal primacy in Rome.

Mrs. Tanner called for a check list for ARCIC's future agenda. But this would cause dispondency after 1988 unless there was someone to give a vision of the goal for the future.

Sr. Boulding commended a study of women in the Church as this was not viciated by the sacramental problem.

Prof. Chadwick called for more joint consultation on contemporary issues. Fr. Duprey agreed. The Church had to take positions.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for suggestions on the way the Commission should now work.

Dean Baycroft expressed some frustration at the lack of time for this discussion. He was concerned that the whole Commission should be able to own the work produced. But he went on to suggest three or four groups to look at "All that hinders the mutual recognition of ministries"; the content of the next stage; requests for more work on the Final Report of ARCIC-I; and moral issues.

August 31st. 9.30 a.m.

From the Chair Bishop Santer proposed two groups to plan the Commission's work on "all that hinders" and "Stages". The first to include:

Bishop Vogel, Bishop Lessard, Sr. Boulding, Mrs. Tanner, Professor Pobee, Professor Chadwick, Archbishop Butelezi and himself. The second to include: Bishop Murphy-O'Connor, Dean Baycroft, Fr. Akpunonu, Fr. Adappur and Fr. Duprey. This was agreed.

Saturday, 31st August, 1985. 5.00 p.m.

From the Chair, Bishop Murphy-O'Connor invited the Subcommittee on "Steps and Stages" to present its reflections.

Dean Baycroft presented ARCIC 49.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor then spoke to its work. He wanted something concrete encouraged by the bishops, as he too feared disillusionment. It was important to help people realize there was a new stage both theologically and practically. He feared the keen would ignore rules, the intransigent consolidated, and the apathetic between. But it was not just fear; Christian hope must be given expression.

Prof. Pobee wondered at what level the document was pitched. Translation (more than linguistic) would be required.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor saw it as addressed to Episcopal Conferences and Houses of Bishops/Synods but for all to read.

Professor Chadwick hoped a proposed Archbishopal visit to Rome would be contingent upon visible progress.

Canon Hill agreed. The Archbishop of Canterbury would not go to Rome without a new stage in the relationship between the Churches.

Archbishop Butelezi wondered whether extraordinary Synods were that popular. Normal Synods had elected bishops.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor saw the symbolic attraction of Presidents of Conferences.

Dean Baycroft insisted that growth in unity demanded common action. So the need to work on practical matters.

Mrs. Tanner did not despise symbolic events. But unless there was lay participation women were alienated.

Dean Baycroft saw local celebrations easing this.

Bishop Santer repeated his conviction that the eucharist could not be isolated from joint action. But the things people wanted to hear were shared eucharists and mixed marriages.

Sr. Boulding asked about the contributions of ARCs to the subject.

Canon Hill explained that Canadian ARC had completed papers on the theological undergirding of 'steps and stages' but the papers, though sent, had not yet arrived at Lambeth.

Dean Baycroft's letter (ARCIC 44/3) was then circulated. It described the Canadian ARC material. Thanks were to be expressed for this work.

Mrs. Tanner hoped any report would not simply read like a reiteration of the Malta Report.

Dean Baycroft saw real progress since then. There was the new Canon Law on Mixed Marriages. Now was the time to find a way of saying what could be done.

7.00 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for a report from the group that had been discussing reconciliation of ministries.

Bishop Lessard replied and said the group had four topics on its agenda: (1) the three-fold ministry, (2) a profession of faith (cf. Cardinal Willebrands' letter) (3) the ordination of women, (4) Apostolic Succession. They had dealt with the first three.

Mrs. Tanner said the context of their discussion had been on 'ultimate goal'. There are signs that the goals indicated in the Final Report are acceptable to some Anglicans, though others would prefer a federal model of church life. The group had felt the need to work on (1) the three-fold ministry in relation to ordinals, Vatican II etc., and (2) on common profession of faith/standard of faith on eucharist and ministry. The Cardinal's letter had suggested this to them.

Fr. Akpunonu did not see that the Cardinal's letter required this. After some discussion it was agreed that the Cardinal's letter was not requiring the production of a profession of faith by ARCIC-II.

Bishop Vogel felt the need for an "in-house" paper on ordinals.

Some discussion established that in so far as ARCIC-II had a task/relating ordinals to agreed statements, it could only be a job of collating material that was relevant. It was generally agreed that ordinals could not, in any event, be expected to embody a full theology of eucharist and ministry.

Bishop Lessard reported on the group's discussion of the ordination of women. There seemed to be two possible approaches to work on this topic: (1) ARCIC-II could undertake a theological study of the question and make suggestions on the basis of that study. (2) We could accept the fact of the ordination of women and examine the implications of this fact for reconciliation of ministries/communion/regional communion. There had been no consensus for either approach.

Fr. Akpunonu stressed that the ordination of women was a theological question. He asked whether, in the view of ARCIC, a local church could take a unilateral decision on this and could such a decision be an act of the Church.

Bishop Gitari mentioned that the Lambeth Conference had agreed that those provinces who wished to could go ahead with this.

Bishop Lessard said that for Catholics this is a theological not a disciplinary question and so any decision must be by the Church.

Bishop Santer felt that if the authorities of one church see it as a matter of doctrine, it should be treated as such and there was hurt in the Anglican communion because this had not been respected.

Bishop Vogel said that for that reason, the way in which it happened in the U.S.A. had been wrong even though there was an internal consistency in the arguments for it.

Dean Raycroft said that Fr. Akpunonu had made a fair point but that there was no perfect way of acting in a divided church. In response to Bishop Lessard, he added that the first alternative was necessary as an internal study for our own understanding. A delay in getting to mutual recognition could be a good thing since that stage is as far as many Anglicans really want to go in reconciling our churches.

Fr. Duprey said it is important to show that the ordination of women issue does not affect our agreed theology of ministry. It stands. He did not see how the Catholic Church, if it judged ordination of women to be impossible for itself, could be in communion with a church that had it. The issue is the relation of the fact of the ordination of women to the question of the capacity (in technical-theological sense) of women to be ordained.

There was some discussion as to whether the Catholic Church could be in partial communion with a church that ordained women or in communion with a region/province that ordained women.

Prof. Chadwick said that for the R.C. Church this issue was theological and not socio/political. Those in favour tended to see it in socio-political terms and were anxious not to be identified with an obsolete socio-political order.

Mrs. Tanner said we need to consider the issue of tradition and God's plan. Could it not be that new aspects of God's plan arise within tradition. We need to look at what developments are taking place today in ministries as a whole.

Bp. Lessard said that rather than a theological study we need to explore and get to the bottom of two facts that confront us: one is the ordination of women, the other is the Roman declaration. A theological study could only be a lining up of opposing arguments.

Dean Baycroft said our discussion actually illustrated the need for a theological study of the substantive issues; we need to look at ordination of women in the total context of the role and ministry of men and women in the life of the Church. We also need to consider whether we should look at the diaconate separately.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor said we need to see it for what it is, namely an obstacle to full communion and then go on to study the issue.

Bp. Lessard queried this point and this led to a discussion of whether or not the Pope's letter did actually suggest that ordination of women was an unsurmountable obstacle to communion.

Dean Baycroft suggested we discuss the possible consequences of any changes in practice e.g. could there be convalidation of ministries in parts of the Anglican communion that don't have women priests while not having such a convalidation in places that do.

Fr. Duprey said that for Catholics the key issue is the importance of tradition: it is a locus theologicus for Catholics and the reasons for this being so need to be articulated. This is the context in which the Catholic position is to be explained.

Bp. Vogel said that this issue has come up in all debates on the matter. Sociology and religion cannot be separated. The argument for it is that the fullness of time has now arrived within our tradition.

Fr. Adappur said that to understand the Catholic position we must understand vocation as God's calling of whoever he wills. We cannot require God to call everyone that we would wish him to call.

2nd September 1985 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Santer: expressed sympathy to Bishop Vogel on his mother's death and Bishop Vogel expressed his appreciation of this.

Bishop Santer: We have a considerable task to complete a document; we would need to finish our review of the document by Tuesday lunch time. Fr. Yarnold and I will be responsible for tidying up the document. We are grateful to the group of drafters for their work.

Procedure: first people make any points they wish about the shape of the document, then we go through, paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. Charley drew attention to a revision of 9, and suggested a change in 16.

Fr. Duprey requested a presentation of the new text.

Mr. Charley: 1 is positive statement, 2 onwards is historical background up to 7. Under "Salvation and Faith", 8 sets things in the context of faith, 9 and 9A speak of faith and assurance of salvation, and 10 and 11 are also on faith. In 12ff we come to the language of salvation. Then we look at various concepts including sanctification and justification and the relation of the two comes in 13. The concept of righteousness gets us to the heart of matter so from 14 we speak about sanctification (14 and 15) and justification (16). 17 is a bridge to 18ff on salvation and good works. This section speaks of necessity of works of righteousness and leads to merit in 20. Then the Church in Salvation, 21-26 and 27 is a summary asserting agreement. 28-31 shows relevance of document for today.

Fr. Yarnold: We decided not to have a lot of subheadings to avoid clutter. The four headings we have correspond to the four problems cited in the introduction.

Bishop Lessard First part indicates four difficulties, and they are then dealt with in a different order. Could they not be treated in the same order. And in the presentation of the question of the church in the first part, the problem is not investigated, as the other three are.

Bishop Santer : We shall go round everyone asking for comments.

Bishop Cormac: I like the new order: at parts, though, it becomes rather difficult to read. Also there are some unnecessary repetitions.

Prof. Chadwick: I am grateful for the draft. Not very happy with the historical matter. The two extreme views of justification. But neither of these extreme positions were occupied either by Trent or by Anglican divines. Often their positions were rather alike and the two views in the document don't reflect either the classical Tridentine or Anglican views. So historically, it is incorrect. Also appendix needs more work.

Archbishop Butelezi worried about polarities presented in the text. We did not express sufficiently the role of the Holy Spirit.

Fr. Adappur: First part is much better but as we proceed is lack of readability and is repetitive. The reference to culture is inadequate: it only speaks of anxiety. Better dealt with in Gaudium et Spes and in WCC documents. When we speak of God's sovereign power could relate this to Nietzsche's thinking on man. We could present the gospel as a reply to the human condition.

Fr. Yarnold: Committee had not agreed to an overall title of the document.

Prof. O'Donovan: Material in 2 needs to be supplemented by a statement of convergence. Unhappy about 17 and about certain expressions in 13 and 14. And I wonder if we can actually agree on sanctification if justification is controversial. More work on appendix.

Fr. Duprey: Happy with the paper. Need to express link between sanctification/justification and the church's role in salvation. This would be good for ecumenical dialogues as a whole. And I'm not happy with section on culture: is it in fact necessary?

Bishop Lessard agreed with the last point. I don't see improvement in the draft in terms of realised eschatology. Lacks optimism.

Mr. Charley : I share concern about polarity. In 18 sentences badly worded and it is bad exegesis. Modern cultural section needs sharpening; not happy about appendix.

Fr. Akpunonu: I like Trinitarian dimension: I suggest we treat justification first since sanctification follows from that. Section on culture could be omitted; doesn't do justice to the topic.

Fr. Tillard: I agree with Prof. Chadwick on 2 and with problems with appendix. But I wish to defend the order sanctification/justification.

Dean Baycroft : Appendix and document should be taken separately. I'd be happy if the second conclusion was inserted into earlier points in the text.

Fr. Thornhill: There is a polarity which is contrast between the genius of the Priesthood and Catholic traditions, and there is a lesson to be learnt from this. I think 34 should be reinstated in the conclusion.

Bishop Vogel: Great improvement. In central section concept of restoration is stressed and I'd like dimension of grace more developed. Could be more stress on community and on the individual's dependence on it. We need to look more closely at anxiety section. Some anxiety is a symptom of something, it is not a cause.

Fr. Soane Appendix needs more work: a good critical review of it.

Sr. Boulding: Appendix needs work. 6 and 8 of appendix could be rewritten. And in culture section is a sudden change of style. First paragraph needs work, too.

Mrs. Tanner: Great improvement. (1) Language needs looking at; (2) as Bishop Lessard said in 7, the fourth difficulty is not spelt out, (3) the use of "culture" not a helpful word but would be good to have something on contemporary relevance.

Prof. Davis : Concerned about mild and oblivious way of dealing with the contemporary world. Great problems of today not touched. Also we should provide a document that non-Christians could read with interest. Also, some images of church left out e.g. mystery and gift .

Prof. Pobee: (1) My first question was: what is the general title of the document. I hope title would be "justification and salvation"; (2) the issues dealt with at beginning are general reformation issues and not all are ARC issues (3) use of Scripture: I'd prefer quotations to come from Paul and have back-ups from other New Testament writers.

Canon Hill: I agree on the culture section, but note that this is the first draft on this topic. On the appendix, the question is do we feel that the material in the draft suggests to us that the issue can be resolved? On main dogmatic section, it needs thinning down so that the argument can be clearer: this is important to convince readers of its significance.

Bishop Santer: Some points have come up again and again and we need some proposed amendments e.g. in 2, historical material, and material on the church. On these we need a redraft for consideration. On three matters we need to settle: (1) A title (not more than five words). (2) What about conclusion? - two points of view on this have been put forward, and we need to decide about it. (3) On the appendix: it is more important that our material on justification makes it clear that these issues are soluble than that we have an appendix on these issues.

Fr. Duprey Section 14 does this sufficiently (point 3 above)

Fr. Soane: we have ^{not} actually demonstrated in the text that the practices (indulgences, etc.) don't undermine our agreement on justification.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: I'd be happier not having an appendix: the issue is sufficiently dealt with in the text and it shows we've worked through it.

Bp. Lessard: This is actually similar to treatment in the Lutheran/Catholic dialogue. Burden of this decision lies with the Anglicans. The limited statement of the issue in the Lutheran-R.C. statement has not aroused questioning.

Prof. Pobee agrees with Bp. Murphy-O'Connor. It is sufficient to say we have looked at this issue together and that we may come back to it again.

Dean Baycroft: My point about the appendix is that it gives undue prominence to the issues: what we have done is all that need to happen on this: any more work would be making too much of it.

Bp. Santer: Dean Baycroft's view seems to be a general view, as is the view that raising this issue would raise more problems than it would solve.

Fr. Soane took up Sr. Boulding's view that the appendix as it stands would not satisfy the CDF. This is very important.

Sr. Boulding said it is the phrasing that needs work.

Mr. Charley: I feel it is so difficult to present this well that it would be better not to have an appendix. And the CDF's is an untypical Catholic position.

Prof. Chadwick: In May 1979 it has said what it thinks about purgatory and it is very limited. I think the matter should be confined to silence, and we give an elucidation of it if required.

Bp. Santer: Prof. Chadwick is suggesting we leave out any allusion to the problem. What about the title?

Prof. Pobee : A title like "The Church and Salvation" would be good because we embarked on this topic because of questions about the role of the Church in salvation.

Sr. Boulding: If the title is that general people will tend to want it to talk about believers and unbelievers. How about "The Role of the Church in Salvation"?

Can. Hill: the focus is salvation and the title should respect this.

Mr. Charley: "Salvation and the Church".

Dean Baycroft : Should we not include justification by faith in the title?

Bp. Cormac agreed with Mr. Charley's title, as did Fr. Duprey.

Fr. Yarnold simply preferred "Salvation".

Fr. Duprey said the word "Church" showed that the document took account of questions from the Catholic point of view.

Bp. Santer proposed that the title be "Salvation and the Church" and this was agreed after a vote.

Bp. Santer said we have to decide about how to handle 28-30 and settle the question of whether we need to deal with this at all. If we do, remember we have had no background material on this: we are on thin ice.

Bp. Cameron: Our difficulty is that if we try to address contemporary problems, there are so many different ones that crop up and yet to say nothing leaves us with difficulties. So we need a carefully worded paragraph referring to the problems, showing we have taken account of them.

Canon Hill: We need to revise the Draft of this section and to see if in a revised form it could carry the support of the Commission.

Prof. Pobee are we not opting out of our responsibilities if we are silent on this. SODEPAX etc. has done a lot on this: we need to identify the broad strokes of what we should do. Title shouldn't be "Modern culture" but "The Modern World".

Prof. Chadwick: The concern with sin which lies at the heart of our work is the element in our faith which links the two worlds in which a Christian has to live. Without a concern with forgiveness of sins, we reduce our faith to a private psychotherapy. The forgiveness of sins is what prevents faith being either wholly this-worldly and so threatened by self-righteousness, or wholly an other-worldly thing.

Bp. Lessard: I presume and hope something on this will be included. This theme could be incorporated into the central part of the document, e.g. in section 24 in relation to stewardship, or in 23 in reference to the Kingdom.

Dean Baycroft: I agree with Bishop Lessard: I would suggest we insert this section as we go through the document; freedom from anxiety could be put in relation to freedom from sin and death.

Bishop Santer: Where would 29 and 30 on Justice in Society go?

Dean Baycroft: 22 needs expansion and it could possibly go there.

Fr. Akpunonu: Could not do justice to a separate heading on this and we should try to weave this into the rest of the text. Could we agree on this?

Mr. Charley: I agree with Bishop Lessard; it could be brought in in a much abbreviated form in the section on the Church. We had agreed to make the point at the beginning of the document that this lapse is vital to the work and mission of the Church. If we do that, then we can also end with this material in relation to our theme on the Church's mission.

Prof. O'Donovan: There is nothing in 28-30 which does not purport to be a simple explication of the notion of righteousness, drawing out its social dimensions. I do not think everything in it could be grouped under the heading of "Church"; Ecclesial community is not the only kind of community.

Bishop Vogel: My point is Mr. Charley's. The question of the relevance of justification could be made at the beginning, at the end of para. 2.

Bishop Santer: Problems we have now seem to do with our unclarity about the main focus of the document.

Fr. Soane: Para. 6 of the appendix speaks of the consequences of sin: sin destroys personal and social values and when sin is forgiven, we are empowered to put the world to rights.

Fr. Yarnold: We must not try to weave the odd idea into the text; it will not work.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor expressed agreement with integration of this material into the main text and in relation to the Church as sign and steward.

Fr. Tillard: After 26 we could have a section on the mission of the Church in relation to the condition of the world today.

Fr. Duprey: I agree with Prof. O'Donovan's idea of community outside the Church. In 26 we could speak of this and link it with the notion of the Church, so making the link we are looking for. Also, we could refer here to the theme of man's struggle for liberation.

Prof. Chadwick, referring to Mr. Charley: The significance of what we are saying should be stated in I, to show that this is not a remote scholastic topic. There is a prejudice in my country against disputes about this topic. Also, many of our contemporaries actually believe that the problems of our world are insoluble. I believe our faith has something to say to the cupidity

of individuals and society. Something on relevance at the beginning would capture readers who would otherwise groan at it.

Bishop Cameron: Has not our title become uncontrollable? If we are going to embark on sections on Mission we have to agree on a connection between this and our main agreed statement. If we do get on to this, it is hard to know where the frontiers are and it can be a runaway horse.

Fr. McDonald: The important thing is that the connection between our main ideas and the last section be explicitly agreed and stated.

Mrs. Tanner: It is not just about mission, it is about life and mission. If we put 28 and 29 after 26 in a revamped form, this would be sufficient.

Bishop Santer: A small group of people needs to look at 28-30 and find a way of putting it after 26, and also putting a flag in I, to point the way forward. They should look at questions of forgiveness and the relationship between koinonia and created community.

A group consisting of Professor Chadwick, Mrs. Tanner, together with Bishop Lessard was set up to work on this issue and to redraft in the light of the discussion.

2nd September 1985: 3.15 p.m.

From the Chair Bishop Murphy-O'Connor re-opened discussion of ARCIC-II 50/(a). He raised the order of sanctification/justification on the basis of 'Reduced form of paras. 13-15' by Oliver O'Donovan.

Professor O'Donovan noted that he had kept the original order. Para. 14 had been omitted, but some sentences used. Baptism had also been omitted.

Fr. Yarnold suggested the debate be left till later, as the order had now been agreed.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor returned to para. 1 when ready and 2 and 3 also.

Para. 4

Mr. Charley asked if these to be re-ordered as suggested.

Fr. Yarnold had drafted a synoptic para.

Mr. Charley saw no reason against 6,5,4,7,. This was accepted.

Mr. Charley saw a problem because some issues arose later.

Canon Hill preferred the detailed examination began at 8 until the reordering and redrafting of all the first section had been completed. This was agreed.

Para. 8

Sr. Boulding queried whether only Christ gave the Holy Spirit.

Fr. Akpunonu and Fr. Tillard said both were correct.

Professor O'Donovan didn't think the phrase offensive to the Orthodox.

Sr. Boulding "Gives us his Spirit". This was not accepted.

Mrs. Tanner thought something needed to be added on all things being fulfilled.

Bishop Vogel proposed "Who gives the Holy Spirit by whom all things will be brought to perfection".

Bishop Santer proposed a new sentence. After discussion the suggestion was not accepted.

Fr. Yarnold noticed that at Pleshey and Durham grace referred to the gift of the Holy Spirit within us. This had dropped out in the third sentence. He distributed a suggested new draft (also para 15).

8. 3rd sentence

"Grace not only speaks of the once-for-all death and resurrection of Christ, but also of God's continuing work on our behalf, when he gives us the Holy Spirit to dwell within us and calls us to respond to his love, forgiving our sins and conforming us to the image of his Son. Even this ability..."

15. "Sanctification is the making in the believer of this righteousness and holiness without which no one may see the Lord. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit through which the love of God is poured into our hearts (Rom.5.5), transforming the soul by grace. It involves the restoration....."

These were accepted.

Fr. Duprey did not think everything could be said in every para.

Mrs. Tanner questioned the latin solus Christus.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor suggested some explanation of the phrase.

Bishop Vogel proposed solus Christus - Christ alone. This was accepted.

Bishop Santer noted a near duplication with para. 13 in the third sentence. He proposed a redraft. This was accepted.

Professor O'Donovan queried the word certitude in para. 10.

Bishop Santer proposed the deletion of "our certitude". This was accepted.

Paras. 9 and 9A

Dean Baycroft successfully urged inclusive language.

Bishop Vogel questioned "dead faith".

Fr. Soane countered by the later quotation from James.

Fr. Akpunonu suggested putting in the biblical references.

Fr. Tillard said the problem of good works was not James but the whole New Testament.

Fr. Duprey thought "dead faith" classical in RC theology.

Bp. Santer suggested "otherwise faith remains dead."

Bp. Cameron preferred to end the sentence earlier after "call".

Sr. Boulding supported Bp. Santer with the addition of James.

Fr. Tillard wanted to avoid going back to James.

It was agreed to accept Bp. Santer's proposal but without the James reference.

Bp. Santer objected to "central."

Fr. Duprey suggested "faith includes our assent to the truth of the Gospel"

Accepted .

Prof. Davis was unhappy with "it must be".

Fr. Yarnold proposed "faith calls for a response from..." It ought to be.

Fr. Tilhornhill offered "a response is from"

Fr. Soane insisted that there was a call. The original was right.

Fr. Duprey preferred the original text.

Fr. Yarnold could not understand the original.

Canon Hill suggested this be left to the drafters.

Fr. Duprey found it difficult to accept that "Faith includes the assurance to salvation". So did Fr. Tillard.

Mr. Charley now also preferred the original - adding "But our response.."

Bp. Lessard on the contrary, still found the original confusing. There was the jump from faith to assurance.

Prof. O'Donovan wanted some reference to assurance, as confidence and joy was part of faith.

Fr. Yarnold felt stampeded. The logic of the original was not clear. Line 7 suddenly spoke of our response - but to what and after faith the text returned to assurance again.

Mr. Charley expounded the drift of the document.

Bp. Santer: "The response of faith must be total."

Bp. Santer saw Fr. Yarnold's point and now also understood the logic of the original. He suggested the insertion "faith" in the second sentence and "The response of faith must be total.'

Mr. Charley also proposed an addition from Prof. Chadwick:
"God's gracious will for us includes the joyful confidence that, as those who are called by God through the Gospel and granted participation in the means of grace....."

The redactors would work on this.

Para. 10.

Dean Baycroft asked for the removal of the word "absolute".

Bp. Vogel and Fr. Adappur and Fr. Akpunonu wanted it.

It was retained.

Sr. Boulding : "even" was the wrong conjunction in the fourth sentence. She wanted "However" added"

Fr. Duprey understood it to refer to a future warning.

Bishop Santer proposed, "However, there is also in the Gospel"
But Fr. Tillard resisted this. It was not only the Gospel.

Sr. Boulding found the last sentence obscure. The text was left.

Bishop Santer proposed shortening to make it clearer.

Bishop Vogel thought this made it psychological.

Fr. Duprey said the link came from God, not us.

Prof. O'Donovan disliked the number of certitudes.

PARA. 11

Fr. Akpononu questioned faith coming to "fruition".

Fr. Tillard explained by reference to Peter's speech in Acts. Anglicans and Roman Catholics believed that it was not sufficient to believe. Baptism was also necessary.

Prof. O'Donovan thought it sounded Zwinglian.

Fr. McDonald proposed "finds fruition". But Fr. Yarnold was anxious not to impugn infant baptism.

Prof. Chadwick suggested: "The believer is incorporated into the community of the People of God by the Sacrament of Baptism".

Fr. Tillard proposed: "Faith in Jesus Christ leads to the sacrament of Baptism".

Fr. Thornhill offered: "Faith in Christ leads us to enter his mystery through the Sacrament of Baptism".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor tried: "Faith in Jesus Christ is intimately linked to the Sacrament of Baptism".

Prof. Davis posed: "inextricably". The matter was left to the drafters.

Fr. Adappur suggested: "from the sinfulness of our previous existence". He was not happy with 'consecrated'.

Prof. Chadwick wondered about "alienation and despair" for sinfulness. 'Sinfulness' was kept.

Prof. Davis wanted an emphasis on regeneration and transformation. When did this begin.

Fr. Duprey offered: "to be consummated when we shall be fully transformed" to try to meet this point. Fr. Akpononu questioned "fully".

Bishop Santer proposed "with him" in the 2nd sentence.

Mr. Charley suggested that "transformation" should be put in.
"It also speaks He would draft with Prof. Davis.

PARA. 12

Fr. Akpononu said the explanation soteria was weak. It was more than restoration.

Bishop Cameron understood "broad" to mean all embracing.

Dean Baycroft wanted an expansion of the treatment of hilasmos. Pauline usage was hilasterion. He also wanted the addition of 'propitiation', though he preferred 'expiation' personally.

Fr. Yarnold had problems with the double meaning of atonement. He also questioned the two Greek words. It was agreed.

Prof. Davis proposed: 2 Cor. 5:18-19. Accepted.

Fr. Thornhill did not want to rise to propitiation.

Mr. Charley corrected Eph. 1:7 not 17. Rebirth called for Jn. 3:3; also Rom. 5:1 & 2.

Bishop Gitari wanted 1 Peter 2:16 under sanctification.

Fr. Akpononu wanted a restoration of a reference to new creation.

Bishop Santer noted Pleshey had said, "their restoration to what God wants them to be".

Prof. Pobe offered 2 Cor. 5:17. Mr. Charley said if this was used it should be cf.

Prof. Davis wanted to emphasize 'New Creation'.

Monday, Sept. 2, 7.00 p.m.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: We've reached 13 and we have to decide whether to use a reduced form of the text or the original.

Bp. Vogel returned to p.8 and said that generally on this page he found an over-emphasis on restoration and not enough on recreation. Also the last sentence was unhelpful in terms of the importance of the community. It is not made strongly enough and would be probably better omitted.

Bp. Lessard agreed and thought that since it is so briefly stated at this point it could be omitted.

Bp. Santer suggested another formulation that was accepted.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor returned then to 13 and asked Prof. O'Donovan to explain his alternative ideas for this paragraph.

Prof. O'Donovan I have two concerns about the existing text. It rambles from 13-16 and lacks direction. Secondly when in 14-15 it speaks of righteousness given to us by God, it evoked an autonomous sanctity given in justification. In the redraft I have attempted to draw together a unified picture of justification and sanctification.

Mr. Charley On section 13-15: I take the need for greater clarity. Taking 13, I find your abbreviation omits a lot. We're trying to approximate to the problem of justification and sanctification, and put them together, adding the eschatological dimension. We explain justification in terms of communion with a God who is righteous; sure hope and a present pledge of the future fulfilment of sanctification. We refer to baptism and eucharist and in 15 look at the precise nature of sanctification. It is the fruit of the Spirit; good works are the fruit of the Spirit: it is something God has accomplished although subject to the battles of life.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor expressed a desire for clarity and brevity on this.

Fr. Yarnold said another alternative would be to keep the original draft without the historical section.

Fr. Thornhill justification does logically precede sanctification. Not to follow that order would confuse. Why not transpose 15 and 16?

Fr. Tillard: This is a question of methodology: to bypass the distractions of the past: we agree on sanctification so we should start with this so as not to go back to the quarrels of the past.

Fr. Soane I would like to hear the arguments for and against the historical section and I would like to retain the material on the sacraments.

Sr. Boulding: Oliver's text needs opening up to the Catholic interest.

Prof. Pobee referring to Fr. Thornhill's remarks said that the biblical text 1 Cor.6.11 puts sanctification prior to justification.

Prof. O'Donovan : How are we to understand Fr. Tillard's view that the goal of God's work is sanctification and not justification.

Fr. Akpunonu in reply to Fr. Tillard said we do need to put in the polemical historical context.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: Can we look at the original drafts of the paragraphs and go through them?

This was agreed.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: let us look at Prof. Chadwick's alternative for 13, 11. 1-10.

Prof. Chadwick: I take the view that the Catholic/Protestant polarity was much less than the original text suggested. It would be better to set out the most extreme radical views of justification on either side and in that context to note those Anglican and Catholic views that were very similar.

Fr. Yarnold was unhappy with the statement of the conservative Catholic position which was actually a heretical Catholic position. Better to leave it out.

Bp. Cameron referred to Cranmer's views which have considerable authority in Anglicanism, and felt they should be fairly represented in the final draft.

Fr. Adappur felt it was difficult for the non-specialist to pass a judgment on the history and felt the term "Conservative Catholic" was unhappy.

Mr. Charley We have to show some historical detail; could 13 be modified simply to say that the Catholic view of justification was not always the Tridentine one.

Prof. Chadwick: The justification/sanctification distinction is very uncharacteristic of Anglicanism. This is the issue.

Bishop Santer: Will not the historical material be sufficiently dealt with in 5?

Dean Baycroft: We need to show in the section that is answering the problem, that we have not forgotten the historical context. We could say "some individual conservative Catholics".

Canon Hill: The original draft spoke about how each side felt the other approached the issue and I feel this would be better.

Sr. Boulding: We actually need both.

Bishop Santer: When speaking about the polarity of views on the subject, it is better to say Protestant and Catholic (not Anglican and Catholic).

PARA. 13

We then moved to an examination of 13, substituting "Protestant" for "Anglican".

Prof. O'Donovan found the phrase "not wholly distinct nor unrelated" too weak and wished to say that sanctification and justification are two aspects of one reality. This was accepted.

Bishop Vogel: Third line from the end: I suggest "God's grace effects what it declares. He imparts a righteousness that was his and becomes ours, etc."

Prof. O'Donovan: The very last phrase "required in vain", adds nothing: it is moralistic.

Fr. Akpunonu disagreed.

Prof. Chadwick suggested a formula from Calvin as a substitute.

Fr. Yarnold agreed.

Fr. Duprey felt the last phrase was redundant.

Mr. Charley felt the phrase important: it shows that the grace of God is not given in vain.

Sr. Boulding questioned the location of this phrase.

Canon Hill noted that in mixing the two drafts in the way we had, we have changed a dogmatic to an historical statement. He suggested a redraft.

Prof. O'Donovan questioned the word "yet" in the fourth line from the end.

A request was made for a redraft of the whole sentence from "the pronouncement by God". It was agreed that this would be submitted to the drafters.

PARA. 14

Bishop Vogel: Third sentence is too long and needs repunctuating. Fourth line from the end: we should say incorporation "into Christ".

Fr. Soane had difficulty with the phrase "God's verdict includes Christian hope".

It was agreed that Christian hope is founded on God's verdict.

Prof. O'Donovan suggested emendations.

Fr. Thornhill felt that in the structure of the last sentence the importance of the eucharist could be brought out more.

Fr. Yarnold disagreed because the eucharist is a sacrament of initiation. The position of the eucharist in Christian life was then discussed.

Bishop Santer asked what was the antecedent of "this" in line 6.

Prof. Chadwick suggested an alternative.

Fr. Yarnold insisted that the eucharist is part of our incorporation into the body of Christ: it is an initiation.

Sr. Boulding suggested that eucharist is part of the process of initiation.

Bishop Vogel disagreed.

Mr. Charley suggested a redraft.

Prof. Chadwick suggested an alternative version of the third sentence.

Prof. O'Donovan queried the words "requires" and "goal" in the first two lines and proposed alternative wordings and this was added to by Fr. Tillard.

PARA. 15

Bishop Vogel proposed some simplifications of the first six lines.

Prof. Davis agreed with need for simplification but had difficulties with the idea of "reception". He did not like any weakening of the continued initiative of God's gift of sanctification.

Fr. Yarnold agreed with Bishop Vogel and felt his suggestions made the text less moralistic and legalistic. The first sentences were reworked.

The phrase "law of Christ" caused considerable discussion: the "life of Christ" was proposed as an alternative and agreed to, though Dean Baycroft felt that it was a significant loss.

Mr. Charley suggested biblical quotations in relation to the final judgement of God based on our works.

Prof. O'Donovan suggested changes to the sentence beginning: "So the righteousness of God". He suggested an alternative that was accepted.

Canon Hill suggested an alternative to the next sentence.

It was felt by some that the quotation at the end of the paragraph should be omitted; also that the sense of the second half of the paragraph was vague.

Fr. Akpunonu suggested leaving out the last sentence.

Sr. Boulding agreed the last sentence was weak, but that some alternative formulation of the point was needed.

Tuesday, 3rd Sept. '85 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor invited continued discussion.

PARA. 16

Mr. Charley added an additional sentence from the drafters: "Christ's perfect righteousness is reckoned to our account instead of our own striving to make ourselves acceptable to him".

Fr. Yarnold was not clear if justification had two meanings or one.

Fr. Duprey saw a juridical meaning and an effective meaning to justification.

Bishop Santer offered "aspect" rather than "category".

Professor Chadwick asked for the omission of "on the one hand / on the other" and the first sentence.

Mr. Charley wanted to keep the first sentence.

Bishop Gitari wanted the first sentence in positive form. Sr. Boulding agreed.

Bishop Santer suggested "It was impossible for us"

Prof. O'Donovan could no longer understand "Accordingly" now that aspect had replaced category.

Fr. Thornhill asked for "Prior to any movement on our part".

Fr. McDonald offered "justification considered in its juridical aspect" to help Prof. O'Donovan.

Prof. O'Donovan reminded the Commission of the wider and narrower usage of Justification. Fr. McDonald's suggestion was accepted.

Prof. Pobe also wanted reference to the "judge who is also Father" and Gal. 4:6.

Fr. Tillard wanted to keep a reference to "Redeemer". Saviour was accepted.

Fr. Adappur did not like "the divine court". Why not "divine judge".

Bishop Lessard still had trouble with aspect/category. He suggested a transposition - putting the reference to the court at the end. This was not accepted but the drafters would make the logic clearer.

Fr. Soane was afraid of an implication that God could forgive but nothing happen. He wanted to end at "unchanged" to avoid entering the de auxilis controversy.

Fr. Duprey said the response was the effect of God.

Fr. Tillard would accept "repentant believer".

Fr. Akpunonu said a human judge could make mistakes.

PARA. 17.

Sr. Boulding wondered whether righteousness was being used in the same sense as the previous para, : "acts of righteousness and love" was suggested.

Prof. O'Donovan felt "acts" had an atomic feel to it.

Bishop Santer preferred "in righteousness and love" or "thus fulfilling the Law of Love".

Fr. McDonald suggested "a life of righteousness".

Prof. Chadwick had doubts whether this was the strongest para. Could it be deleted.

Sr. Boulding would support this if one sentence on the consummation was put in the previous para. Prof. Pobe agreed. But he wanted "victory" rather than "triumph".

Fr. Tillard explained the importance of the para. for the Roman Catholic tradition. The victory of grace was important. But there might be external faith but no final salvation. Fr. Akpunonu agreed.

Bishop Cameron wanted retention but wanted a different form. Two points were being made. Fr. McDonald agreed.

Mr. Charley explained that it meant that God's declaration was valid but that there was a process in the meantime.

Bishop Gitari objected to "the message of the New Testament".

Bishop Santer did not like "fruition".

Prof. Chadwick wanted a slightly longer para. if it was to be retained.

Canon Hill asked about the Biblical translation. It was agreed there should be a consistent usage.

PARA 18

Professor Chadwick proposed a new beginning: "18. Faith is the foundation and root of our justification. The faith by which we respond to the Gospel is a form of love, and its object is the crucified and risen Christ. Faith is both wholly divine and wholly human, and is no mere moment in the individual's natural experience of the temporal successiveness of things. As a human act of loving gratitude before God's mercy, faith is free, and is experienced as bringing liberation from egoism and an inner transformation of habits of thought and motive."

Fr. Adappur did not know why natural freedom had been left out. e.g. a non-Christian had a choice between Christianity, Hinduism, etc.
Fr. Tillard agreed. Fr. Adappur could draft an alternative.

Sr. Boulding suggested "it perfects."

Dean Baycroft had suggested "it is to be distinguished from."

Bp. Cameron was not happy at the raising of human freedom. He was not happy at Prof. Chadwick's draft. Faith was almost a work.

Mr. Charley was very unhappy at the whole argument. Was the argument: a limited human freedom, initial response was in some sense free but in grace, then a new freedom in Christ, transcending all previous freedom: a freedom for and a freedom to be.

Fr. Adappur questioned a limited freedom.

Sr. Boulding disagreed.

Bp. Cameron saw a pit centuries deep. There was a paradox. There was a right of refusal but faith was a gift.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor called for a re-draft.

Mr. Charley accepted this with Fr. Tillard.

PARA. 19

Prof. O'Donovan proposed a new initial sentence to explain "works".
"Traditionally we speak of the 'good works' of the righteous - but this phrase means to refer not only to particular deeds but to the whole quality of their life."

Fr. Tillard preferred "the whole quality of their relation to God."

Bp. Santer suggested "habitual quality of their life."

Fr. Duprey tried "the authenticity of their Christian life."

Prof. Pobee added "which should be informed by their relation to God."

Prof. Chadwick suggested "moral quality"

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the whole para. Good works are not only because we want to be obedient. This was a Redemptorist view of ethics.

Bishop Cameron questioned Heb. 11,6.

Fr. Tillard saw the problem of congruent merit here. This was the Thomist contribution to the discussion. There was a gratuity to the Christian life.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor agreed. For the justified, their life was in a mysterious way pleasing to God.

Fr. Akpunonu felt the texts had been mixed up.

Bishop Santer suggested the suppression of the last sentence.

Fr. Tillard was not entirely happy. The merit of God himself in us - an Augustinian quotation emphasized by Lutherans - would be lost.

Mr. Charley suggested a redraft of the end. It was agreed that he and Fr. Tillard would try a redraft, but keeping the basic text.

Prof. Davis liked the Augustinian transition and Canon Hill suggested this still be the link even in a re-draft.

PARA. 20

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor reminded that there would be no appendix.

Fr. Duprey could not accept that we 'contributed' to our salvation.

Fr. Adappur wanted a positive exposition. He offered a re-draft.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked if the last sentence was to be kept.

Mr. Charley felt there must be some allusion. But for some people this would not be enough.

Canon Hill believed it important to say that the subject did not invalidate the wider agreement.

There was a majority for retention.

Prof. Chadwick wanted to avoid the words "purgatory and indulgences". Most people did not know what they meant. We must not suggest false meanings.

Fr. Duprey said ARCIC-II had avoided emotionally charged words.

Canon Hill suggested a footnote.

But Prof. Davis wanted to retain the words.

Mr. Charley thought the reference to the Article XXII would suffice.

On a vote, Professor Chadwick's proposal was accepted (with a reference to the Article). The drafters would work on the text. There was also some support for a footnote.

ARCIC-II Tuesday, 3rd Sept., 1985 6.30 p.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: Tonight we will carry on to Sections 21-23. Fr. Yarnold will introduce this section.

Fr. Yarnold: 21 is a link passage (Salvation - Church); 22 Church as community; 23 as steward; 24 as sign, up to 26, Church as "black but beautiful".

Mrs. Tanner introduced a redraft of the closing paragraphs of the section, i.e. paras 26 and 27.

PARA. 21.

Mrs. Tanner: Could we get Trinitarian life in at the end of the 1st sentence?

Prof. Wright asked whether the Trinitarian theme was being included at the beginning. It was agreed after a vote to keep the text as it is.

Prof. Davis: Should we change the title of this section, since it is the title of the whole document?

Other options were suggested.

Fr. McDonald pointed out that if we keep the title as it is, this will be presumed to be the most central part of the document.

Canon Hill suggested "The Church and Salvation". This was agreed.

PARA. 22.

Fr. Tillard suggested God "also" chose in the first sentence, the church is not only an instrument.

Mr. Charley suggested using the present tense would help: "chooses" not "chose".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor put forward two alternative versions: "which serves" or "is part of". This was left to the drafters.

Fr. Soane queried the sense of the phrase "all humankind should be served". A change was agreed: "will" should replace "plan".

Prof. Davis raised the question of the ecclesiological structure of the paper as a whole: the Church is a manifestation of God's initiative. Here we speak of a Church as a reconciled community and we also use other images. I think we must see the Church as those who are called.

Fr. Akpunonu thought 21 made this point.

The phrase "calling on this community" was suggested as an alternative phrase at the beginning of 21 which would make Prof. Davis' point.

Bishop Lessard felt the point was made anyway.

Fr. Tillard agreed with Prof. Davis that there is a lack of logic in the understanding of the Church. We are not faithful to the idea of koinonia to

which we are committed.

Mr. Charley: this point has been made: the instrumentality of the Church is a point we had agreed would not be at the forefront of our ideas in this section.

Bishop Cameron said it does not matter that different, complementary views of the Church should exist side by side in the text.

Fr. Tillard suggested we suppress 22; he objected also to its last sentence.

Bishop Gitari suggested the insertion of "repentance" in line 3.

Mr. Charley objected to the word "gifts" in the last sentence.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said we would return to this section to decide whether to keep it or not.

PARA. 23.

Bishop Lessard: (1) Can salvation of all be inserted here so as to facilitate the suppression of 22? (2) The Church is presented as the "Lord of all creation": this is because of the way it is worded.

Canon Hill supported Bishop Lessard's first point and made a suggestion.

Bishop Santer suggested using the first sentence of 22 at the beginning of a changed first sentence of 23.

Prof. O'Donovan supported the retention of 22: it gives the best focus that can be given to the whole question of unbelievers etc. discussed earlier in the meeting.

Prof. Wright pointed out that the phrase "God's purpose" is used differently in 21 and 23.

There was discussion of whether God's purpose that we be saved and that we be conformed to the image of his Son could be taken as the same, or were quite different, or complementary.

Bishop Santer expressed reservations about 'opposition and persecution' in the last sentence, since the Church does not always meet opposition and persecution. His amendment was agreed: "when the church experiences..."

Bishop Lessard's second point was returned to and a change agreed on: "and so entered into his glory" (end of second line of p.16 after "suffering").

It was agreed to miss out Rom. 8:14 in this paragraph.

Paragraph 24

The section was read out including an amendment by Bishop Santer.

Bishop Lessard favoured the amendment.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor disliked the first sentence.

Fr. Duprey suggested its suppression.

Mr. Charley suggested an amendment of it.

Professor Wright wondered whether the theme of stewardship really added anything in this paragraph.

Prof. Pobee felt that stewardship was defined in terms of reconciliation which could be brought out more in this paragraph.

Prof. O'Donovan said the theme stewardship suggested the idea of guarding and conserving the gospel which was important.

Canon Hill asked the drafters why the material had been so condensed in this section: he found the mixing of sign and steward confusing.

Fr. Yarnold said "sign" was only a link.

Mr. Charley felt 24 need rewriting.

Prof. Davis expressed surprise that 23 was basically about sign.

Prof. Chadwick pointed to correspondences between parts of this section and ARCIC-I.

Sr. Boulding suggested "activity" (singular) in line 6. The paragraph was referred to the drafters.

Canon Hill before reading the section suggested that the revised Pleshey draft on Church and Salvation, 10-14, was better than the text we have now.

Mrs. Tanner agreed but felt it needed re-ordering; 15 should be omitted.

Fr. Yarnold said it was not really so different.

Prof. Chadwick agreed. This was discussed.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor suggested we continue going through the new draft.

Bishop Santer agreed.

Para. 25 was read out

Mr. Charley: In line 2, the word "for" is a non-sequiter. The whole of God's purpose for mankind is not exclusively worked out through the church. "Because" was adopted as an alternative.

Para. 26

The revised text was read out.

It was agreed that the church should be called "it" and not "she".

Bishop Cameron queried the suggestion that the eucharist is the only way the church is empowered to become what she is.

Professor O'Donovan felt the focussing on the eucharist here was arbitrary.

Bishop Lessard wished to defend this but suggested adjustments.

Prof. Wright suggested that only the BEM quote be used without the preceding sentence.

Sr. Boulding said the whole paragraph was built around the BEM quote.

Mr. Charley said 26 was too easy on the church's failure and the eucharistic theme misleading and inappropriate.

Fr. Akpunonu found the jump to social questions too great.

Bishop Cameron referred to the BEM text and pointed to ambiguities in it.

Fr. Tillard suggested an alternative which involved excluding the BEM quote.

Prof. Wright suggested retaining the first sentence of the BEM quote in a reordered text.

Fr. Tillard's reordering was generally accepted.

Mr. Charley returned to his point about the text being too easy on the church

Prof. Chadwick had sympathy with this.

Prof. O'Donovan suggested insertion of sentences from the previous draft to meet Mr. Charley's concern.

This led to considerable discussion. Bp. Lessard and some others felt that we were going too far in "self-flagellation" since the church is the Body of Christ.

Bishop Cameron suggested the inclusion of "with integrity" after "speak" in the third last line.

Discussion resumed as to whether to include (exclude) or include with explanation the BEM text.

PARA 27

Sr. Boulding queried the word 'participate' in the first sentence.

Prof. O'Donovan said this paragraph will not do because it fails to express the dialectical relationship of the Church to the structures of society and the delicate nature of the Church's relationship with society. It will be read as naive and failing to take notice of the fundamental ambiguity that characterises all political settlements.

Fr. Soane said the phrase "God has never let go of the world" is a precious line that secured Fr. Soane's earlier concerns about non-believers etc. In fact, it should be spelt out more.

Sr. Boulding endorsed this point and said the BEM quote could appropriately go here.

Mr. Charley: I would like, on this something from the Sermon on the Mount on Tight and leaven. But also something on prayer and prophecy. Something on this would lead to something on action.

Bd. Murphy-O'Connor returned to the question of the BEM quote. Votes were taken on this and on the question of the extent to which the sinfulness of the Church should be stressed. On the latter, most people were in favour of it not being so strongly stressed as Mr. Charley had suggested. Opinion was divided on the question of the BEM quote.

It was proposed that Mr. Charley, Professor O'Donovan and Mrs. Tanner work out a new section 27. This was agreed to.

Wednesday, 4th September 1985: 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Santer from the chair invited discussion on the revised historical material (redrafts by Bp.Lessard and Prof.Chadwick).

Sr.Boulding asked for a shorter first sentence and more punch.

Mr.Charley queried whether the Spirit incorporated. He wondered about bearing "in their bodies". Prof.Chadwick cited 2 Cor.4.

Fr.Akpunonu wanted salvation as the beginning and end.

Prof. O'Donovan preferred the original (50/(a)). The new last point.

Fr. Adappur asked for the deletion of "he has made" in either.

Mr.Charley offered "he has created".

A debate on the merits of each draft followed.

Fr.Tillard preferred the original, then the sentence "This..." This was carried.

Bp.Gitari did not want "end".

Prof.Davis offered "heart of the Gospel....saving Grace..."

Mr.Charley "heart of the Gospel is salvation". This was accepted.

The second version of the next sentence was accepted.

Prof.O'Donovan urged the original "and the unfailing...." as more total.

A discussion followed.

Bishop Santer asked for a decision-"us" or "believes": "us" was accepted

Prof.O'Donovan asked for "offered to men and women...."

Fr.Tillard and Prof. K.Davis objected. Lost.

Prof.Pobee was still concerned that "faith" had been removed. Fr.Tillard and Mr.Charley agreed.

Fr. Duprey suggested the restoration of "evking faith".

Prof.Pobee offered "by grace through faith" in the first sentence.

Bishop Santer tried "by the gift of faith". Accepted.

Paragraph 2 (Prof.Chadwick's redraft)

Prof.Davis did not like on the one hand...on the other ... Could the end be put as a statement.

Sr.Boulding agreed - it was too long.

Bishop Cameron thought there ought not to be reference to Scripture here.

Mr.Charley found it too expansive. He objected to "contribution". He disliked the end.

Prof.Wright said vassilates between good and bad.

Fr.Tillard saw the root of the problem as the re-discovery of Romans and faith.

Prof.Chadwick wanted to give a sympathetic portrait.

Fr.Yarnold did not find any mention of the dispute about preparation for justification.

Fr.Soane felt Fr.Tillard's point could be met in para 2A.

Mr.Charley preferred the original (50/(a)).

Dean Baycroft felt the logic would be better by emphasizing "two centuries before".

Prof. Wright asked for the deletion of "However".

Paragraphs 2A and 23 were also considered alongside 2.

Fr.Yarnold thought "quasi manichee" would throw readers.

Fr.Soane welcomed the draft. Old fears were not well-founded.

Fr.Duprey wanted a sentence between 2 and 2A on the venacular translations of Scripture.

Prof.O'Donovan preferred to say Anglican formulas were not directed against Trent. But the Commission disagreed.

Fr.Yarnold suggested "theology of St.Augustine".

Bp.Santer asked Prof.Wright to make a final draft.

Fr. Duprey did not understand "sanctified and completed" - he offered "inspired by".

PARA. 3

Prof. K. Davis noted John Baycroft's proposals. "Generally" was cut.

Mr. Charley objected to "a free human response". Fr. Tillard tried "authentic human". Prof. Chadwick agreed. Prof. O'Donovan disagreed. Bp. Cameron was worried about the ambiguity. Mr. Charley tried "a response of faith". Fr. Duprey tried "a true response of faith". Sr. Boulding proposed "a real response".

"authentic human response" was accepted.

Fr. Adappur asked for a change in "concentrated."

Bp. Santer now took the new order: 6, 5, 4.

PARA. 6

Prof. Chadwick found "entail" weak. For Luther and Melancton it was identical.

Mr. Charley and Fr. Tillard agreed. A discussion followed.

Bp. Lessard asked for "constitutive" and a reversal of order.

Archb. Butelezi was uneasy at "scrupulosity".

Prof. O'Donovan said the last sentence must now run before 4.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor wondered at "antinomian".

Mr. Charley tried "a form of legalism" instead of "scrupulosity".

Prof. Chadwick: "Legalism" required another clause. Agreed.

Bp. Cameron proposed "encouraged a casual indifference to".
"Antinomian" was deleted.

Bp. Santer objected to "psychological". "Subjected" was accepted.

PARA. 5

Prof. Pobbé asked for the omission of "different" in the footnote. He accepted "various".

Prof. Chadwick insisted on "predominant" usage.

Mr. Charley wanted adding "which does not mean that the content of what they said was unscriptural."

Sr. Boulding thought it unnecessary but the addition was accepted.

Fr. Duprey and Prof. Pabee had problems with the move from the verb to the noun.

Bp. Santer tried "and its cognates" . Accepted.

Bp. Lessard proposed "extrinsic to" for " External in".

Prof. O'Donovan asked for an inversion at "Bv this they meant..."

Prof. Chadwick insisted that many Anglicans also objected to imputed righteousness as a legal fiction.

Fr. Akpunonu preferred "to believers" rather than humanity.

Prof. O'Donovan was not happy at this limited atonement.

"Human beings" was suggested and accepted.

September 4th, 2.30 pm

Bp. Santer: We begin with old 4 which is now 6. (p.2 of Graymnoor draft). The paragraph was read.

PARA. 6

Fr. Tillard: Is it true that we Catholics believe that the Protestant view implies that God's judgment is arbitrary?

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor · "arbitrary" is here used in a sense related to predestination.

Prof. Chadwick read from Stapleton's account of Protestant views.

Fr. Yarnold suggested a deletion of "was arbitrary and"

Prof. Wright asked if there was some view about god's attitude which accurately represented Catholic perception.

Bp. Lessard suggested "are" worthless and felt "arbitrary" was equivocal.

Dean Baycroft suggested: " ... human actions are worthless in the sight of God" as an alternative.

This is agreed after a vote.

The sentence at the top of page 4 was then discussed but a decision about it left until after discussion of Fr. Yarnold's redraft of 7.

This was read out.

PARA. 7

Fr. Yarnold explained that the purpose of the draft was to speak of the role of the Church in salvation.

Canon Hill : in my redraft of the Church material I have lifted some of this material on the Church. So some material is now duplicated.

Bp. Santer suggested an alternative beginning.

Dean Baycroft suggested an amendment to change the word "presupposed".

Sr. Boulding suggested "implied".

Prof. Chadwick proposed "reflected" and this was agreed on.

Fr. Tillard said that disagreements in the sixteenth century were also about the interpretation of Scripture.

Prof. Wright said there were very many disagreements: in this paragraph we're dealing with the problems that we have to tackle.

Fr. Tillard: This problem of Scripture was more acute in the English than the continental context.

Prof. Chadwick thought the insertion of this issue could be useful.

Bp. Lessard: Could not this issue be used in the connecting paragraph following 7.

Bp. Santer disagreed.

Prof. Pobee didn't think we needed to devote time to this issue: our focus here is justification by faith. Could it not be in a footnote?

Ways of including this topic in the text were discussed.

Mr. Charley said the thrust of this paragraph was different from previous ones in that we are now saying Catholics and Protestants did think this or that: not that they were perceived so to do.

Fr. Tillard said that keeping sacraments was characteristic of the Anglican reformation as opposed to the continental.

Prof. Chadwick suggested an amendment of the last sentence, ending with " by hearing the word of God preached."

Bp. Santer pointed out a logical problem in the paragraph: we state the differences and then illustrate them by caricatures. What are we doing in this paragraph? Are we concentrating on the role of the Church or do we want to say something about the role of Scripture as well?

It was pointed out that if we raise the issue of Scripture here we will need to address it in the body of the text.

Bishop Santer suggested a redraft including something on the "Word".

We returned to the end of 6 ("While the break"....).

It was agreed on.

An extra, connecting sentence was proposed and agreed.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for reassurance that the "Catholic-Protestant" polarity referred to in the text was related somewhere to the specifically Anglican context.

Prof. O'Donovan felt we had actually made this point sufficiently.

Sr. Boulding suggested an emendation that could make this point. - "these matters are no longer a matter of dispute between Catholics and Anglicans" (rather than "between us").

The new redraft of 18 and 19 was distributed.

Mr. Charley said 18 is largely new material; 19 is mainly alterations.

Paragraph 18

Prof. Chadwick suggested "it is both his work and ours" in the last sentence.

Prof. O'Donovan felt this lost the balance of the sentence.

Fr. Tillard said that this last sentence is basically from St. Augustine.

After some discussion the need was felt for a redraft of the sentence, especially the phrase "but when he does".

Mr. Charley suggested the sentence could end with "and what he sees is his own work within us."

Fr. Adappur suggested another alternative version.

Mr. Charley's was accepted after a vote.

4th September: 4.0 p.m., after the break

Bishop Santer presented a redraft of 7. It was agreed in principle.

The discussion of 18 resumed.

Professor Wright lines 5 and 6. "Nevertheless..." There are those who would question the extent to which human beings are as responsible as this sentence suggests (given hereditary and environmental factors).

Prof. Chadwick suggested an alternative.

Fr. Duprey insisted that the theme of free choice was a basic Christian theme that must be retained.

Bishop Lessard: If there is no act of the will, there can be no "actus humanus".

A discussion of the nature of human freedom ensued.

Fr. Tillard raised the issue of "fundamental option". Prof. Chadwick reminded us that most of our contemporaries are in fact determinists. The late medieval situation was the opposite. Mr. Charley was against watering down free decision.

Prof. O'Donovan suggested a redraft.

It was agreed that "fundamental" replace "decisive" in this sentence.

Fr. Soane pointed out that all freedom is in some sense conditioned.

Mr. Charley said it was impossible to include all aspects of this dilemma in this context. The point of this sentence is that we are responsible beings in the sight of God.

It was eventually agreed to retain this sentence but with the word "fundamental", not "decisive".

Prof. Davis questioned the phrase "the arena of salvation is human freedom" and asked for explanation.

Bishop Lessard shared this difficulty.

Fr. Tillard said the origins of this sentence are in St. Thomas Aquinas who said that sin and salvation are problems of human freedom.

Bishop Santer said the problem is the word "arena".

Some felt the word "arena" evoked Christian life very richly.

Bishop Santer: Could it be the second sentence?

It was agreed after a vote that the sentence could remain. The word "arena" was discussed : it was agreed to be rhetorical.

Prof. Chadwick proposed an alternative.

It was agreed, after a vote, to move the sentence to the beginning.

Prof. Davis: I understand the work of Christ's setting us free from slavery, i.e. sin, threat of death, powers of the world, and the law. Here, freedom from the law is missing. Today "law" may be reinterpreted as "self". I would want "self" to be inserted in the sentence beginning "It is freedom ..."

Prof. Pobee: questioned the equating of "law" and "self" in N.T.

Bishop Cameron agreed with Prof. Pobee and felt this point raised a whole Pandora's box of problems.

Fr. Soane said the idea of law is wider than "self" and is very complicated.

Canon Hill: Would it help to actually quote the Scripture references at this point?

Fr. Tillard felt the point was an important one: the N.T. is about freedom from concentration on oneself.

After a vote it was agreed to leave the text as it is.

Fr. Yarnold returned to the "Nevertheless" sentence.

After a vote it was agreed that the text remain in its amended form.

Prof. Wright asked about the second sentence.

Bishop Lessard and Fr. Duprey replied to this.

Dean Baycroft warned against being over-concerned about possible misunderstandings of our agreed text.

Prof. Chadwick proposed an additional sentence after the first one to meet Prof. Wright's anxieties.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor suggested that Prof. Chadwick's proposal be left with the drafters.

After a vote it was agreed to leave the second sentence as it is and that

Prof. Chadwick's proposal be put to the drafters. Mr. Charley proposed an alternative version of the "arena" sentence which was adopted.

PARA. 19.

Fr. McDonald suggested an alternative version of the last sentence which was accepted: "It is in this perspective that the language of merit must be understood"

Sr. Boulding asked about "The response of God's love" at the centre of the paragraph. Following on from this

Prof. O'Donovan suggested the deletion of the quotation from the Book of Proverbs.

4th Sept. 1985 6.30 p.m.

From the Chair, Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said a number of people had problems with 18 - 20. There could not be a text this year. He invited the Commission to look at Canon Hill's revision of the Church material, and Bishop Santer, Prof. O'Donovan and Mrs. Tanner's revision of the concluding section. He hoped 1-17 could be generally accepted. There was no point in a text people were unhappy with. A first text would be closely examined. Bishop Santer also added that a number of people had to leave. The size of the document was larger than ARCIC-I.

Canon Hill introduced the text. It was generally acceptable.

Bishop Santer introduced para. 26.

Prof. O'Donovan introduced para. 27.

Mrs. Tanner introduced para. 28.

Mr. Charley was not happy with the order in para. 27.

Fr. Yarnold wanted a reintroduction of some material from Revised Pleshey 24.

Archbishop Butelezi was unclear whether the emphasis on forgiveness was right.

Fr. Tillard was unhappy at the mention of communities in 27.

Fr. Tillard asked about 18-20.

Bishop Santer said 18-20 dealt with such complicated matters that they were not mature for publication.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for paras. 1-17 to be read with a view to it being 'held' for next year with, if possible, no major substantial changes.

Paras 1 - 7a

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor invited substantial discussion.

Fr. Yarnold found the reference to the place of Scripture a can of worms. A Catholic footnote to balance No.2 might also be called for.

Prof. Wright agreed.

Fr. Duprey queried the use of Catholic and Protestant.

Fr. Tillard and Mr. Charley found the text too long.

Prof. O'Donovan could not accept the "if" in para. 2.

Paras. 8 - 17

Prof. Wright and Sr. Boulding found it a little long.

Fr. Tillard was anxious that the last sentence in 15 had been left out.

Archbishop Butelezi asked about the alternative at 11. In 13 there was a contradiction, as there was statement and caricature.

In para. 15 "law" was kept.

Prof. Chadwick said it was for the Commission to say how much or how little history they wanted. A debate on the length continued.

Mr. Charley still felt it could be too long e.g. 2B and the second footnote. He feared people would get bogged down! He was also anxious to retain the last sentence in para. 15.

Dean Baycroft asked whether the Commission could morally support the draft conclusion. Were we morally agreed?

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked Canon Hill to outline procedure over the text.

Canon Hill said points on 1 - 17 should be sent to him. They would be circulated. A sub-group would work on 18 - to the end so that a whole penultimate text was before the next meeting.

Fr. Tillard asked if 1 - 17 had been approved?

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked if general agreement could be spoken of in the press release.

Mrs. Tanner was not happy that the last section should go to a sub-commission. At this stage all needed to own it.

Mr. Charley thought a small drafting group was required to look at new material. A Sub-Commission should plan future work.

Fr. Duprey hoped the press release would only say that the Commission was near agreement.

Bishop Santer asked whether a paper should be commissioned on Purgatory, etc.

Fr. Tillard thought this was elucidation.

Bishop Cameron thought the question would be asked.

The Commission was almost equally divided. It was left to the Co-Chairmen to decide.

Bishop Lessard cautioned about elucidations. If necessary then a subject should be included.

Fr. Duprey did not feel the matter an essential part of our work.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked for comments about future work. He mentioned:

1. Reconciliation of Ministries.
2. Growth in Reconciliation.
3. Responses to ARCIC-I.

One group had produced a report. This would be the basis for work, including the suggestion of a publishable Report. Dean Baycroft was to be asked to write a draft paper (49 (85)).

Fr. McDonald reported on the responses of Episcopal Conferences.

Fr. Duprey thought it would be useful to reflect upon the responses on Eucharist and Ministry and of the CDF. This was the point of Cardinal Willebrands' letter.

Prof. Pobee saw work on Ministry in two aspects: Apostolicae Curae and the ordination of women.

Fr. Duprey thought moral questions should be dealt with at a national level. There was not the same level of necessity.

Bishop Santer: Would ARCIC-II need to address itself to the question of moral authority. Fr. Duprey felt this would come up as part of the response to ARCIC-I on authority.

Bishop Lessard explained the Press Conference was really a "background briefing".

Sr. Boulding wanted an approach to women's ordination soon!

Fr. Yarnold did not want arguments for and against.

Prof. Wright asked for documentation on responses.

Mr. Charley wanted a way of assessing priorities.

Fr. Duprey wanted a theological study of unity by stages.

Dean Baycroft thought a Paper on Growth in Reconciliation required a great deal of work. Priorities in different areas should be notified.

Bishop Santer thought the most important things were ecclesiology, the hermeneutics of faith and the transmission of revelation.

Dates for 1988 were set: 30th August - 8th September.

NEXT YEAR'S DATES WERE CONFIRMED: 26th August - 4th September, 1986.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor expressed particular thanks to Bishop Raymond Lessard and Professor Bob Wright for all their work in the preparation of the meeting. Professor Wright had had to be absent for a part of the meeting due to the death of his mother and she had been remembered at the Commission Eucharist.

Great appreciation was also expressed to the Graymoor Community.

Thanks were also given to the Secretariat.

The next meeting was to be at Llandaff.

Bishop Santer closed the meeting with prayer.