

Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission II;  
Fourth meeting, Llandaff, 26 August - 4 September 1986

MINUTES

Wednesday, 27 August; 9.30

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor in the chair: Welcomed everyone and read a letter from Julian Charley. He said he rang Fr Duprey asking if it would be possible for him to come to the meeting for a few days. Pierre Duprey said he would if he could. Stressed importance of the meeting especially because of recent publication of correspondences. People looking to the Commission now. Interventions need to be economic, prudent and generous because of amount of work to be done. Referred specifically to letter of co-chairmen to Card. Willebrands.

Storrington draft

Expressed thanks to secretaries for preparing the draft. There will now be four drafters of new text viz. Mary Tanner, Ray Lessard, Don Cameron and Ted Yarnold. In looking at draft there are:

- 1) Purely drafting points (which will not be discussed)
- 2) Substantial points
- 3) Points which are not in either category 1 or 2.

Propose to go through text para by para. asking those with substantial points to speak to them.

Christopher Hill: Oliver O'Donovan has been through the American evangelical comments and will speak to Commission on them. Julian Charley's comments have come and will go to everyone.

Mary Tanner Could Oliver O'Donovan say something now about American points.

Bp. Santer (on footnotes) : We've had question before us of what to do with historical background. Best to have economical footnotes at critical points to show how text relates to historical formularies. Ted Yarnold and Bp. Santer have worked on this.

Oliver O'Donovan Felt unease that well-intentioned readers were not seeing what we are saying, when reading comments of American evangelicals. Several things we can do to help show we grasp their concerns.

They misunderstand our use of the eschatological present; and we are seen to hold to an individualistic and voluntaristic understanding of sin; Bishop Allin would like us to be more specific about Anglican criticism of Trent.

Bp. Cameron Must take on board misunderstandings. But they are attempting finer tuning than we're attempting.

Sr. Bouldin There is a more substantial issue in the question of sin raised by the N.Americans.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor Better to deal with these N.American issues when we come to the relevant paragraphs.

Discussion of text

Para.1

Bp. Vogel Questioned use of word "share" in (divine nature)

Bp. Cameron Said it helped.

Sr. Boulding questioned "share like him"

Prof. Chadwick: Reference to 2 Peter at this point.

Bp. Murphy O'Connor: Use of "participate" might be better: "participate in life of God".

Dr. Gassmann "participate" more active.

Bp. Vogel Preferred participate

Bp. Santer: The "like him" is the problem.

Chr. Hill: Julian Charley not happy with first para.

Bp. Baycroft: If this para. is to be redrafted could it be in inclusive language.

Mrs. Tanner: Throughout the document there is a lot about imaging and it is very male. Picture of our imaging the Christ who is image of the Father. There are three places in text where we can change text to save ourselves from masculinity.

Donald Cameron Uneasy with tinkering with Father and Son language.

Sr. Boulding: Difficult to change this first para. along these lines.

Mrs. Tanner Many women critical of Final Report will be very sensitive to this.

Fr. Akpunonu: Is there any doubt about Jesus Christ being a man? Do we need to apologize for it?

Fr. Tillard This is very controversial in Faith and Order. We cannot spoil what we have done by trying to solve another major issue. What is wrong with saying Christ is only-begotten Son of God?

Mrs. Tanner: Problem is cumulative effect of image of Son and Father.

Prof. Wright: "Image of Father" - wouldn't "image of invisible God" be better?

Professor Pobee: First para. put emphasis on salvation of human family and it needs to be recast to speak of salvation of all creation. In the Chairmen's Preface it needs to be clear that we are not dealing with all (e.g. ecological) aspects of salvation.

Archbishop Butelezi concurred with the stress on recreation of the universe.

Fr. Yarnold: "United with one another in Christ" would be better than "United with Christ".

PARA. 2.

Professor Chadwick suggested omission of all of Para. 2 except first clause. It is a colossal throat-clearing operation.

Sr. C. Boulding: This ties up with suggestion of footnotes on formularies.

Bishop Santer: But we need to get in a reference to justification which this paragraph does. Also in this paragraph, who are we talking about under "Reformers". We need to acknowledge that Anglicans share Protestant stance on justification.

Professor O'Donovan: But we cannot smudge over historical material, He was concerned about missing out historical material.

Fr. Akpunonu: We need the theological background.

Canon Hill: Had a note on a specific point.

It was felt generally that the paragraph should stay.

Fr. Yarnold: Could we leave out some later parts?

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: Let us survey whole paragraph.  
need

Bp. Santer: In ll. 6 - 7/changes to make it wider in concern and in people involved in dispute. Last sentence too crude. Cannot set justification over against salvation.

Fr. Akpunonu: We should not widen the range of concerns too much.

Professor Wright: 1.12 "Church of England" - who are we talking about; use of term is imprecise - is it the Church officially or is it certain theologians?

Fr. Thornhill: Support Mark's suggestion since it brings out complexity of whole issue.

Professor O'Donovan: No official voice for Church of England but the unanimous voice of all 17th Century theologians read Trent in hostile way.

Professor Chadwick Herbert Thorndyke thought Trent mostly right but careless on anathemas. Also Forbes (1638) wrote on justification in the form of a commentary on Bellarmine and sometimes said Trent got it right and Bellarmine wrong. Hooker, Davenant, Forbes, Jeremy Taylor, Thorndyke are key people. Is not iron curtain against Trent. Bull, later, rude about Trent but people suspected him of agreeing with it.

Bishop Vogel could eliminate half of the sentence.

Canon Hill There is little in Anglican formularies which contradicts Trent but point of these paragraphs is to get good-willed readers on our side. We musn't try to pretend that there was no disagreement in the first place. (This to be left to drafters.)

Dr. Gassmann would help Christopher's point if we saw e.g. liturgical importance and implications of justification. Not just an isolated point of dogmatics.

Sr. Boulding Last sentence a non-sequitur: need to state that there is disagreement on this.

Fr. Akpunonu Need to show that we see this an area of disagreement that needs to be dealt with.

Fr. Tillard Centrality to the Christian faith and practice" would solve the point.

### Para. 3

Bishop Cameron Do we need to make the point that the whole 16th century debate was between people who had basic agreement on Trinity and Christology. Was a of undisputed consensus.

Prof. Pabee, Sr. Boulding and Fr. McDonald concurred.

Prof. Wright Are we agreed there was more that was a matter of agreement than disagreement at that time.

Dr. Gassmann that there was great agreement is something we know from our historical research today: not perceived at the time.

Bishop Cameron Calvin's intemperate language based on conviction that on certain issues his opponents are very wrong.

Bishop Santer Need to distinguish Bishop Cameron's point from point that all the discussion on justification took place in a common Augustinian framework.

Fr. Thornhill Hesitate on this: it's a document of reunion, not a public relations exercise.

Sr. Boulding Need to rewrite para. 2 before we can deal with 3.

Professor Chadwick There is a demand for history. Should we say that one difficulty was disagreement about original sin? Its the Erasmus-Luther dispute as to extent to which human freedom was totally destroyed by original sin.

Fr. Soane This relates to history in para. 19.

Fr. Tillard against introducing original sin, the issue is covered in the present wording.

Bishop Vogel Can't bring it up and not do anything with it.

Fr. Tillard Better to say instead of "related to human response", "related to human liberty".

Dr. Gassmann We need to specify what kind of liberty we are talking about.

Bishop Vogel Let's say "freedom" not "liberty".

Para. 4

Bishop Vogel "Scrupulosity" and "legalism" don't explain anything (last sentence). Better to have "scrupulous earning" or "meriting salvation".

Prof. O'Donovan Scrupulosity is important because it relates to Reformation concern about conscience. It shows why the issue is so sensitive.

Canon Hill Julian Charley doesn't agree with scrupulosity, but I agree with Oliver O'Donovan.

Fr. Akpunonu How is "holiness" to be understood, good works?

Canon Hill Echoes concern of Americans: Homily on Salvation intends to guard against the idea that justification need not bear fruit in good works.

Prof. Chadwick Anglicans were on the Catholic side on this issue.

Other suggestions to "holiness" suggested, such as "prayer and good works", "holiness of life", "observance of the commandments".

Professor Chadwick suggested amendment.

Professor O'Donovan Drafters need to decide who we are talking about.

Wednesday, 27th August, 1986 11.15 a.m.

PARA. 5.

Professor O'Donovan suggested reformulation of footnote I to include idea of "simul justus et peccator".

Bishop Santer suggested reformulation of beginning of 5.

Professor Wright made the point that if we adopt Bishop Santer's adaptation, we do not list justification itself as one of the key differences between us.

Professor O'Donovan : This is not the case since justification is a cognate of iustitia and so the issue is proposed as a difference between us.

PARA. 6.

Professor Chadwick: At 11. 6 or 8, could drafters include the word "unconditional" in relation to forgiveness. Important theme and the drafters could incorporate this.

PARA. 7. -

PARA. 8.

Dr. Gassman: Last sentence: do we actually set out in the subsequent texts the reasons that have led us to conclude that this is no longer a matter of dispute, as we say we will do.

Bishop Santer: Judicious footnotes might help this, i.e. showing connection between what we say and traditional formularies.

Bishop Cameron: We need three or four bridge sentences to meet Dr. Gassman's point.

Bishop Baycroft: Would it not be better to say "need not be matters of dispute" rather than "no longer".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: Agreed with this because we are not resolving all the historical problems but are stating our faith today.

Professor Wright: Don't we need to acknowledge that there are various factors (developments in scholarship) which enable us to agree today where our ancestors would not.

Canon Hill supported this.

Sr. Boulding: Could we not say: "we have not found" that historical differences are still a problem? Also, we need to adjust headings.

Bishop Vogel: We should say "we believe" rather than "the Commission" to take our communities with us.

Fr. Adappur suggested a reference in this context to the Edinburgh Conference on Mission of 1910.

PARA. 9.

Bishop Vogel suggested "will" rather than "work" in line 8.

A problem came up with the last sentence, which Fr. Tillard thought embodied a Christomonism that would be unacceptable to the Orthodox.

Bishop Santer suggested removing it.

Professor O'Donovan: In fact, there is no real controversy between us and the Orthodox on the centrality of Christ.

Fr. Yarnold: Should we use a phrase from Scripture to make the point, e.g. "one mediator"?

Fr. Tillard: But the way we in the West speak of Salvation puts the other two persons of the Trinity out of the frame of Salvation. "Solus Christus" is not Christian.

Dr. Gassmann: If we say "source and centre" rather than "context" it will be all right.

Fr. Tillard: An ablative "Christo solo" would be acceptable.

PARA. 10.

The question of upper and lower case, especially for Gospel was raised and referred to drafters.

Bishop Santer: When we speak of the Church and the Gospel we should have upper case.

Fr. Yarnold: Important that formulation about assurance/confidence does not contradict chapter 9 of the Council of Trent - (Sentence beginning "It is God's gracious will .....").

PARA. 11.

Sr. Boulding: What do we mean by "the gift of final perseverance". A technical term that needs to be explained.

Bishop Santer: "Perseverance to the end"?

Professor Wright: Not a term that is readily understood.

Bishop Cameron: Felt "final perseverance" should go.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: It is a familiar notion for Roman Catholics.

Fr. Tillard suggested an alternative formula.

Fr. Soane: Would be O.K. if we add "those who are truly repentant".

Professor Chadwick: Total affect of the paragraph is too inclined to perfectionism. Like the document as a whole it does not say enough about our need to repent, make amends etc.

Fr. Thornhill: We have not in the Para. made the point that repentance and perseverance is a grace.

Archbishop Gitari: Said that the paragraph says than sin will always be forgiven. But what about the sin against the Holy Spirit?

Bishop Santer suggested an amendment.

PARA. 12.

Fr. Adappur: "Previous existence" would be a problem in the Indian context. Better to say "previous life".

PARA. 13.

Bishop Vogel: Middle of p. 9 we find "propitiation" and "expiation" and suggested an amendment.

Professor Pobee suggested we do invoke language of sacrifice but do not speak of propitiation.

Fr. Tillard suggested "context of sacrifice whose goal is reunion with God and denotes ....."

Bishop Cameron: Para. 9 line 3: do they "complement one another" these terms? The terms overlap in the New Testament.

Bishop Lessard: "There is no controlling term". Does this contradict our saying that "salvation" is the most comprehensive one?

Bishop Cameron: The formulation is correct.

Professor Pobee disagreed. Salvation is one New Testament term.

PARA. 14.

Dr. Gassmann: This para. comes back to controversial reformation points. This does not happen in subsequent sections, so should it not go back to the beginning, after paragraph 5, in the list of difficulties.

Bishop Baycroft disagreed because it is answering the problem after brief restating.

Professor O'Donovan: We need here to be clear about who and when we are talking about. Bishop Allison (USA) makes point that if this is intended to rehearse what Anglicans thought about Trent it is simply wrong.

Canon Hill felt it should stay where it is.

The cutting of paragraph 14 was discussed.



Professor Wright supported retention because of overall context, especially para. 13.

Fr. Akpunonu supported leaving it there.

Professor Chadwick (on the assessment of the respective points of view in the paragraph) said that Devenant (1631) had the most important contribution on this with his account of imparted righteousness.

Bishop Santer Are the caricatures accurate and defensible?

Bishop Cameron Given what we are trying to do, these statements are correct but a little bald and unequivocal.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor After all, these sentences on Catholic and Protestant views are only reiterating what is said before.

Professor O'Donovan This paragraph contradicts historical superimposition of different images. What is said of Roman Catholic and Protestant opinions belongs to an earlier period than the developed concern about justification/sanctification which surfaced fifty years afterwards.

Sr. Boulding Could we say something like "as the debate developed....."

Bishop Wallace Could we qualify by saying that Catholics and Protestants "tended etc....to say".

Fr. Tillard suggested an amendment beginning with the statement of Catholics and Protestant views and omit the first sentence and include the footnote in the text.

#### Para. 15

Professor O'Donovan suggested rewording of sentence at top of 11 to meet concerns of the North Americans about use of the eschatological present.

Canon Hill read Julian Charley's reformulation of sentence at top of page 11 and this was referred to drafters.

Bishop Wallace The footnote on page 10, however it is incorporated in the text, leaves us with a question that needs to be answered. How today do we see this question about the understanding of the term justification? The Catholic-Lutheran dialogue actually agreed that today we agree that it means both pronounce and make righteous.

Bishop Cameron The answer to this question is contained in the document as a whole.

Professor O'Donovan Disagrees with Bishop Wallace because what the footnote describes is a terminological misunderstanding not a theological dispute.

4 p.m. Wednesday, 27th August, 1986

Bishop Santer in chair.

PARA. 16.

Bishop Vogel: "Righteous": do we ever say what it means? Suggested definition.

Bishop Cameron: One would need to expand or omit that definition.

Professor Pobee: This definition was not in dispute between us and does not need to be treated. Also the report must not be too long. It is not absolutely necessary.

Bishop Santer: Has Bishop Vogel identified a lacuna which others feel?

Prof. O'Donovan: Yes. There has been a lot of biblical work on the Old Testament idea of righteousness.

Fr. Akpunonu: Bishop Vogel is right but we are not able to do justice to this point.

Fr. Soane: People might misunderstand the phrase if it is not explained.

Canon Hill: Would a footnote be the right solution?

Arbp. Butelezi: Agreed.

Prof. Wright: Against having it in the text. So either have a footnote or a sentence or two in para. 13 which already has biblical material.

Prof. Chadwick: Could we omit first sentence of para. 16?

Fr. Yarnold: If a footnote, let it be appended to paragraph 5 where we first introduced the notion.

Bishop Wallace: It does need definition. This is a rather off-putting notion for many Catholics and needs elucidation.

Fr. Tillard: A footnote could explain the holiness - righteousness connection.

Bishop Santer: We do need a brief exposition on this.

Bishop Cameron: The notion is very complex in Old Testament which is a different category of thought from forensic idea in Romans.

Fr. Akpunonu: Footnote not at paragraph 5.

Bishop Vogel: All we need to say is what we mean by our use of this word.

Sr. Boulding: In paragraph 5 we have spoken of righteousness of Christ. So we should explain it where we first use it.

Dr. Gassmann: It is explained in first sentence of 18. Could we mention righteousness therefore in 18 and omit the sentence from 16.

Mrs. Tanner: This takes us back to footnote 1. All the meanings of iustitia/righteousness belong together.

Fr. Tillard: Footnote a bad solution; a parenthesis would be better.

Fr. Thornhill: Suggested such a parenthesis "God is the source of all goodness and fidelity."

Bishop Lessard: Could the definition be introduced obliquely at end of 15?

Bishop Vogel: Accepted Fr. Thornhill's suggestion.

Fr. Tillard: Could we use the word 'integrity' to parallel righteousness?

Bishop Wallace: proposed the parenthesis of Fr. Thornhill.

Canon Hill: Against taking the sentence out (which Sr. Boulding suggested). It is important for the logic of the paragraph.

Prof. Wright agreed and supported Fr. Thornhill's insertion.

Bishop Baycroft: Might this not fit in in paragraph 1?

Prof. O'Donovan: Agreed with Bishop Santer that "goodness and fidelity" do not render "righteousness".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: If we cannot agree on an elucidation we must leave the text alone.

Bishop Vogel: We could re-work first sentence of 16 to omit attributing righteousness to God.

PARA. 17.

Sr. Boulding: Should 18 (on justification) not come before 17 (on sanctification)

Prof. Wright: Lots of other things therefore have to be reversed if we changed this.

Decided to leave it as it is.

Prof. O'Donovan: Last two sentences of 17 were typical of the sentences misunderstood by Evangelicals. He suggested a reformulation that demonstrated the eschatological perspective.

Fr. Akpunonu: Is there justification in scripture for this change?

Fr. Yarnold: Prof. O'Donovan's amendment actually undermines our agreement on what God's action actually does.

Canon Hill: Mr. J. Charley has a problem with the word "fulfilled" and suggests "assured" instead.

Bishop Santer: Suggested another emendation.

Dr. Gassmann: Does not the American evangelical difficulty come from the scripture quotation.

Fr. Tillard: We must not suggest the issue of predestination and Julian's suggestion effectively avoids it.

Prof. Wright: Do we need to say this since its already said in para II.

Fr. Soane: Can we just omit "as it is uttered".

There was discussion as to the appropriateness of omitting the last sentences altogether or at least missing out the quote from Ephesians.

Prof. O'Donovan Defended the sentiments of the last sentences on the grounds that its eschatological language is not extravagant or rhetorical.

Fr. Tillard suggested a reformulation.

Prof. Chadwick spoke in favour of the Ephesian text.

Fr. Yarnold : We need to establish agreement on whether God declaring us righteous makes us righteous here and now.

Prof. Chadwick: The question is better expressed as: is there any imputed righteousness that is not also imparted?

Prof. O'Donovan: that is not the question. What do we mean by "righteousness"?

Bp. Cameron Is not our problem that we are adopting two stands of NT thoughts to the exclusion of others.

It was agreed that we must say that there is no sense in which justification does not leave us unchanged. On the Scripture quote the chairmen suggested that it either be left out or a more appropriate one found.

Prof. Wright Could not Ted's very useful statement about what precisely it is we are agreed on be incorporated in the re-drafting?

Sentence beginning "final judgement" is not the right.

Bp. Cameron agreed and

Fr. Yarnold suggested a re-wording to which Fr. Tillard (original drafter) agreed.

#### PARA. 18

Bp. Cameron p.13: "This is why...." does remission of sins bring renewal of life? Is it not one process?

Prof. Chadwick Could "adoption" be added.

Fr. Yarnold: "is accompanied by" would be better than "brings"

Bp. Cameron agreed to this.

Can.Hill: Charley's last three lines of paragraph are true but don't follow on.

Prof.Chadwick suggested "showing himself just" (last sentence) rather than "was able".

This was agreed on.

Fr.Yarnold Is the first sentence intended to be a denial of the need for any preparation for justification? It would be so read.

Prof. O'Donovan: Justification here refers to Christ's action, it's not about our action.

Bp. Santer: It could still be misunderstood.

Prof.Wright: asked if Fr.Yarnold actually disagreed with the statement.

Ep.Wallace: Could "on the part of humanity" replace "on our part" to resolve this?

Sr.Boulding: Can we not use the full Romans' phrase "while we were yet sinners".

Can.Hill The problem is that "any movement on our part " is ambiguous.

Fr.Thornhill suggested "prior to any entitlement on our part"

Bp.Santer Should we make another sentence of it?

Fr.Tillard: The drafters want to make the point that the manifestation of God's love was prior to any movement on our part. The whole of humanity is included.

Prof.Pobee : Can we connect "manifestation" and "declaration"?

Bp.Santer: If Tillard's explanation is the intended meaning then it needs to be spelled out.

Fr.Tillard: It needs to be made clear that God's justification is more than individual's justification.

Prof. Wright had a difficulty with the second sentence, especially the tagging on of "resurrection".

Prof.Pobee We either omit the word "supreme" or drop the biblical reference.

Bp.Vogel Christ's sacrifice is not just his death on the cross but his whole life, leading to the resurrection

Fr. Yarnold: Suggested a rewording that did not separate the cross and the resurrection.

Fr. Adappur: contested the paragraph's assertion that God's verdict of acquittal is "impersonal".

Sr. Boulding: suggested omission of "impersonal".

Prof. Chadwick: said that a verdict of acquittal is actually an impersonal thing.

Canon Hill: agreed with Fr. Thornhill that we need to make the point that divine acquittal involves a personal relationship whereas civil law acquittal does not.

Bishop Baycroft: suggested a reformulation.

Fr. Tillard: We must not in this paragraph lose the idea that salvation is more than justification. It also concerns the cosmos.

PARA. 19.

Dr. Gassmann: The first sentence is wrong.

Canon Hill: Mr. Charley says first sentence is too bold; propose "a measure of human freedom".

Fr. Tillard: Miss out first sentence. This agreed to.

Fr. Soane: First sentences jumpy. He suggested insertions.

Prof. Chadwick: Is not our formulation of the issue here too individualistic. We are also limited by our being a "bee in a beehive", by a corporate group egotism in which each of us is involved.

Fr. Tillard agreed and said this was crucial. The social dimension of Salvation must be asserted. Justification of world is not justification of a collection of individual sinners. We are losing the patristic understanding of salvation.

Prof. O'Donovan: I concur with this and the phrase "to the extent that these embody personal consent" could be omitted to meet this concern.

There was general assent to this set of concerns and it was agreed that Prof. Chadwick, Prof. O'Donovan and Fr. Soane would remodel the first part of this paragraph.

Prof. Pobe: There is a sentence here on the demonic and cosmic powers, and it could be inserted at line 3 of para. 14.

Dr. Gassmann: Is the last sentence really logical?

Bishop Santer: Is it right that our treatment of freedom and original sin comes under the heading of good works?

Sr. Boulding : what we say here about good works is a very inadequate answer to the question raised in 6.

(question was raised as to whether this whole section needs rewriting.

PARA.20

Prof. Chadwick : What does the first sentence mean?

It was suggested that it begin "God's final judgement"

Dr. Davis: We should note that here we mention evil for the first time. Raises the question of "from what". What are we being saved from?

Fr. Tillard This raises again the problem of the text being too individualistic.

Bp. Cameron: Could not Dr. Davis' points be left to drafters.

Prof. O'Donovan : The first half of the James text is misleading out of its whole context.

Can. Hill: Could we have a reference to the text but expanded.

Bp. Cameron thought the James quote important but suggested expansion.

PARA. 21

Fr. Tillard The Christian's reward is not only his own crown of glory but that he sees the world recreated through his own cooperation. The text is too individualistic. The notion of merit is stupid.

Bp. Cameron found idea of "through the cooperation of mankind" difficult and preferred "through our incorporation into the body of Christ"

Dr. Davis: Concerned about the concept of Christian duty here. Don't we need to spell out the centrality of Christian duty.

Bp. Vogel: 4th sentence; "with God by grace" would be better than "with the God of grace".

Prof. O'Donovan (on duty): Part of the problem here is that we have in mind a modern post-Kantian view of duty which equates it to law. Properly understood duty can be assimilated to love.

Bp. Santer proposed that this be referred to the drafters.

Thursday, 28th August a.m.

Bp. Murphy O'Connor opened the discussion on Para.22 from the chair.

Fr. Akpunonu wanted a description of the Church at the beginning of the para.

Prof. K. Davis wanted to see the Church as instrumental in bringing the creation to re-creation.

Bp. Lessard felt para.28 would be the place for this.

Fr. Soane thought a reference in 22 would link with the new first paragraph.

PARA.23

Fr. McDonald noted that Julian Charley felt "sign" in the penultimate line was too strong. Prof. Pobe and Sr. Boulding agreed. Bp. Baycroft and Bp. Santer disagreed.

Fr. McDonald suggested "a sign of".

Prof. Wright noted that the Church as "sign" was not a stated disagreement in the earlier part of the document. Nor was it found in the NT.

Bp. Cameron although the word was not in NT. the concept was.

Fr. Tillard saw the whole section as very important for the sacramentality of the Church. But the para. was not clear as it used sign in different senses. It "skated".

Dr. Gassmann shared Julian Charley's unease.

Fr. Akpunonu found a richness in the use of "sign".

Fr. Yarnold wanted the last three sentences run into one to make the sense clear.

Bp. Murphy -O'Connor wanted the first sense of sign made clear.

PARA.24

Prof. K. Davis wondered whether "eph haprax" could be translated less cumbersome. Prof. Chadwick agreed but had no alternative. He wanted the Eucharist added to the first sentence.

Bp. Vogel did not want the Holy Spirit added to the Church; suggested by the phrase "not from itself". Prof. O'Donovan saw this as an echo of I Corinthians. Fr. Thornhill offered "comes entirely from the Holy Spirit". Prof. K. Davis suggested "through the Holy Spirit".

Bp. Santer could not see Bp. Vogel's problem. The majority wanted retention.



Fr. Thornhill, Prof. Wright, Sr. Boulding still thought the last sentence erroneous.

Bp. Cameron asked if John Thornhill could redraft.

Prof. Pobe and Bp. Baycroft thought the addition of the Corinthians reference would help.

Fr. Adappur recognized that the Church could be seen as both human and divine. Bp. Santer offered "comes not from its members".

Prof. Wright suggested "not from ourselves".

PARA. 25

Fr. McDonald found 25 + 26 too triumphalistic. God worked outside the Church too.

Prof. Chadwick suggested the replacement of "within" by "through".

Fr. Tillard wanted an additional sentence. There was a uniqueness of the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

Sr. Boulding suggested "While we recognize that..., nevertheless.....".

Fr. Akpunonu did not want to water down the para.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether the Commission wanted to deal with the question of the Holy Spirit's activity outside the Church. The Commission did not want to take sides on this issue.

Prof. Wright also asked whether baptism constituted membership of the Church.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor felt the members of the Commission would have to interpret this question in the light of the respective disciplines of their Churches.

Prof. K. Davis saw three lines of interpretation about the relationship of the Church and the Kingdom.

Fr. Tillard did not want to come down on this issue. It was very confusing. There was an "already" and a "not yet".

PARA. 26

Dr. Gassmann wondered whether it was only the sins of the members of the Church which weakened its witness. There was also weakness and shortcomings in the institutional expressions of the Church.

There was general agreement, though care needed to be taken in the drafting.

Prof. O'Donovan offered the "fallibility" of the Church.  
Bp. Santer did not want a platonic Church.

Fr. Soane wanted to defend the view that the Gospel and Sacraments would infallibly have effect if men responded.  
Prof. Chadwick wanted the addition of Christian division being a countersign.

Bp. Lessard and Prof. Pobee questioned the sacrament.

Fr. Yarnold and Fr. Tillard proposed "for this reason it can be described as 'sacrament' of God's saving work".

PARA. 27

Dr. Gassmann felt the "not yet" of the Kingdom needed to be expressed. He would draft something.

Bp. Baycroft did not see the Church as "foretaste" as meaning the Church would become perfect before the world.

Fr. Yarnold did not want a new heading. This confused.

Professor Chadwick was sure the use of 'only' was bunkum.

Bishop Santer saw the Church in process of reconciliation.

Sr. Boulding argued for a change in the case of the verbs.

Fr. Tillard proposed an additional sentence. "The Church is not yet entirely faithful to the command of the Lord".

Fr. Soane was doubtful. God did work through the existing Church Christ founded.

Fr. Tillard said the Church evangelised not only by words but by witness.

Bishop Vogel questioned whether Christ founded the existing Church. He proclaimed the Kingdom. The existing Church was in between.

Professor Chadwick A via media between misfortune and carelessness.

Fr. Adappur suggested "the Church is aware of its failings...."

Fr. McDonald, Prof. Pobee and Bp. Baycroft wanted reconciling as well as reconciled.

Prof. O'Donovan were N.Americans using "reconciling" as transitive or intransitive.

Bp. Vogel: transitive.

Bp. Santer thought there would be problems with the following paras. A Sub-Commission might be needed for both paras.

Prof. Wright had problems as the Church was the subject of the final sentence, ie. what examples of unequal acceptance were there within the Church.

Prof. K. Davis felt there was a lack of sense in the communio sanctorum. Was this the place.

Fr. Tillard saw this as the future work of the Commission.

Prof. Pobee suspected righteousness and freedom needed to be added to the last sentence - in the light of the whole document.

Fr. Yarnold felt the last line repeated the beginning of the para.

#### PARA. 28

Bp. Lessard questioned "mission to the world".

Bp.Santer found this para. very unsatisfactory, It felt like a foreign body - a feeble gesture in the direction of modern relevance. Improve or leave out.

Prof.Wright and Bp.Cameron agreed.

Prof.O'Donovan said it sprang from a request for something on the contemporary relevance of justification. The option was still open of following the suggestion of Dr.Gassmann.

Prof.Chadwick wondered whether social justice might be more appropriate under 'Good Works'.

Bp.Lessard hoped "re-creation" would fit well at this point.

Bp.Murphy-O'Connor felt the end was bald. Could 28 be subsumed in the Conclusion.

Prof.Pobee felt it fitted well in the 'Good Works' group.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor also invited discussion on the Conclusion.

Prof.Wright was attracted by the suggestion of a re-working of the contemporary relevance of justification.

Bp.Santer felt the 'Good Works' section would lose its focus if this material were added.

Ep.Baycroft favoured dropping. He still found the subject of justification boring.

Fr.Thornhill agreed.

Prof.Chadwick stressed the link between good works and contemporary discussion about liberation.

Prof. Pobee reminded that joint action in the world was one of the ways the Churches had come together.

Sr.Boulding hoped the Conclusion was the place to say something about joint action.

Prof.O'Donovan found Prof.Chadwick's proposal growing on him. We would show that justification was not boring.

Fr.Tillard was unhappy at the equation of mission and good works. Mission was not ethical.

Dr.Gassmann said that the Churches were preaching good works! Justification was still relevant - though not in that terminology.

Bp.Cameron supported this. If justification had no present relevance the creating and redeeming God had been turned into a behavioural scientist.

Ep. Murphy-O'Connor also agreed. He wanted this to be said in the Conclusion.

Fr. Yarnold saw the para. as complimentary to the section on the Church as sign, steward, instrument.

Bp. Vogel also wanted something in the Conclusion of the continuing tension related to justification (not between the Churches but within them).

Bp. Santer noted there were two conclusions floating about: mission and freedom.

Dr. Gassmann saw the ethical consequences as a separate para.  
Sr. Boulding did not see the two conclusions as contradictory: mission followed the Church and freedom followed from justification.

Prof. Pobe recognised three elements. (1) historical, (2) contemporary faith, and (3) living the practical consequences of our agreement.

Fr. Thornhill hoped the Commission would not depart from an ARCIC-I Conclusion.

Bishop Santer did not want mission lost. This flowed from the Church.

Dr. Gassmann argued for separate sections and a separate Conclusion.

Prof. Chadwick noted that the Anglican tradition included those who saw Christian life as an inner mystical experience. This was not, however, characteristic.

(There were R.C. examples as well).

Our two communions were not divided on the fact that the Church sacraments were cardinal to the mediation of justification.

Fr. Tillard felt there was disagreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics over the meaning of mission and evangelization. For Roman Catholics, works were included in evangelization.

Bishop Cameron said the word mission in Anglican usage was plastic. He did not feel there was so much difference.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor proposed a group to re-vamp the last three paragraphs in the light of the discussion.: Dr. Gassmann, Prof. K. Davis, Prof. Pobe and Fr. Thornhill, with Fr. Tillard available to them.

Mrs. Tanner wanted the Group to look at the whole section on the Church.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked the new Group to liase with the drafting Group.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor invited discussion on the question of "Beliefs & Practices" (57(b) (86)).

Prof. Wright would have liked to have agreed with the draft but recent official documents on Indulgences put seriously in question the agreement on the role of the Church in salvation.

Bp. Wallace asked whether there would be a fuller discussion on the nature of the Church. Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said there would.

Fr. Tillard saw a clear distinction between the sensus fidelium and what was said by the Magisterium. In the R.C. tradition there was a repetition because the Magisterium wanted the community to continue in peace. It is impossible to say the doctrine of indulgences was at the core of the faith. They were not at the heart of the discussion of justification. They were linked to the problem of penance.

Sr. Boulding agreed with Professor Wright. She was not happy with the document but it was official.

Bp. Cameron did not feel that an examination of practices would lead to greater consensus.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor felt the Magisterium was addressing the Catholic faithful. Anglicans must not only look at documents but at the contemporary Catholic practice.

Fr. Tillard gave the definition "remission before God of the temporal punishment due for sins already forgiven as far as their guilt is concerned."

Fr. Scane found the draft too bland. Penance could not be entered into.

Fr. Thornhill thought agreement could be reached.

Dr. Boulding saw the problem as one of authority.

Archbishop Butelezi thought the issue came up as a devotional conclusion. It was not at the heart of the faith.

Prof. Pobee felt there must be some reference. We could agree on their original use.

Bishop Baycroft wanted to drop the issue. The Paul VI document toned down excesses. But it was still bizarre. Yet this had to be lived with. It was relatively harmless but could not be defended.

Bishop Vogel felt they must be dropped or say this must be judged by the criteria of the basic agreement.

Canon Hill agreed with Professor Pobee that there might be agreement on the original meaning of indulgences within the penitential discipline of the Early Church. Then scrutinize contemporary practice in the light of the agreement.

Prof. O'Donovan was also sympathetic to this approach. But indulgences must be judged in the light of the agreement and not vice-versa.

Bishop Santer reminded the Commission of the political consequences of the discussion. The claimed authority of the Pope to dispense something beyond the grave was unintelligible.

Fr. McDonald cautioned against claims too much for the agreement. The issue of authority had not yet been resolved.

Bishop Wallace said their context was intercessory. He had never preached on indulgences.

28th August p.m.

From the chair Bishop Santer asked for opinions about the Chairmen's Introduction (57(a) (86)).

Professor Wright noted the mandate for ARCIC-II was "outstanding doctrinal reasons". Could the decision to take up justification be put in the passive.

Sr. Boulding queried the Lutheran reference. So did Bishop Baycroft.

Bishop Wallace queried "in the light of the judgement".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor wanted some explanation as to why the issue had to be tackled. For many it was not an issue.

It was agreed to re-draft the section on the Lutheran-US Dialogue.

Sr. Boulding wanted the title Salvation and the role of the Church.

Bishop Wallace preferred the short title. Professor Wright agreed.

Bishop Baycroft wanted to keep the short title. Anglican Evangelicals now agreed the Church did have a role in salvation.

Fr. Akpunonu preferred to speak of 'Justification' as the subject.

Canon Hill and Professor Wright preferred the more inclusive 'Salvation'.

Professor Wright objected to the balance between Protestant and Catholic tradition.

Bishop Vogel suggested the balance be put in the past tense.

Bishop Baycroft sympathised with Professor Wright.

Bishop Santer and Archbishop Butelezi thought the division ran across, not between the Churches.

Sr. Boulding offered "One tradition, Another tradition..."

Professor Wright thought part of the problem was the confusion between history and the contemporary situation.

Bishop Santer said their original draft had associated Martin Luther and Thomas More.

Bishop Wallace wanted Martin Luther not Thomas More.

Bishop Vogel suggested "which follows Martin Luther".

Sr. Boulding felt a restricting of the para. People were not happy about two camps.



Bishop Santer again wanted something noting the differences between the theological and ecclesiastical boundaries.

Bishop Baycroft was not happy at too strong an identification of the English Reformation with the Continental Protestant Reformation.

Bishop Santer suggested something to the effect that justification was central.

Fr. McDonald agreed. But others said the Catholic tradition would also say this.

Professor Wright wanted the removal of Catholic and Protestant to an earlier part of the paragraph: "different perspectives, Protestant and Catholic".

Sr. Boulding asked whether the statement that the issue was to be taken up and the description of the different perspectives needed to be closer together.

Professor Wright asked whether all would understand 'Augustinian framework'.

Bishop Santer offered 'theological framework'.

Canon Hill wanted to retain a reference to Augustine.

Professor Wright doubted agreement on what an Augustinian framework might be.

Sr. Boulding stressed framework.

Bishop Wallace asked for the deletion of Augustine.

Canon Hill and Sr. Boulding hoped for derived from/owing much to Augustine.

Sr. Boulding asked whether others would understand "limited to its role in salvation". What other role for the Church was there.

Professor Wright "is limited to an affirmation of its role in salvation".

Bishop Santer felt this was too minimal.

Bishop Baycroft asked whether ARCIC-II was to produce a De Ecclesia.

Bishop Gitari questioned whether salvation was 'mediated' through the Church.

Fr. Akpunonu saw the Gospel and Baptism as coming to the believer through the Church.

Bishop Baycroft questioned the placing of "our free human response".

Prof. Wright offered "mediated and preached in the Church".

Sr. Boulding agreed with Bishop Gitari - an individual could come to salvation in other ways.

Bishop Vogel wanted to see a reference to a Covenantal relationship.

Bishop Baycroft hoped to see this in the text of the agreement.

Bishop Santer objected to the Church as a conglomerate of believers.

Prof. Wright suggested 'sign, steward and instrument' as in the agreement. There was general agreement to this.

Sr. Boulding asked whether it was Anglicans & Roman Catholics or members of the Commission. She felt "the completion of all things in Christ" was compressed and obscure.

Prof. Wright noted the discrepancy between "justification by faith" and "justification by grace through". Storrington did not use either. Would it be safer to just use 'justification'.

Bishop Santer suggested "the doctrine of justification" but felt "justification by faith" should be kept above.

Bishop Baycroft did not like "need no longer".

Sr. Boulding felt the three final sentences were very compressed.

Prof. Wright found "he" confusing. He proposed "God".

Bishop Gitari wanted "as far as possible the restoration of full ecclesial communion".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor wanted something to strive for. Others agreed.

Bishop Baycroft saw this as not explicitly speaking of organic unity. Canon Hill agreed. The phrase was used in the Common Declaration.

Bishop Santer asked for gaps. Some had been mentioned - re-creation; agreement was now possibly due to historical, biblical and theological study, the missionary experience as leading to unity.

Fr. Adappur felt an inspirational tone was required.

Archbishop Butelezi hoped re-creation would now come sufficiently in the main text.

Bishop Baycroft felt some reference to multilateral and bilateral dialogues.

Prof. Wright felt some reference to koinonia would be helpful - especially in the light of future work.

Bishop Baycroft wondered about hopes for further steps.

Fr. McDonald felt this would depend upon judgements on ARCIC-I.

Sr. Boulding thought thanksgiving for what we had in common and hoped to have.

Friday, 29th August, 1986 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Santer (in chair): The drafting group are still busy and so are the group doing the section on good works. The group doing the final chapters have done their work and are now back with us. Those of us who are here must now begin to look at our future work. We will discuss Tillard's paper when everyone is here together. There is also John Thornhill's, John Baycroft's and Bob Wright's paper. All of them overlap. We will begin with John Baycroft.

Bishop Baycroft: The paper is not as polished as I would have liked. I did not bring two important documents: SPUC on Local Ecumenism and the Canadian document on ecumenical collaboration. The document is open and 'in process'. It does not have international dimension: context is Canadian.

Strategy. To take a cumulative approach to problem and not isolate particular problems. Let us take all the opportunities to cooperate so as to constrain us to solve our problems. The Lund principle is taken seriously so as to make reconciliation irresistible. Regionalism is encouraged i.e. of local Churches to do something for the benefit of universal Church. Theological introduction is serious. The practical suggestions are not inflated; - we believe these proposals are restrained and hope more will be added. What we do in Canada goes far beyond what is suggested here. Document done by me in consultation with Canadian ARC and so is rather Anglican and I welcome R.C. reactions.

In detail.

Introduction reminds us that we are already in imperfect communion. Final paragraph of p.2 - 'limited eucharistic sharing' may need unpacking. At one time Anglicans were more open and then changed but in recent years more open again. Our experience of eucharistic communion precisely as food for the journey has been good. P.3, 3rd paragraph: We are not comfortable in saying together where each of us has to accept change as communities. We have to set out preconditions for reconciliation; we show need for proper discussion and commitment for inter-communion because without that the present inter-communion will not get anywhere.

Local ecumenism : with good local ecumenism we could do what is envisaged here, but some on both sides are wrong.

Steps Towards Unity is more practical section. The different proposals are not sequential (one following on after another). They are separated but all three are intended to happen together and are inseparable in practice. We need advice here on how much can we "get away with" so to speak, on sacramental sharing. There must be more of this - based on reception of Final Report - than is presently encouraged. Joint availability of penance would be very good, e.g. many Anglicans in Canada go to R.C. houses for spiritual direction. We must face some of the questions on eucharistic sharing. Most of what is suggested here can happen without the recognition of Anglican orders. But things cannot happen if we do not believe they will be eventually recognized. There must be more shared jurisdiction and decision-making.

Bishop Santer: Note difference between Tillard's paper which is on the underpinning of the future as a whole, whereas John's is more specific. In tackling both we must identify those matters of principle that we must get old of and make part of our thinking. We won't nit-pick but identify issues of theological or strategic principle.

Prof. Pobee: We must be clear what purpose of this operation is relative to John's paper. I suggest: It concerns us around this table, but we must carry our Churches with us and practical steps is a crucial instrument: we must draw them to the attention of our Churches. It is 20 years since the Malta Report and we can now put before authorities something practical related to that. In Durham I was struck when we were near our common Saints, and when Lord Ramsey was with us, I felt a wound very sharply. It is possible that those of us in dialogue here might go beyond official rules and be in "holy disobedience" together. This paper is challenging us. Do we dare? We might after this identify things we might do from our own countries and submit them to Chris or Kevin. In Africa, people are afraid to step out of line especially given economic links with the European countries where authorities stand.

Fr. Akpunonu: Thank for paper. The level of ecumenism is different in different countries. But the thing we can bring back to our own Churches is the question: do we really want unity and is there in fact fear. There are two basic issues: ministry and authority; we need a breakthrough on these matters. Each area should begin to do something; we should be those who release confidence.

Sr. Boulding: I re-echo John Pobee's experience. I think we should ask the question whether this is a "special case" of intercommunion.

Bishop Vogel: In ARCIC-I we went through this discussion on the basis that the unity of faith in that group was stronger than the unity in any one of our congregations at any one time. Do not we have a "lived" unity despite "propositional" differences. Can we find a context in which to grasp each other's identity, so overcoming constitutional completeness and difference. Our topic, our resolution on Justification by Faith to my mind provides such a context.

Abp. Butelezi The paper could be strengthened by exchange on experiences of different places. Situations vary. Intercommunion is a painful issue. Looking at experience of Churches that have tried it, it tends to become open communion and not food for the journey. Intercommunion could have the effect, so, of putting us in a position where it was more difficult to carry our churches with us. Situations vary so much, and racial and social issues complicate them.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor thanked Bishop Baycroft for his paper. We need practical and substantial encouragement from highest authorities. If we're not seeing full recognition in near future, people have a right to some direction and encouragement on road to full communion. What are we doing now? We are trying to form the basis of a statement of encouragement and indications to be made by the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury after 1988 to the churches. They could restate present discipline but invite bishops to interpret discipline more generously. We musn't, however, take away from basic principle of Church - Eucharist.

Professor Pobee We could add the area of ecumenical formation.

Bishop Santer What Bishop Murphy-O'Connor is saying is different from the issue of planning our own work. We have to ask ourselves how we are to handle the theological task entrusted to us.

Fr. Thornhill I'm trying to grasp what our work is: Steps to unity and ways we can express the unity we have. Recently it came home to me where we are situated historically - only in a very initial stage. We're exploring the unity we already have. Because we're awaiting verdicts on Final Report we don't know exactly how deep our communion is, e.g. we know in the Catholic Church the character of our unity with the Orthodox. The Anglican-Roman Catholic state is still being tested and explored. One good thing would be a liturgical expression of common faith. Inviting people to explore their faith together. Re intercommunion I think we will eventually find unity of faith. On orders: there is the real problem, e.g. do we all on ARCIC-II have the same interpretation of Cardinal Willebrands' letter on Anglican orders?

Fr. Akpunonu Should we submit to our respective authorities a paper on steps towards unity. Should we not practice kenosis. For 2000 years the Church has not ordained women, could we not exercise restraint on this issue. Unity is more important than the ordination of women. If we don't, we'll grow further apart. Intercommunion raises lots of questions which we have to face. Orders is the issue and we should take the bull by the horns on that one. Intercommunion could bring indifferentism.

Canon Hill The work of the Commission needs to be in three major sections:

1. Seeing what we can do where relations are good on the basis of existing unity. Need to find right way of encouraging local development;

2. To spell out what could happen with some degree of mutual recognition of ministries. (This must not be confused with 1)

3. We need some prophetic statement about the kind of unity we are looking for, so that the gifts we have received in separation will not be denied.

All three must be separate in our minds.

Fr. Tillard In between Roman Catholic and Orthodox there is no intercommunion - only certain cases of eucharistic hospitality with the Russians. So the problem of ministry is not the key one for intercommunion. Even if the Catholics declare that Anglican bishops are bishops, it doesn't follow there will be intercommunion.

Sr. Boulding Bishop Cormac is saying we want to suggest the content of the next common declaration. This would be very important. On common liturgical expression (cf. John Thornhill) could not the Catholics forego Mass for one Sunday.

11.30 am.

Bp. Baycroft (Reacting to comments before): You misunderstand the thrust of the paper if you focus everything on that. I'm talking about much more than eucharistic sharing. The context is wider than the "holy disobedience" perspective. We've too quickly bracketed the issue of sacramental sharing: the point is we already have it because of sacramental sharing, e.g. in John's recent episcopal consecration Catholic bishops were involved in the service as much as conscience allowed. Jurisdiction and collegiality: recognition of orders is not the sole issue. There is wider sharing now and looked for in the future.

Fr. Adappur: Two areas where we can all work together: Evangelisation: bringing people together to Christ; In-culturation: the issue of how to apply the gospel to ancient religions.

Fr. McDonald drew attention to the fact that the issue of eucharistic sharing in marriage is now increasingly being seen in the perspective of their sharing the sacrament of matrimony. Also we should not be too over-optimistic about the effect of a future common declaration of the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Note that it is the insertion of ecumenism into the Code of Canon Law that has had the greatest effect in the Catholic context.

Prof. Wright : Jean said no intercommunion between Catholics and Orthodox. Note also that there is no agreement between the two about a universal primate. In ARCIC-I we have done work on this and it may lead to agreement on this. Full ecclesial communion does not preclude there being a universal primate.

On the question of how Anglicans receive Final Report. From Anglican side the picture will not be all that clear after 1988. Note that resolutions of Lambeth Conference are not binding until accepted by the authorities of regional Churches who have voted on and accepted them. The things John Baycroft has suggested would be helped by regional responses to the Final Report. By 1988 these responses will presumably be releasable.

Bp. Santer: Liturgical celebration of what we already enjoy together in faith. We must not see this only in terms of formal liturgical experience. On question of what we have been doing already. We as Churches have also to abstain from our 'rights' to do certain things so as to realize full communion. e.g. ordination of women. The Pope's line on this has to be attended to because of the shape of unity already being discerned.

Bp. Wallace thanks John Baycroft for the paper. A similar paper drawn up between Uniting Church in Australia and RC Church - could be photocopied. The question of subsidiarity is raised which is a difficulty in RC context. Thanks Fr. Adappur for ideas about joint evangelisation. Referred to



study on Final Report in Brisbane and the commitment made by the two Archbishops.

On intercommunion, I am fairly generous in allowing Anglicans to come to communion in the Catholic Church on special occasions. I'm embarrassed not to permit reciprocity. My own view is that Anglican orders are valid but I don't feel I can set myself up in judgment on this and I don't think this Commission can.

Bp. Vogel Referred to the idea that a sacramental marriage is a new sacramental unit. The parties have a new identity and so the couple should make their decision on the basis of that.

Sr. Boulding: In this country it has been argued that there should be reciprocal communion in a mixed marriage because the union there is closer than that which exists between our Churches. Also in sacramental sharing the issue need not be orders because one side can take the other's communion within the other side's understanding of it.

Bp. Baycroft: Kenosis: I'm uncomfortable when the first suggestion on this is ordination of women, especially when the suggestion comes from males. Kenosis means not grasping and e.g. the Catholic Church needs to "let go" somewhat of the formulations of Trent. RC members of Canada ARC have not made us feel we are destroying Koinonia by ordaining women.

Dr. Gassmann Fact that no practised Catholic-Orthodox intercommunion exists, is not because recognition of orders is not sufficient but because of all sorts of other factors. The readiness for it is there on the Catholic side in Vatican II.

Also can be recognition of a bishop, priest as being such within their communion, although not in full communion.

We should not ask for eucharistic hospitality in a dialogue commission, it would seem very selfish and privileged. It would be elitist.

Fr. Thornhill: I feel the need for a special symbolic expression of communion between us, because in the common mind is a lingering suspicion that we do not really believe the same thing. It would be educational. We need more preaching from the ARCIC documents.

Bp. Baycroft: Recognition of ministries. I think inability to do this is providential at this time. Many other issues have to be dealt with before solving the most difficult issue would make any difference (cf. ordination of women).

Can. Hill Bp. Baycroft's paper began to spell out the theological basis of our unity. On the Thornhill suggestion of celebration of faith, I would support this.

Fr. Thornhill: One thing I have in mind is a credal formula, since Creeds have always developed by the Church in times of crisis.

Rev. Gassmann: In Faith and Order we are not trying to create a new ecumenical creed. We are trying to provide a common interpretation of the Nicene Creed in the light of the challenges and problems of today.

Friday, 29 August, 4 p.m.

Bp.Murphy-O'Connor in the chair.  
(going through the re-drafting of para. 19)

Fr.Tillard This para. is built on phrase "new" humanity, but the Greek word is Kainos (in which what was good in the old is saved in the new) not neos.

Prof.O'Donovan: We tried to get the balance Tillard requires.

Fr.McDonald: We use the word "new" with the resonance of Kainos as well as neos.

Prof.Chadwick: Could we in line 3 say "renewed" rather than new humanity.

Dr.Gassmann There is something completely new in our renewed humanity. Bp.Baycroft and Fr.McDonald suggested an amendment to line 6 which would rectify the misunderstanding.

Fr.Akpunonu queried the meaning of 'old humanity' in line 8, and this was discussed.

Bp.Vogel suggested : nothing "we" can do.

Prof.Pobee suggested putting (Rom.6,6,) after old humanity.

Fr.Thornhill: perspective could be more corporate.

Bp.Santer suggested amendment to 9

There was discussion of the sentence beginning "Nothing that our old...." . It was variously seen as rhetorical, clumsy, as suggesting man's total depravity, and as excluding salvation for those outside the Church.

The phrase "Christological centre" was queried and Prof.Davis' alternative was to be submitted to the drafters, i.e. "the person and work of Christ".

Fr. Akpunonu: The style of this para. differs from the remainder of the text.

The general structure of the paragraph was discussed and the second half seen by some as obscuring the total sense. Difficulty especially focussed on the sentence beginning "For humanity was" and Fr.Akpunonu and Dr.Gassmann were asked to do some work on it. Bp.Baycroft felt that we needn't be too concerned to answer the difficulties we are addressing in precisely the terms in which they have raised them.

Can.Hill queried the phrases "earlier idiom" and "form" which he felt needed more explanation.

PARA. 20

Bishop Baycroft questioned the word "individual", and felt that the corporate dimension was reduced in the paragraph.

Bishop Vogel: In line 4, could we change "total freedom" to "liberty".

Fr. Adappur queried the word "sex".

Bishop Baycroft: "fellow" humanity emphasizes masculinity.

Canon Hill: phrase "even good works". Does this mean "can be flawed" or "is always flawed".

Prof. Chadwick explained that the second one comes under a Tridentine anathema.

Fr. Akpunonu also felt that this paragraph did not flow and perceived an attempt to undermine good works.

Fr. Tillard queried phrase, "group egotism" and "egotistical element".

Prof. Wright: First sentence is very difficult to understand because of double negatives.

It was generally felt that the idea expressed in the first sentence is essential but could be put more positively.

Prof. O'Donovan said that the negatives are intended to signal possible misunderstandings and indicate that we are not falling into them. This is a characteristic of ARCIC prose.

Canon Hill suggested omission of "pride or some egotistical element".

Prof. Pobee queried "admits", five lines from the end.

Difficulty was expressed with the phrase "repeated repentance ..... freedom from sin." An amendment was accepted.

It was felt by several that 20 was too negative in its view of the human condition. There was no mention of the Holy Spirit. Others felt the paragraphs were better than previously because the Storrington draft said too little about evil and sin.

Prof. Chadwick: This paragraph is a polemic against individualism. Some seem to have found it gloomy. Perhaps it needs more on the "Christian dance".

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor: The question of the style of this paragraph will have to be looked at.

PARA. 21.

Fr. Soane: This is intended to pick up elements of para. 6 of earlier draft.

"Journey of faith" was substituted for "pilgrimage".

Sr. Boulding suggested "bound together in prayer".

Fr. Akpunonu questioned the last sentence "not intended to earn divine favour".

Fr. Soane explained that this phrase was to show devotional acts do not automatically earn God's favour in a contractual way. Prof. Chadwick's amendment was accepted.

Prof. O'Donovan explained the purpose of the first sentence.

PARA. 21(a)

Bishop Vogel queried the third sentence "reward ..... delight". The sentence was discussed.

Dr. Gassmann queried "completion" as open to misunderstanding.

The need was felt for a clearer eschatological perspective in what is said about reward. It was asked whether the beatific vision is intended by "reward". Bishop Santer was to consult with the drafters to bring out the eschatological dimension more.

Fr. Tillard: "merit" is not a purely R.C. notion. The problem is more complicated than the paragraph suggests. Even in New Testament (Jones) there is a link between what we do and what God does with us.

Prof. O'Donovan said the first sentence was intended to signal that Christian merit is an R.C. rather than an Anglican notion.

There was discussion between Fr. Tillard and Dr. Gassmann as to the way in which justification and good works relate to one another, Tillard making the point that the two are in a real sense related to one another. Fr. Akpunonu made the point that the two can never be separated. Bishop Santer said that more could be said on the relation between the two in para. 19. Canon Hill suggested the reinsertion of the Storrington Scriptural sentences to help Tillard and Akpunonu's concerns.

Prof. Chadwick suggested that the first sentence of 2/a be deleted and this was proposed as a possibility, and referred to the drafters.

30 August, a.m.

Bishop M. Santer opened discussion on the final paras. (27-29) of 64 (a).

PARA. 27

Bp. Baycroft had two little problems. But always in the 1st sentence was just too strong. This was true under the conditions of history.

Bp. Santer offered: "which in this world is always in need".

Bp. Baycroft also questioned "subject to imperfection and human limitation" in the final sentence. Finitude was not sinful.

Bp. Santer proposed "marked by human limitation and imperfection."

Sr. Boulding found the reference to pietism and politics unclear.

Fr. Tillard proposed "nor a political or social programme".

Fr. McDonald (for Prof. O'Donovan) felt the reference to Word and Sacrament was unnecessary.

But Fr. Tillard wanted this in the <sup>light</sup> of the whole agreement. Prof. O'Donovan also found "self-centered concern" too narrow. Fr. McDonald agreed.

Dr. Gassmann felt this was acceptable.

Sr. Boulding tried "self-centeredness".

Bp. Santer asked whether "are thus enabled to act freely" went too far.

Prof. Pobe suggested "are thus empowered".

PARA 28

Bp. Baycroft urged the addition of "addressing individuals and communities" for the sake of missiological principle. Good news only for individuals would not do.

Bp. Santer did not find the totality of mission in this sentence. The colon made these exhaustive.

Prof. Davis referred Bp. Santer to the previous sentence.

Bp. Wallace wanted to see something about building up community.

Fr. Tillard had the idea of adding "announcing the laws of the new humanity,.....".

Bp. Baycroft tried: "... as expressing, for example, in witness against...."

Prof. Wright did not find Fr. Tillard's suggestion helpful. There was no mention of worship. Fr. Thornhill liked a reference to the new humanity.

Dr. Gassmann tried "announcing and celebrating God's life sustaining....."

Bp. Baycroft tried "the ways of the new humanity".

Bp. Santer felt law belonged here. It fitted the social context.

Prof. Davis offered "announcing the arrival of the new creation..." Begin with the positive, then go on to witnessing. This received good support.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor asked for the "participation of the Church in Christ's mission" to be taken up into the previous sentence. This was accepted.

Bp. Baycroft liked the reference to law in Fr. Tillard's suggestion. Otherwise he was very happy at Prof. Davis' suggestion. The "ways" of the new humanity reflected the Torah.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor thought that if all three sentences were read together with the lifting up of the first part of the sentence referring to participation in Christ's mission all would be included.

Fr. McDonald (for prof. O'Donovan) suggested 'agent' for 'agency'. He also found the sentence too weak. Just settlements hardly covered Hitler.

Fr. Akpunonu wondered about the meaning of provisional settlements.

Sr. Boulding suggested "such settlements are by nature provisional".

Paragraph 29

Sr. Boulding wondered whether "tried to express... attempted to realize should enable" would be more accurate. The latter was accepted.

Bishop Santer suggested "the whole doctrine of salvation".

Bishop Santer then invited discussion on paragraph 1.

Bishop Baycroft questioned "in the hope of resurrection". This was deleted.

Fr. Tillard The purpose of God was to restore us to union with each other as well as with God. The draft did not reflect Irenaeus' anakephaliosis.

Bishop Santer was unhappy at the restoration.

Fr. Akpunonu suggested the addition "and with one another."

Canon Hill tried "to draw all humanity into unity". Fr. Tillard and Bishop Baycroft liked this but others demurred.

Fr. Thornhill offered "the whole human family".

Fr. Tillard had a solution "to draw all humanity into communion". Dr. Gassmann felt Fr. Tillard was a koinonia maniac!

Fr. Akpunonu liked the biblical language of the paragraph.

Bishop Santer tried out "into communion with himself" and "... to bring us into union with himself and one another". He also questioned the repeated use of 'empower'. Was this irresistable grace.

Professor Pobee said this referred to the Holy Spirit. Fr. McDonald agreed: this referred to the dynamics of God.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor tried "call and enable".

Fr. Thornhill "us and opens up for us the way to find him anew".

This was accepted.

Professor Wright asked for the removal of the suggestion that heaven was in need of reconciliation.

Bishop Murphy O'Connor suggested "The Spirit of God is poured into the hearts....".

Professor Pobee felt the "powers of evil" needed to be restored.

Bishop Baycroft suggested "The powers of evil, sin and death..."

Professor Wright and Fr. Tillard asked whether this whole sentence was governed by Christ's life, death and resurrection. The punctuation was unclear.

Bishop Santer re-drafted.

Sr. Boulding asked for "as a pure unmerited gift."

Professor Wright asked for this to be put at the end: "All this is pure unmerited gift".

Dr. Gassmann asked for the addition of a eucharistic reference. He suggested "sustained through Word and Sacrament".

Professor Pobee asked for "salvation by faith through the grace of God" as in Ephesians.

Fr. McDonald felt this would narrow the meaning of salvation.

Professor Davis saw faith as the constant appropriation of salvation in the New Testament.

Professor Wright reminded the Commission that this phrase had been agreed at Graymoor.

Fr. McDonald said the appropriation was dealt with later.

Fr. Tillard wanted the "grace of Christ".



Dr. Gassmann offered "as the Church proclaims the good news, the heart of its message must be salvation through the grace of God in Christ".

Bishop Santer asked for "it has received from God".

These were accepted.

Fr. Tillard queried 'healing'.

Prof. Davis proposed "reconciliation".

Fr. McDonald felt this was over-used.

Bishop Santer then invited discussion of Salvation & Good Works as re-drafted.

PARA. 19.

Fr. Adappur asked for 'operate' instead of 'proceed'.

Fr. Tillard was not happy with "Nothing that our old humanity can do ....." What of the instrumentality to salvation of the people of the Old Testament. He agreed with the intention of the sentence but it was wrong.

Prof. Chadwick offered: "God's transforming power makes possible what we left to ourselves cannot do." This would replace "Nothing that our old humanity ....."

Accepted.

Prof. Wright questioned the position of "living faith ....."

Sr. Boulding suggested it be put before the previous sentence. This was accepted.

Fr. McDonald: "We show the force of the Scriptural denial ....."

Prof. Wright asked then for the "the force of the affirmation" later.

Fr. Tillard did not know the meaning of humanity created to live in activity.

Dr. Gassmann proposed: "to live in activity and freedom before God".

Fr. Adappur suggested "created to live and act in freedom before God".

Fr. Tillard wanted "in order to ....."

Bishop Vogel wanted some adverbs.

Bishop Wallace wanted 'intended' for 'created'

Prof. O'Donovan felt the note of re-creation was important.

Bishop Santer tried "made to live" .

Sr. Boulding was still not happy with the revised sentence.

Prof. Davis : "A renewed human existence acts out the freedom for which it was created. It cannot act entirely in the interior realm but must manifest itself....." This was accepted.



Saturday, 30th August, p.m.

From the chair Bp.Santer invited continued discussion on para. 19.

Prof.Davis added: "but must manifest itself by bringing forth the fruits of righteousness".

Fr.Tillard did not care for the "decisive verdict".

Can.Hill said in the earlier draft this had explained a now deleted part of the sentence.

Bp.Baycroft felt far too much was being packed into this sentence. He had an alternative.

Prof.Davis offered: "God's favourable action towards us finds its correspondence in our lives to which the true shape of human freedom is restored".

Bp.Murphy-O'Connor asked that John Baycroft's draft be sent to the drafters alongside Prof. Davis.

PARA. 20

Bp.Baycroft felt sensuality was a good thing.

Can.Hill suggested "the lust for power....."

Bp.Santer proposed "selfish pleasure"

Prof.Davis still felt racism had to be included.

Prof.O'Donovan understood "group egotism" as conveying this. The phrase was from Reinhold Niebuhr.

Prof.Chadwick offered "expressing itself in racial discrimination"....."

Sr.Boulding wanted an explication of "group egotism"

Prof.Wright agreed.

Fr.McDonald was anxious not to suggest that the only sins were social. .

Bp.Santer asked Prof.Davis, Prof.Chadwick and Fr. Tillard to draft.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor was unhappy at the construction of the first sentence.

Prof.Davis questioned "finds fulfilment in community".  
Bp.Santer agreed.

Bp.Vogel offered "communion"

Bp.Santer added "with others"

Fr.Tillard was still unhappy at "without determinate structure".  
Fr.Soane offered "moral norms". - Prof.Davis offered "social and moral responsibilities".

Professor Davis recommended "Life in Christ is liberated from the demonic forces of group egotism, racism, classism and sexism which affect and inhibit all of human society and from the restless urge for domination, power, honour, wealth and selfish pleasures".

Professor Chadwick asked for the retention of 'group egotism'.

Professor Wright preferred to keep "lust for". This was accepted.

Fr. Soane now proposed the addition of "a determinate structure of personal and social obligations and rights."

Fr. Tillard felt the problem was because of the avoidance of the word 'law'. One sentence was required defining freedom.

Professor O'Donovan reminded him that they had mentioned "the commandments of God."

Bishop Wallace suggested "...without moral obligations."

Bishop Santer and Fr. Soane felt this ignored social obligation.

Professor Chadwick wanted to guard the Commission against the suspicion of antinomianism.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor drafted "does not imply an isolated life but rather one lived in a community governed by moral and social obligations."

Fr. Tillard then suggested that the sentence "Our liberation..." be now put before the previous sentence.

Fr. Tillard wanted "norms". Others much preferred "obligations".

Fr. Soane warned against writing moral theology. Books had been written on this subject.

Canon Hill queried "...peace and more".

Bishop Baycroft wanted "God's holy will and commandments".

Para. 21

Sr. Boulding asked for a re-ordering of the sentence "To one who..."

PARA. 21(a)

Fr. Tillard suggested "the Christian rests his confidence in the power, mercy ..... and does not trust in his or her own merits." He objected to the word 'only' and the way it was put.

Prof. Chadwick observed that the phrase was from Bellarmine.

Prof. Davis wanted the beatific vision with the society of the redeemed.

Fr. McDonald tried "They will be one with the society of the redeemed in rejoicing in the vision of God". This was accepted.

Fr. Tillard returned with "In contemplating ultimate destiny, Christians rest confidently in the power, mercy and loving kindness of God. They do not trust in their own merits, but pray that ....."

Prof. Chadwick added "but in Christ's".

Fr. Yarnold still did not like "ultimate destiny". It was agreed to delete.

Prof. Chadwick then proposed "for salvation".

The section was then referred to the drafting group.

Bishop Santer then returned to Indulgences.

Prof. Wright asked what the conclusion claimed.

Dr. Gassmann spoke of "difference in theological interpretation, ecclesiological emphasis or devotional practice" as found in the new 29.

Prof. Wright now felt it was not necessary.

This was agreed, providing Bishop Cameron was also happy.

Bishop Santer then asked whether the Commission wanted footnotes on the 16th Century Formularies. These were felt to be desirable.

Sunday, 31st August

10.40 a.m.

The Commission began its final reading of "Salvation and the Church".

Para. 2. Professor Chadwick suggested an amendment "Anglican theologians reacted to the decree in a variety of ways, some sympathetic, others critical at least on particular points". This was included in the text.

6. It was agreed to include "The Anglican theologians of the Reformation taking "by faith alone" to mean "only for the merits of Christ" also held good works to be not irrelevant to salvation but imperfect and therefore inadequate. They saw good works as a necessary demonstration of faith and faith itself as inseparable from love.

Para.12. The second last sentence was changed to "Christians may never presume on their perseverance, but should live their lives with a sure confidence in God's grace".

Para. 13 "cf John 10, 10" was added after the scripture references on line 6.

The sentence beginning at line 9 was altered to "The language of expiation or propitiation (hilasterion etc.) is drawn from the context of sacrifice and denotes the putting away of sin and the re-establishment of right relationship with God".

31st August p.m.

The Co-Chairmen continued to work through the final draft.

Para. 18 Fr. Tillard wanted a mention of the Holy Spirit as agent.

Bishop Cameron tried "is that work of God". This was accepted.

Professor O'Donovan asked whether judgement was of works or grace.

Bishop Cameron suggested the sentence ended at Holy Spirit. This was accepted.

Professor Chadwick asked for the deletion of "always". This was accepted.

Fr. Tillard asked for a further consideration of para. 16. The impression was given that sanctification was a reward.

Bishop Santer proposed the deletion of the reference to reward. The deletion was accepted.

Paras. 19-24

Professor O'Donovan regretted the changes in 19. The plenary had worked a great deal on the original 19. The person and work of Christ, and the New Humanity, had gone. It was less balanced.

Fr. Soane also noted the spelling out of the group egotisms had gone.

Fr. Yarnold said they were in the conclusion.

Fr. Tillard also felt the omission of definition of good works on the basis of the new creation.

Mrs. Tanner said the drafters had not found the New Humanity in para. 13. It would have meant the reworking of much earlier material.

Bishop Cameron said they had looked for the controlling aim of the paragraph. He did not feel the purpose of the paper was to work out the cosmic dimension of salvation. The New Humanity was more in the area of philosophical theology than the New Testament.

Bishop Santer asked the Commission whether it wished now to take this as the basic text or not.

Fr. Tillard wanted some of the important insights in the second part of the old paragraph 19.

Professor Wright preferred the old 19.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor<sup>felt</sup> some would need to work on additions.

By 14 to 2 it was decided to use the new 19 as the working text.

Para. 19

Professor O'Donovan asked for a better balance as in the second part of the earlier draft.

Professor Chadwick suggested that the first 16 lines of the earlier draft should be put before 19.

Fr. Tillard suggested 're-creation in the image of God through sanctification' would be better than new humanity.

Fr. Soane felt this could still be interpreted as individualistic.

Para. 21 Professor O'Donovan was uneasy at characterized

Professor Chadwick proposed 'impaired'. This was accepted.

Professor Chadwick asked whether the last sentence was a necessary flag.

Fr. Yarnold suggested "the paradox".

It was decided to add simul justus et peccata (if possible with a reference to Augustine).

After accepting 20-26 Bishop Santer asked whether this affected the drafters' work on 19.

Fr. Thornhill was slightly uneasy at the footnote on merit. Was it minimalist?

Fr. Yarnold suggested "from deserve , to be granted' , to obtain". This was accepted.

Bishop Santer Again put his question.

The drafters thought the addition could be done, but they found difficulty in immediately grasping how the material related to the other draft.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor moved to paras. 25-32.

Para. 26

Fr. Akpunonu was unclear as to the wisdom of "sign of the compassion".

Dr. Gassmann suggested a re-ordering of the sentence.

Para. 30 Bishop Vogel proposed the deletion of the penultimate sentence. Fr. Tillard opposed.

Professor Wright asked for the restoration of koinonia to make sense of the penultimate sentence.

Professor Wright suggested the shortening of the penultimate sentence.

Professor O'Donovan added "Yet...". This was accepted.

Bishop Santer suggested "the first-fruits and not yet the harvest".

Fr. Akpunonu "final harvest". This was accepted in preference to other variants.

Para. 31 Professor O'Donovan was still unhappy at "just settlements".

Professor Wright and others suggested a re-draft which was accepted.

Professor Davis protested that yesterday's draft (accepted by a majority) had been set aside.

Professor Wright now preferred the drafters' version - for its logical connection with the rest of the document.

The drafters explained they had difficulty in following the meaning of the first lines. The theme of the paragraph was mission. This had been put at the beginning. There was discussion about procedure and content.



Bishop Baycroft was concerned that the created order and sacredness of communities had been lost.

Bishop Cameron had difficulty in putting individuals and communities in the same category.

Professor O'Donovan found the new version timid.

Dr. Gassmann pointed out that the drafting group had been outside the plenary discussion.

1st September, 8 p.m.

The final draft of 19 was discussed and the following addition was proposed by Fr. Tillard and accepted for inclusion at the beginning of the final paragraph:

"In as much as we are recreated in his 'own image and likeness' God involves us in what he freely does to realise our salvation". This to be followed by a quote from S. Augustine.

The paragraph was agreed with amendments.

The Chairman told the Commission that Professor Chadwick would prepare a set of footnotes which would be seen by the Commission over the next few days.

The title of the document was discussed, Fr. Yarnold suggesting "Salvation and Justification" rather than "Salvation and the Church". There was discussion of this. Some, specially Fr. Tillard opposing it. It was agreed that a decision be taken tomorrow.

The last draft of 31 was discussed and agreed after a few amendments. Agreement on this brought discussion of the document to a close.

2nd September, 1986. 9.30 a.m.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor (Chairman) welcomed Fr. Duprey.

Fr. Tillard presented his papers. The first paper is in two parts. In the first part the theology of koinonia is explained (pp. 1-8). It is a gift received, a product of the grace of salvation. For apostolic faith, to be saved is not just to be rescued from sin but to be saved from mortal division - fullness of reconciliation. The grace of reconciliation aims at a totality. The Church is those who accept to live in this new state.

One definition of Baptism is "to enter into belonging to Christ by sacrament of water" - this is inadequate. To be baptised is to become a member of the body of Christ, to enter the holy nation etc. One becomes a member of Christ by becoming incorporated into the Church. They are simultaneous. Since Pentecost, Christ is inseparable from his ecclesial body. He is the Bridegroom and is inseparable from the Bride.

Koinonia designates this state of salvation; the unshakeable unity of the person and work of Jesus. What was the OT qahal is now the Christian koinonia and united now by the Word made Flesh (as the qahal was united by the Word). A community cannot be fully the Church without this double relation; the 'multitude' of the New Testament consists of two groups: the sons of the prophets and the covenant on the one hand, and on the other hand are the gentiles. The multitude called to make up the Christian koinonia is both and therefore the totality of the human race. But it is not the totality of the human race as such, but as reconciled.

The Acts see in the events of Pentecost the reversal of Babel. It is a new unity (kaine not neos) in the cross of Christ. Before humanity was divided into two impenetrable blocks. Now the dividing wall of hostility has been broken down. The Body of Christ consists of people who would normally be divided. The Church is those who are no longer separated before Christ. So the scandal of "separated Christians". But the new unity is not a "genus tertium". Both sides are reconciled while remaining different. In modern language this community is "pluralistic". In the New Testament we see that Jewish and Gentile Christians live the same faith in very different ways. In the New Testament it is in so far as Jews and Gentiles are both one body that the mystery of Christ is revealed.

Our koinonia with one another is rooted in that with the Father. But the unity between Christians is their passage to union with the Father. They are one as the Father and Son are one and because Father and Son are one.

Unity and pluralism are not a symbiosis but the refraction of the divine life in the density of the saved human reality. Hence the unbreakable link of love of God and love of others.

In the Church witness is authentic because of koinonia which is the very content of the gift of salvation. So every situation that breaks koinonia is an offence against the gift of God. To fail to seek to restore communion is to be unfaithful to God.

2nd part (beginning p. 9 of English text).

To be in koinonia means to live in a certain way. Koinonia is shared possession of one reality. (1) Shared reality which causes unity  
(2) experience of sharing this unique reality. It is essential to live, behave

in brotherly behaviour as those forming one body. In Christ we can open up to one another, we are in God's koinonia. "We know that we have passed from death to life since we love the brethren". The division of Christians into several blocks calls into question the koinonia of God himself. It makes salvation something merely offered and an obstacle to its full realisation in human reality. So it is a question about God before a question of witness before the world.

It is essential to re-evangelise our two Churches on this point. This is infinitely more serious than disobeying a commandment of Christ. It touches the eternal design of the living God. This comes about through communion in what the Son of God suffered. In this we are engrafted on to Christ. We are far even <sup>from</sup> being aware of this dimension of being a Christian. The koinonia lived by people who live a contradiction of koinonia's very meaning. In this, something of the mystery of the last times is obscured.

Fraternal koinonia must also be lived in a community of sharing until there is a flow of mutual interest in each other's lives (cf Acts texts on p. 14). epi to auto means solidarity in one unique reality in a oneness of mind and heart.

This all points an accusing finger at our present situation. Our Churches know nothing of the full sharing implied in koinonia; they do not live the full truth of God's grace. The Early Church realised that this koinonia cannot be fully lived in the local Church in isolation. The goal of community is not just charity but something dogmatic in St. Paul (cf Galatians). The koinonia needs to live between all the local Churches. A koinonia of mutual aid and even of sharing in this is a worldwide "in Christo". This leads to a conclusion heavy with ecclesiological consequences.

(p. 20). To be underlined that nothing said so far has been presented in juridical categories. Koinonia is not the model among others: it transcends them all and is dogmatic basis of all the rest.

3rd section (p. 22 ff) Koinonia as fruit of the Eucharist of the Lord.

We cannot be in koinonia if we are disagreed on essential articles of faith.

\* \* \* \* \*

Fr. Tillard read the second of his papers in full (ARCIC-II, 55/2).

\* \* \* \* \*

11.20 a.m.

Fr. Tillard answered questions on his paper.

Fr. Soane asked how Eucharist in Fr. Tillard's paper related to Word: the people are gathered by the Word. Fr. Tillard said that in the Eucharist Word and Sacrament are one. The synaxis is the coming together of the people to hear the Word and share in the body and blood of Christ. It's not either or.

Sr. Cecily asked for an expansion of the word "quality" on p.4 (fourth line of section 2) and Fr. Tillard explained that it refers to the reconciled character of the Christian community.

Bp. Cameron questioned the idea that koinonia is the one model in which all others must fit. He said he was almost persuaded it was, but we need to study it.

Bp. Mark said that Fr. Tillard's paper had refuted the idea that a koinonia theology was a bland, triumphalist theology unrelated to the theology of the Cross.

Prof. Wright asked to what extent ARCIC should buy into a koinonia theology. He wandered to what extent it was representative of RC theology.

Fr. Duprey said koinonia was the source of other images like People of God. The trouble is the word has become fashionable and is not fully understood by everyone. But ecumenism actually requires a theology of communion.

Can. Hill: Prof. Wright has put his finger on a problem for Anglicans. Sometimes in England people have a superficial understanding of koinonia, especially those critical of ARCIC. We need to unpack its richness in the context of ARCIC-II.

Prof. Chadwick: At the Rome Synod most bishops were un-sympathetic to CDF document on the Church and supported a theology of communion. We must remember that this is an issue that affects us all. The issue is what are the limits of diversity and pluralism compatible with koinonia. Anglicans live with a lot of diversity. Anglicans would like however, to be cum Petro but want to know to what extent they have to be sub Petro.

Sr. Boulding: People of God is a notion that has to be taken account of.

Fr. Thornhill It can be a synonym of koinonia. The CDF document on the Church should not be taken too seriously. I publicly dissociated myself from it. The Synod Relatio vindicated my opinion.

Fr.Yarnold Commended the paper. On models: one shouldn't just think of a model as an analogy or metaphor. No one concept can bring out all the truth of the Church and one dimension not brought out so much by koinonia is the eschatological one; pilgrim Church captures something of this.

Fr.Tillard Koinonia cannot be just a model. The pilgrim Church moves forward as koinonia.

Notion of People of God according to St.John Chrysostom: it is only because of koinonia that the People of God is a people. Otherwise it is a collection of tribes.

Bp.Baycroft: The idea that this is the model worries me. Koinonia theology is reflection on the reality of koinonia which is itself the fundamental reality: this might be a better perspective. Certainly we mustn't use it as a weapon with which to beat each other. We need to concentrate on the reconciling possibilities.

Prof.O'Donovan: In championing Koinonia we must remember that to use the word is not to grasp the reality. A word can never fully embody the reality.

Mrs.Tanner : Fr.Tillard needn't apologise for challenging Anglicans on the Lambeth Quadrilateral. If we endorse ARCIC-I we will need to go beyond it. She asked about unity-plurality in the context of different cultures.

There was some discussion of the Lambeth Quadrilateral: Gospel Sacraments; Scriptures; Ecumenical Creeds; the Apostolic Ministry. Can.Hill stressed the importance of seeing the fourth element in relation to ARCIC on ministry. This makes it a developing thing. Bp.Santer said the same was true of the Creeds.

Bp.Santer: We mustn't in our unity -diversity discussion want to canonise either Anglicanism or Roman Catholicism for ever. Traditions can get fossilized. In England Anglican and Roman Catholic culture are very interlocked. We mustn't e.g. canonise pan-Anglicanism.

Prof.O'Donovan: The Lambeth Quadrilateral was a weapon to unchurch the non-episcopal Churches and has not been helpful in Anglican - Free Church discussions. It's an unhappy document which makes legalistic requirements without ecclesiological basis and should be left to die. We should develop a picture of unity and then ask others whether they feel able to share it.

Prof.Davis: We must see this in the context of the question of the future of Ecclesia Anglicana. Black Anglicans have been looking at what are the main elements of Anglican doctrine. Not that by the year 2000 Anglicans will no longer be predominantly white or Northern.

Fr. Dupré: It is clear that we must all change if we are to realise unity. The notion of identity is sometimes used to resist change. Some people cannot assimilate new notions and models too easily. We have to acknowledge that one faith can be expressed in different theological regimes. The Uniate Church has been a bad experience in the Catholic Church: it has involved a movement from Church to tribe. It is not the way forward: it lacks a true theology of communion.

Fr. Thornhill: Theology is koinonia put into a time perspective, really. How now do we talk about tradition in relation to koinonia. Relation paradosis - koinonia.

Fr. Yarnold : We must not give the impression that we know what the shape of the future Church will be e.g. that Anglicans in a particular place must become Catholics or vice-versa.

Bp. Baycroft expressed reserve about jettisoning the Lambeth Quadrilateral, but needs to be developed so as to be integrated with the demands of a theology of koinonia.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: Jean's paper is profoundly challenging and takes us to a quite new stage in our work: we need to reflect carefully on its implications.

The afternoon agenda was discussed.

The title of the new document was discussed.

2nd September, 400 pm.

Bp. Santer in the chair.

The two papers relating to the issue of women's ordination (by John Thornhill and Bob Wright) were presented.

John Thornhill

The issue of Women's ordination confronts us with issues of ecclesiology that are definitely on our agenda. The authority question remains an outstanding issue between us. My paper sets out how RC theology perceives this issue. It's a recent question and arises against the background of a profound cultural shift on the place and the role of women. Recent also for Anglicans. There is no consensus in the Anglican Church. Concerning the RC response to this question: note that the RC Church speaks with a living voice in all ages and cultures and thus is an expression of koinonia; its authentic teaching which is based on the fact that the Church itself has chosen to interpret the Gospel. In this area we have to take account of the manner of Church teaching and of the content. With what authority is the Church teaching and is the matter of its teaching central to the deposit of faith? We have to distinguish especially between definitive and non-definitive teaching. In this century there has been continuing reflection on the nature of authentic teaching and how it is to be received.

It is in this context that the CDF teaching on Women's ordination must be seen. It is not "definitive teaching". It is authentic teaching; the view of the RC Church making an initial response. It is a declaration and accompanied by an official commentary. It presents the tradition but doesn't seek to prove its position. Clear that the ruling acknowledges a strong minority voice on this issue. So, what is prophetic fidelity to the Tradition? This is the question that surfaces strongly here. It doesn't just mean repeating what has been said in the past.

We may also look at this against background of the Final Report. Central to this is that the Lord is present in and speaks in the Church. All we have to say in this area must be grounded in supposition of the koinonia; the presence of the Lord in the Church (cf. Norgren's view that the Final Report's bearing on an issue like this has not been tested). The Anglican Church is confronted with having to carry out this testing. Creative fidelity to Tradition called for here. Important also here is the interaction of people and bishops in this creative fidelity to Tradition. Neither alone can perform this function. There must be fidelity to one's own tradition but must be recognized by others in the koinonia as part of authentic tradition. We can't say "this is our decision and we don't criticize your decision". In the koinonia theology each Church must recognize itself in the other Church.

In conclusion the theology of male-female identities needs to be "depthed" in this discussion. No final 'yes' or 'no' has surfaced on this nor have the critical arguments finally surfaced. I think this situation calls the Anglican Church to a new depthing of its own identity. It was only when I joined ARCIC that I began to hear the living voice of the Anglican Church. In the RC Church this

must be discussed in a spirit of poverty before God as we face this new question. But we must see the unity of the Church as basic in this area.

Prof. O'Donovan asked for clarification on the criticism of Anglican process on p.11.

Fr. Thornhill explained that he thought no Church could move on this without reference to the wider Church.

Bp. Vogel agreed that in the 70's there was not this koinonia awareness in the Episcopal Church in the USA; only of the integrity of the individual local Church.

Fr. Thornhill: We cannot know whether we are right on this matter until it has been accepted by the Church. It is irresponsible to act prescinding from this.

Bp. Vogel: In US Episcopal Church view is that it's only by doing it that the Church gets to a position of confronting the question and so deciding.

Bp. Baycroft: The Anglican process did involve consultation and the building up of consensus. It was agreed that we would not excommunicate one another over this. What has been more divisive: The Church of Canada's decision to go ahead with this, or the Church of England's decision not to? Consensus has built up in the Canadian Church. How long do you wait before doing something you believe is right?

Prof. O'Donovan: Does John Thornhill think it is a plausible process in principle that this is a matter that is to be decided locally? We are universally agreed in the Anglican Communion that this is a thing that can be decided locally. Is that acceptable procedure?

Fr. Thornhill: Yes in a universal Church, but not a particular Church. It may be though that this is eventually the way it must be decided.

Bp. Santer: Note that this is an issue of ministry and ministry is something that is universal. It's of the essence of ministry that every minister is a minister of Christ. In my view the problem with the consultation on this was the view that the theological issue of women's ordination can be decided locally.

Sr. Boulding: What is the status of consultative process in Canada if you can say in advance that this will not be a Church-dividing issue?

Prof. O'Donovan: Issue is both theological and pastoral.

Fr. Akpunonu: We are mixing up theology with pastoral/canonical implications. Orders is a sacrament which is given and Church must discern whether the sacrament can be given to women. It is a theological issue and it is that that must be addressed.



Prof. Wright: Introduced the bibliography and reading material that he had prepared for members. He introduced his paper (ARCIC-II 58/1 (86)).

It is good that the highest authorities of both Churches now see this issue as one that can and should be addressed in the context of ARCIC (cf the paper). The seven approaches are seven possible ways into this topic. People outside will want us to give some indication of how we are going to approach this issue. What ARCIC has before it now is not an obstacle but an opportunity.

Fr. Yarnold: I would like to pick up the question of whether pluriformity over this issue is an obstacle to koinonia. After both sides respond officially to ARCIC-I there needs to be some kind of new stage, hopefully some degree of intercommunion even if not reciprocal. Ideally, though, we need it to be reciprocal and this means some degree of recognition of ministries. I would like to explore possibility of some degree of recognition of ministries even if we cannot recognise all people in those ministries. Can't we say that we recognise the orders of another Church but cannot yet recognise the orders of women? Is there a way forward here?

Fr. Akpunonu: The fact that not everyone in the Anglican Communion accepts women's orders is cause of disunity among Anglicans. This development comes from the women's movement in Western culture.

Bishop Wallace: I agree with Ted Yarnold. Cannot we say we recognise Anglican orders but for the time being we cannot participate in services at which women preside?

Arbp. Butelezi: Do we yet have sufficient arguments to take a definitive position? The fact that we do not feel we can do it now does not mean we never will. We have a canonical position on this but remember that Canon Law is rooted in theology which develops.

Sr. Boulding: I do not think Ted Yarnold's position would work, viz. to recognise some of another Church's ministers but not others.

Prof. O'Donovan: Would this mean that the Anglican Church would have to indefinitely forswear ordaining women bishops?

Mrs. Tanner: We have spoken about koinonia but some women say that the Church must have koinonia in order to manifest the true character of the unity and diversity of the Church. What is happening in the Church of England at the moment damages the unity that exists. If Ted's suggestion went through it would spoil the koinonia within the Anglican Communion as well as the communion between Catholics and Anglicans.

Bishop Vogel: There are reasons for going ahead with this. All decisions are based on experience which is provisional. Arguments persuade some but not others because of the horizons of discourse in which we are talking.

2nd Sept. 8 p.m. Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in chair.

The title was discussed and it was decided that it would be Salvation and the Church but that Justification by Faith would figure in the introduction and the blurb. A series of footnotes were introduced by Canon Hill and after amendments, some were approved. It was agreed that they should go at the end of the text.

The press release was distributed and various amendments suggested.

3rd September a.m.

Bishop Santer asked the Commission to discuss its priorities. Should ARCIC simply react to issues set before it. He asked for thought on the conclusion of Jean Tillard's paper, the paper by John Baycroft and the Observation by Christopher Hill.

Professor O'Donovan asked about the status of the correspondence about the ordination of women. The Secretaries noted that the issue was on the agenda. It was not yet agreed how it should be handled.

Bishop Santer wanted the ordination of women set in the wider context of growth towards unity.

Bishop Baycroft and Professor Wright still hoped for some discussion of this - it would be difficult to go back to North America and only say the Commission was working on koinonia.

Fr. McDonald stressed the need for a shared grasp of koinonia before the problem could be effectively dealt with. This needed to be signalled.

Bishop Baycroft agreed. But it was of urgency that the Commission said it was to study the impact of the ordination of women on the koinonia. This allowed a fair discussion on both sides. But the Commission needed help from the outside. He suggested a sub-commission of twelve members: six for ARCIC, 6 from outside and to be women. It was important that women and men could equally make their contribution. ARCIC would not censor this work.

Fr. Akpunonu urged the necessity for a solid theological background first. We must not be stempeded. He proposed a 'Pleshey' meeting on koinonia.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor found Professor Wright's 5th approach most appealing. He proposed a paper on the process of authority relating to the ordination of women in both communions. This would fit in with work on koinonia. Another paper would look at the practical implications of koinonia.

Canon Hill urged an integrated approach. Koinonia and its practical implications - within them the reconciliation of ministries and the ordination of women.

Professor Pobee wanted to see the problem in the context of ministry.

Sr. Boulding agreed. But stressed ministries.

Bishop Cameron and Professor Wright sympathized with Bishop Cormac's suggestion - linked to the conclusion of Jean Tillard's paper.

Fr. Yarnold also wanted some attention to the degree of reconciliation possible before agreement on the ordination of women. But something practical was a matter of urgency for people in time for the Malta anniversary and the verdict of the Churches on ARCIC-I in 1988.

Fr. Adappur explained the cultural and religious background to Indian situation. Reflection by ARCIC must be in a global perspective. The sincere convictions of those who ordain women were impressive. But it was not easy to come to.

Canon Hill repeated his plea for an integrated approach - as suggested in his Observation.

Fr. Tillard recalled that both Communion were in dialogue with the Orthodox Church.

Professor O'Donovan warned against the temptation of approaching the problem deductively from ecclesiological principles. The area had to be trawled for the real theological issues. The debate was often a covert debate on creation. He hoped and expected the straighter we faced this the more agreement there would be. The answer was not wrapped up in ARCIC-II.

Fr. Yarnold also wanted work on possible changes in Roman Catholic discipline.

Fr. Adappur still felt Jean Tillard's paper was the best place to start. He did not want to study Apostolicae Curae for the next five years. All hinged on koinonia.

Mrs. Tanner was confused by the host of good things. She asked for clarifications from Christopher Hill, Jean Tillard and Oliver O'Donovan.

Canon Hill said he saw some work being published before others.

Fr. Tillard explained that the Orthodox were part of the sensus fidelium. Their position must not be dismissed as foolish. Strict dogmatic reasons pro and contra could not be found: it was a matter of apostolic ethos.

Professor O'Donovan did not know how long his approach would take. He was afraid of walking down an ecclesiological cul-de-sac.

Prof. Chadwick saw the problem as both short and long term. There was an argument around that the Roman dawn would eventually break. Was the Pope's letter saying please don't be under the illusion Rome will change its mind. Realism prompted the recognition that the ordination of women was here to stay in some parts of the Anglican Communion. Did this mean ecumenism was reduced to courtesy but never able to envisage true communion - the goal of ARCIC. The mutual recognition of ministry must be integral to this. There appeared to be a no road sign. The alternative might be one Province entering in communion - another not. There were various views about the Anglican Communion in England - some saw it as the ghost of the British Empire crowned upon the grave thereof. Others passionately believed in it. Then there was Apostolicae Curae ....."

Bishop Vogel reminded the Commission of the study on sexuality from U.S. ARC. He argued for the unity of the tradition. The Orthodox could not separate themselves from the wider development of which they were part.

Arbp. Butelezi saw the serious nature of the theological issues and goodwill as the hope for a solution. The Orthodox were a challenge.

Bishop Wallace supported Canon Hill's approach. Pastoral proposals could be made fairly quickly. He saw the two letters from Cardinal Willebrands as suggesting work first on the reconciliation of ministries. Then an examination on decision-making processes in the context of the goal of unity.

Bishop Baycroft explained that his understanding of consensus was not a question of votes. All 'settlements were provisional'.

Fr. Soane felt the need to say something on the ordination of women within the next five years. Where did morals fit in?

Canon Hill saw these as within the authority/goals of unity sector.

Bishop Santer stressed the unity of the Church was in the dogmatic order. We are not interested in 'federation'. What were the essential theological ingredients of communion. The ordination of women would be looked at in one way if neighbourliness was the goal - another if it was communion.

Fr. Duprey reminded the Commission that the reconciliation of ministries was part of the original mandate. There were two facts: the RC and Orthodox Churches said tradition was the real reason against; then there was the fact of the ordination of women in the Anglican Communion.

Bp. Vogel questioned the prudence of advancing towards the ordination of women if gender really was part of the essential theology of ministry. There was a contamination of issues. We must not trip over the next pavement.

Bp. Wallace believed there was hope for the reconciliation of ministries on the basis of the Willebrands letter. He did not want to separate the issues but felt they must be distanced.

Sr. Boulding: 'Apostolicae Curae' gave these grounds against Anglican ministry. At least we could say there are no other difficulties.

Can. Hill said the consensus fidelium worked both ways: the fact that Anglican Churches had ordained women was an ecclesial factor to take into account. The tradition-for Anglicans-had developed.

Bp. Santer had a problem with the consensus fidelium: it was a little like crystal ball gazing! Who were the magisterium and who were the faithful.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor thought it would be helpful to explore the ecclesiological implications and approaches on both sides.

Bp. Vogel found this most helpful. It would be good to see how authority handled this issue. The basic ingredients could be summarized in reasonable time.

Fr. McDonald also saw this as promising. Could we get a picture of how the Anglican and Catholic minds fitted into the wider ecumenical perspective.

Fr. Thornhill was attracted to Christopher Hill's plan and also his last suggestion as relating to koinonia. He saw tradition and koinonia as closely related. The mystery, the koinonia of God in time and history. Here and now both Churches were faithful to this tradition. Chr. Hill's schema and Bp. Cormac and Bp. Bernard's proposals were compatible.

Prof. Wright warmed to Fr. Yarnold and Sr. Boulding's suggestion. He also asked for consideration of what kind of statement the Commission was working towards. A paper on koinonia would take 40 years. An agreement on the theological issues would not be so easy.

Mrs. Tanner hoped for a paper on how the ordination of women was affecting koinonia within the Anglican Communion. Then how partial communion with the Free Churches affected the issue with their experience of the ordination of women. And how the lack of the ordination of women affected the Church as a sign of koinonia.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor felt the Commission might work towards papers with different perspectives - not strictly agreed statements.

Prof. Chadwick did not want the koinonia to be browbeating. "If you take it seriously you won't do it; if you do you will tolerate it". Interinsigniores was rather like 1 Cor. 10. Could we recognize different customs in the Church of God? What are the limits of koinonia?

Bishop Baycroft was encouraged by Bishop Murphy-O'Connor. But he did not want to rule out an agreed statement. We must be open to the possibility of change. The problem was not the ordination of women - but that some Churches did not.

Sr. Boulding liked the idea of publishing something, but not simply stating our divisions. There must be a solid block of real agreement.

Prof. Wright expanded on Professor Chadwick. There was a discussion in North America. The poles were: "If you take koinonia seriously you won't do it; or you will do. ARC-US found a middle ground encompassing both these positions. Was koinonia capable of embracing both positions. Jean Tillard's paper was a step in this direction. Both Churches were tolerant of great pluralism on other issues.

Fr. Yarnold said it was one thing to say there could be two views on women's ordination. ARCIC-II's problem was the reconciliation of ministries. To what extent was this compatible with this dogmatic block.

Fr. Tillard said the question was which kind of diversity is tolerable in Church order. Since Alexandria and Antioch we have known this kind of diversity of doctrine. In these centuries we learnt how to understand diversity of liturgies. Diversity of ministry was quite a new field. Anglican comprehensiveness went along with invariable Church order.

Bishop Santer thought that beginnings had been made in the work on episcopate and the episcopate. Doctrines were one thing; they were in the mind. But here you are faced with a woman or a bishop! There was the sheer facticity!

Bishop Baycroft was not happy about tolerance.

The Co-Chairmen said they would try some proposals for the Commission.

3rd September, 4.00 p.m.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor in the chair proposed some ideas for future agenda:

- 1.- A paper on koinonia combining this with something on "steps".
- 2.- A study of what might now be possible in terms of reconciliation of ministries.
- 3.- Diversity in order.
- 4.- Ordination of women (a paper tracing Anglican and RC positions on this).

Fr. Tillard: Paper 1 must deal with our present imperfect koinonia and then where we are going.

Mrs. Tanner Can we take Jean's framework and get a sub-commission to flesh it out more. A subcommittee to work on ordination of women issues.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor: Can we do the paper on diversity in order.

Bp. Santer: I like the idea of having two groups working than just papers by individuals, but we need to identify.

Fr. Tillard said even in the Protestant tradition there was a fully recognised ministry.

Fr. Yarnold agreed. This was new. But it only touched us on the ordination of women. Could we do this? Fr. Thornhill agreed. He wanted work on where we were going.

Bp. Baycroft agreed. He wanted a reduction of set work.

Sr. Boulding liked Mary Tanner's suggestion.

Bp. Santer cautioned against so filling the agenda that the Commission could not respond to criticisms of ARCIC I.

Prof. Wright felt 1 and 3 of Bp. Cormac's schema were close to each other. So were 2 and 4..

Bp. Santer felt some issues were best dealt with by individual papers and some with sub-commissions. Two issues were the maximum the Commission could deal with at one time.

Bp. Cameron asked for more study of the biblical understanding of koinonia.

Mrs. Tanner : was Jean Tillard envisaging a 6 year (say) programme which would deal with all the issues? Or could something be published before? Fr. Tillard said the latter. He asked what would be the goal of a sub-commission on the ordination of women. Mary Tanner answered not head on. How could Anglicans and RC's be in communion when Rome will not change.

Fr. Tillard said we have to try to find this way to be in communion.

Sr. Boulding argued that this called for dealing with Apostolicae Curae. There was a little work to do - using the work of English ARC.

Bp. Cameron asked about responses to ARCIC-I. The co-Secretaries outlined the Anglican and RC procedures as they led up to 1988.

Prof. Wright Noted the two 'position statements' found in the correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Willebrands. He wanted to keep up the momentum. ARCIC should propose something on the reconciliation of ministries which had a chance of getting through.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor wanted to see this in the context of steps towards unity.

Fr. Duprey: how we went ahead called for imagination and sympathy from Rome. The ordination of women should not discourage work on the recognition of ministries.

Fr. Yarnold noted the Franklin paper provided a prima facie case for re-examining Apostolicae Curae.

Prof. Davis wanted to place the <sup>4</sup>issues in a broader context. But where would the space be found for continuing the work of ARCIC-I. He wanted to see koinonia linked to growth. Lay ministry was becoming more important in both communions. What was the call to ministry urged by koinonia. And there was the role and status of women in Churches other than the RC Church and the Orthodox Churches. What was the meaning of tradition? What of God's sexuality? Would this link with ethics.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor returned to a paper on steps and Koinonia. Steps to unity were also growth.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether ARCIC would explain the official RC point of view or what they actually thought.

Bp. Murphy-O'Connor hooped they would not diverge.

Prof. Chadwick asked how far it was a matter of wanting to change others to what we are. It was a play-pen squabble over the rubber ducks. We have learnt to love one another. Was the whole discussion over the ordination of women about what we want one another to be. Liberal Anglicans were unhappy at what they think of RC diversity. But this was implied by koinonia.

Sr. Boulding said many RC's were in a difficult position: there was loyal authority; there was the lack of convincing argument; there was personal doubt.



Bishop Murphy-O'Connor shared this anxiety.

Bishop Wallace questioned whether a statement on this issue should be published. He agreed with Bishop Murphy-O'Connor. The arguments against were unconvincing but neither were the arguments in favour sufficiently convincing to change the tradition.

Fr. McDonald said there was a school of thought which held that the Catholic and Anglican ethos were so different that there could never be unity. This ethos had to be noticed. It was a background of Christian culture. This was reflected in Balthazar and De Lubac. Perhaps issues of ethos and culture would emerge in discussion about ethical issues.

Fr. Akpunonu said a definite stand had not really been taken. The eucharist was at the heart of the problem. If good arguments can be produced the issue moves to the realm of canonicity. Doubt about sacramental validity held the Church back from action until the issue was clearer.

Fr. Thornhill agreed with Bishop Wallace. It was not the job of the Commission to urge change. Our energies were limited. Nevertheless the Commission could say something.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor reminded the Commission we were still talking.

Fr. Yarnold found the Council of Jerusalem a model. There were no knock-down arguments. Would Fr. Duprey interpret Cardinal Willebrands' letter. Was the question about plurality in the koinonia.

Fr. Duprey saw the issue in the context of the reconciliation of ministries.

Fr. McDonald said the Cardinal's two letters need to be seen in relation.

Bishop Santer had sympathy with not going head on. But some issues had to be faced even with an oblique approach. Some arguments appealed to the guts rather than the head. We can run away from the question of power. Who presides over the communities? Arguments avoiding this issue were romantic.

Professor O'Donovan found most useful the honesty of Roman Catholic members' views on the document Inter insigniores - but without dissent. A range of views need to be recognized on both sides. The issue should not frighten us off. But we must be prepared to go into it deeply, head on for its own sake.

Professor Wright asked whether Cardinal Willebrands felt ARCIC could do something useful on the reconciliation of ministries.

Fr. McDonald answered definitely yes.

Fr. Soane asked where ARCIC was going.

Bishop Santer thought there was a consensus on Koinonia and steps towards unity. But there was difference over ministry. There

was the view that the reconciliation of ministry was the issue. There was the view that the ordination of women had to be tackled head on - perhaps to solve inter-Anglican division.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said the Co-Chairmen would have to consider all this very carefully. The ordination of women could not be ignored. The question was how it related to the other work. He saw two areas: koinonia-steps and ordination of women.

Bishop Santer saw ARCIC making a real contribution to the ecumenical movement as a whole.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said the Commission expressed the aspirations of the Church as a whole.

---

The local bishops joined the Commission for its final dinner.