

ANGLICAN/ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

(ARCIC-II)

First Meeting, Venice, August 30 - September 6 1983

Tuesday, August 30, 2030

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in the chair.

Prayers were led by the Co-Chairmen.

After members had briefly introduced themselves, the provisional programme was presented and accepted, and a number of practical points were agreed.

Letters of good wishes were read from Archbishop McAadoo and Bishop Clark, Co-Chairmen of ARCIC-I, and also a letter of welcome from Cardinal Ce, Patriarch of Venice.

Wednesday, August 31

0930-1030 The Co-Chairmen led a period of prayer and reflection in the Chapel.

1055-1245

Bishop Santer, in the chair, explained the purpose of the day's work - more detailed introduction of themselves by members and a general survey of the present quality of Anglican/Roman Catholic relations in the regions from which members came. This would provide an idea of the real context in which this new Commission is starting its work.

Members then spoke of their individual experience in ecumenical relations and particularly in Anglican/Roman Catholic relations. Even before the afternoon's direct discussions of regional situations a broadly positive picture emerged, though there were exceptions.

1600-1905

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in the chair.

North America

Bishop Lessard presented paper ARCIC-II 6/2 (83): he spoke principally from his experience in the United States, but had been in consultation about Canada and drew attention to the Caribbean.

Fr. Tillard stated that Canadian ARC's study of Lima is primarily concerned with its coherence with ARCIC-I.

Dr. K. Davis spoke of Roman Catholic participation in the Caribbean Council of Churches as outstanding, instancing the contributions of the Archbishop of Kingston and Castries. In the Caribbean "service unites, doctrine divides". Political independence had brought the Churches together, e.g. in Guyana and Grenada.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor hoped that guidelines for national ARCs might emerge.

Canon Baycroft: Canadian General Synod had a Roman Catholic Bishop, invited to speak but not to vote. Canadian Anglicans would hope to see more lay participation in Roman Catholic structures. One Roman Catholic was a member of the Canadian Inter-Church relations committee.

Bishop Gitari asked whether Roman Catholics in Canada reciprocated.

Canon Baycroft and Fr. Tillard said they did.

Bishop Vogel spoke of his use of US/ARC text on "The Response of the Church" in his own diocese. He also mentioned difficulties concerning liturgy at the Anglican/Roman Catholic Church at Tidewater, Va. In reply to a question from Fr. Duprey, Bishop Vogel said the reception of ex-Episcopalians into the Roman Catholic Church was not causing major problems except in San Antonio where there have been press comments about an Anglican use parish".

### Kenya

Bishop Gitari could speak only of Kenya because of difficulties of communication with other East African countries. The missionary background of Anglicans in Kenya was "low Church" by comparison with some other parts of Africa. The Kenyan Church had not revised the Book of Common Prayer and there was less in common with Roman Catholic liturgy. There had been mutual exclusiveness before Vatican II. After independence the Churches began to work together in the field of religious education and joint syllabuses, text books, etc. He mentioned a joint chaplaincy centre at Nairobi University and spoke of some joint local fund raising for church building. But difficulties remained - some competition over schools, some instances of "re-baptism", application of mixed marriage legislation. Some instances of lack of Roman Catholic reciprocity were given. He was sorry that Catholic and Anglican bishops met only when asked to meet with government officials. There had been joint bishops' meetings in 1978-9, but not since. He noted similarities with the points made about Nigeria in Fr. Akpunomu's personal presentation earlier in the day.



### England

Mrs. Tanner presented ARCIC-II 6/1 (83). She stated that English APC has three main items on its present agenda: (a) Joint Study Guide and local responses thereto; (b) the Act of Settlement; (c) Communion and Inter-Church Families. It hoped soon to prepare work on reconciliation of ministries and "Apostolicae Curiae" and also on Moral Theology. She spoke of her positive experience of the Roman Catholic Ecumenical Commission.

On Lima and ARCIC-I she noted enthusiasm in Local Councils of Churches. The Faith and Order Advisory Group had begun the preparation of the Church of England's response to ARCIC and also to Lima. The Liturgical Commission of the English and Welsh Roman Catholic bishops was also studying both documents.

There followed some discussion of Roman Catholic hesitations concerning membership of the British Council of Churches. Bishop Murphy-O'Connor stressed that, nevertheless, Roman Catholic bishops and most Catholics are committed to Anglican/Roman Catholic unity.

Bishop Satter noted that Local Councils seemed often to flourish in areas with grave social problems. He emphasised the importance of the co-operation between bishops, of chaplaincies, of religious communities. The Common Certificate of Baptism is also of value.

In reply to Bishop Lessard, Fr. Duprey said the Unity Secretariat had sent Lima to all Episcopal Conferences for study and comment.

Sr. Boulding warned against a superficial reading of Lima.

Professor Chisholm said that among English Anglicans the most reserved concerning ARCIC are ultra-conservatives and ultra-liberals. But the majority are happily astonished at what has been achieved, even if they do not yet see how it can be made to last. People are not yet clear about the goal of our dialogue.

### Australasia

In the absence of Bishop Ashby, Fr. Thoughill said that Australasia is a vast area in which circumstances differ greatly. Relations in Sydney have become much more cordial and there are joint meetings of the bishops of New South Wales. National meetings, over the years, to discuss ARCIC Statements were cordial but invariably left much to be resolved. In Australia there were many parallels to items already reported.

A joint meeting of Anglican and Roman Catholic Ecumenical Committees in New Zealand in March '83 gave a comprehensive review of the scene there including common study of ARCIC; joint clergy schools; shared marriage preparation; local

covenants; contacts between theological colleges; annual day of Anglican/Roman Catholic worship.

Bishop Cameron said that in Australia sociological factors have a strong influence on Anglican/Roman Catholic relations. There were particularly good contacts in Victoria. Nationally a joint study guide is being prepared: in many respects the laity are well ahead, but he was encouraged by recent episcopal meetings.

Fr. Thornhill said that a joint meeting in New Zealand was worried about the laity getting ahead.

Canon Hill spoke of the TV coverage of the Papal Visit to Canterbury Cathedral and its beneficial effects in New Zealand.

Fr. Duprey said that the Roman Catholic Church is a member of the Pacific Council of Churches and the Archbishop of Tonga was President.

Fr. Yarnold was greatly encouraged by his recent visit to Australia, lay people showed a great desire for re-union. There was some unofficial eucharistic sharing.

### South Africa

Archbishop Butelezi spoke of joint groups of Anglican/Roman Catholic bishops and of a group of bishops and theologians which wound up after the publication of the Final Report. The Roman Catholic Church is not a member of the South African Council of Churches but dioceses were free to belong to local and regional councils. Councils can sometimes be too far ahead of their constituent Churches. Some of the same ecumenical issues arise in the Church Unity Commission of which the Anglican Church is a member.

Mgr. Stewart suggested that when the Commission discussed methodology, some thought should be given to collaboration with national ARCs.

Canon Hill said that the link was naturally much closer when a member of ARCIC was also member of a national ARC.

### REACTIONS TO "FINAL REPORT"

#### Roman Catholic

Mgr. Stewart said that so far the Unity Secretariat had received only six responses from Episcopal Conferences to the Final Report: there were still some 95 to come. This was not discouraging: there was evidence of how carefully some major Conferences were preparing their responses. But he warned



that the six now available were not necessarily an adequate sample. Brief responses had been received from Taiwan and Nigeria, longer and more closely argued ones from Holland, Japan and Australia (an interim response) and also from the Greek-Melchite Patriarchate. Of the "Latin" responses four were very positive about both the content and the method of the Final Report; even if they had certain criticisms on particular points, particularly on aspects of Authority II, these criticisms were offered constructively and, in several cases, with suggested pointers towards a resolution of the difficulties in question. One, Nigeria, is more reserved, "a good start...., but there is still a long way to go". It was noticeable that only two responses took into account the Introduction on koinonia. On the Eucharist some saw need for further work on Adoration and there were some questions about Sacrifice. On Ministry one Conference felt there was need for reference to Roman Catholic teaching on the relationship of a member of the episcopal college to its head, while another was (a) dissatisfied with the expression of the general/ordained priesthood distinction, (b) concerned regarding the implications of the ordination of women on the doctrine of ministry. On Authority several felt more work must be done on reception, Marian doctrines, ius divinum, divine institution, the precise status of Churches not in communion with Rome. The Conferences took explicit account of SCDF's Osservazioni and offered responses to some of these (though one bishop felt these received insufficient attention). By and large these first responses to the Report were encouraging. The Melchite comment could be properly evaluated only when other Eastern responses were available; it was critical of a lack of reference to Eastern tradition and of a certain emphasis on history rather than Tradition; while unhappy with some Latin juridical terminology, the Melchites felt that Anglican and Catholic positions on authority are still far apart (cf. Authority II, 31). But the overall tone of this response too was positive and constructive.

### Anglican

Canon Hill said the Final Report had been sent to the Anglican Provincial Synods (26) for reaction by 1986 in time for the Lambeth Conference of 1988 to 'discern the Anglican consensus'. This procedure had been agreed by the Anglican Consultative Council. The Synods had been asked whether the Final Report was 'consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans and whether it offered 'a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards...reconciliation'. Because Synods meet at different intervals no official reactions had been received so far, but a number of provinces have commissioned draft responses from appropriate committees (10 known to Lambeth) and the Final Report has been 'introduced' to three Synods. The Anglican Consultative Council is encouraging Anglican Churches to hold together discussion of the ARCIC Report and Lima in the initial stages to demonstrate the unity of the ecumenical movement and the convergence of the texts.

It will be remembered that a number of Provinces have already made a provisional response to the earlier Agreed

Statements. Some Churches have accepted the Eucharist and Ministry Statements as statements of Anglican faith (Canada and the USA) others, while offering criticisms, especially of Authority-I, have accepted the earlier statements as a sufficient basis for the next step forward. Only one province has given a clear negative.

There have been many unofficial comments. Two of some importance from a critical point of view are the Report of the Church of England Evangelical Council (drafted by Dr. John Stott) and an article in the Modern Churchman by Professor Stephen Sykes. On the other hand the Papal Visit to Canterbury linked the theological and symbolic and demonstrated the depth of Anglican commitment to Anglican/Roman Catholic unity.

Fr. Tillard said the two presentations illustrated the grave need for a hermeneutic of reception on both sides. Some reactions must be given more weight than others - especially where Anglicans and Roman Catholics were side by side and working together ecumenically.

Rev. J. Charley thought it important that the new ARCIC should get to work on the stages of unity if the Anglican Churches were to give an answer to the second question posed to the Synods.



Thursday, September 1

0930-1100

Bishop Santer, in the chair, introduced the day's work. Questions about justification are among our "outstanding doctrinal differences" and preliminary work had suggested a link with remaining ecclesiological issues and with some moral questions.

Bishop Cameron presented ARCIC-II 5/1 (83), "Justification by Faith: Some Anglican Concerns".

Responding to questions Bishop Cameron thought faith a constituent element in the sacraments (though these terms had various senses); also in his paper, while he referred to past views he was also summarizing a tradition strongly held within Anglicanism.

Fr. Yarnold asked whether Roman Catholic/Anglican differences (2i, ii) were necessarily differences in faith. Were there not semantic differences, not wholly incompatible? Is the Anglican tradition committed to rejecting the Roman Catholic view that sanctification follows justification.

Bishop Cameron thought this had to be looked at. The real problem is the way the important doctrine of justification has been taken from all else.

Fr. Akpunonu asked whether there was a contradiction in para. 2 "God declares the ungodly to be righteous...the moral change or betterment". What is the sense of the word 'declares'.

Bishop Cameron said this is the crux of the matter. 'Declares' comes from the forensic imagery of Romans. God treats us as no longer sinners, clothed with the righteousness of Christ.

Fr. Tillard queried the reference to justification per se in 2.iii: can one omit from justification 'in itself' the fact that justification comes from God's Word preached by the Church.

Bishop Vogel thought justification per se seems a dictionary definition rather than part of a lived reality. We must not manufacture difficulties. Can God impute without imparting.

Mr. Charley was surprised that the word 'grace' did not occur.

Professor Chadwick said there was no problem about justification sola gratia. Our question concerned sola fidei. Are we affirming justification in so forensic a sense that all else is excluded. If so, a long dialogue lay ahead. If not we have a marker here.

Rev. J. Charley held that justification and sanctification were inseparable, though there was a logical distinction.

Dr. Gassmann said the Reformers emphasized there must be good works as a consequence of justification: to be declared 'righteous' was not a moral statement but one about God-man relationships.



Fr. Tillard said that the good works of the individual were preceded by the good work of the Church, preaching the Word of God as the channel of justification.

Fr. Akpunonu said that every salvific work the initiative was God's; the penitent's first response under grace was to acknowledge he had sinned, rather than to perform extraordinary good works.

Professor Pobee said that the New Testament forensic imagery was soon subsumed under the image of 'home' and 'Father' etc.

Rev. J. Cherley said the forensic imagery was there, even if as one of many. Justification underlined the primacy of grace and a true understanding of grace was vital.

Fr. Yarnold asked how we should understand faith in this connection.

Bishop Cameron referred to Abraham's faith (Romans): response in obedience and total trust to God's undertaking.

Fr. Duprey thought the category of reconciliation a more personal one. Roman Catholics agree on the gratuity of justification but asked whether it is extrinsic or the beginning of a new creation (hence its moral consequences etc.).

Canon Baycroft said Luther was concerned both with his own experience and with the sovereignty of God. This was better expressed by 'justification by grace through faith'. A Hebrew understanding of 'justice' would be less 'forensic' and bring out the relationship dimension.

Fr. Akpunonu said that in a biblical context forensic imagery was richer. Through a judge God declared a man innocent, taking him back as his child. God looked on the penitent not to condemn but to call him back.

Rev. J. Cherley said the Reformers reacted against a concept of grace as a 'thing', which led to an idea of justification by 'degrees'. Anglicans thought Roman Catholics' view of justification as needing completion by progressive sanctification - even in purgatory.

Professor Wright asked what precise point of Roman Catholic defined teaching Evangelicals thought wrong.

Rev. J. Cherley spoke of Trent's anathemas seeming to cut across the teaching of the Reformers. We need to be assured, not just told, we now agree.

Canon Hill said ARCIC-I's method had been to look at the classical texts of both Churches to see if there was nevertheless a contemporary common faith that the Commission could state.



Bishop Gitari said that in Kenya Anglican language about being saved presented difficulties to Roman Catholics. Clarity was needed on the terms 'justification', 'sanctification' and 'glorification'.

Fr. Tillard maintained that to go outside the ecclesiological frame would be a massive task. We agree on the role of God in justification, we ask why is the Church necessary - or not - and what does it do. Hence, what 'faith' means in justification by faith. We return to the authority of the Word of God.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said there were different emphases in our traditional ways of speaking: clarification of terms could do much to remove misunderstandings.

Dr. Davis asked where ARCIC saw itself in this exercise - as products of history, as representatives of the present Churches, as charting a new future.

Bishop Vogel said we could not deny the past, ignore the present, or neglect the future. We must look to a future that can help us use the present to overcome the past.

In response Bishop Cameron emphasized the importance of what had been said a) biblical imagery b) 'justification by degrees' c) the role of the Church in preaching the Word.

Fr. Yarnold thought it important to concentrate on issues rather than terms.

1120-1245

Fr. Thornhill spoke to ARCIC-II 5/2 (83) "Problems of contemporary ecclesiology". He now saw more clearly the link between justification with ecclesiology. He agreed with Mr. Cherley on the fundamental nature of grace - what God has done for the world in Jesus Christ. The Church was the community of those to whom this was given.

In discussion Archbishop Butelezi asked whether a defensive and apologetic attitude had conditioned Roman Catholic ecclesiology.

Fr. Thornhill thought this true of Counter-Reformation ecclesiology.

Fr. Soane asked how the paper related to that of Bishop Cameron.

Fr. Thornhill said that Church was the community of justification/salvation/redemption/grace, but past terms could be avoided. Could ARCIC-II give a message of witness to the world (the Good News of Salvation)? This would require clarification of the relation of the Church to the World. The Roman Catholic Church had been too preoccupied with internal matters since Vatican II: ARCIC should avoid the same mistake.



Fr. Soane asked if the Reformation arguments were not concerned with just one point: the entry of the individual into the mystery of the Church.

Fr. Thornhill agreed with Fr. Tillard that the Reformation question of how the Church becomes a more effective vessel of the Gospel had never been answered.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor asked whether the Reformers' concentration on only two Sacraments had made the dispute more acute (i.e. baptismal regeneration).

Fr. Yarnold argued that the Commission should not automatically produce something substantial on ecclesiology. The task was to isolate particular problems.

Bishop Cameron reported that Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians and bishops in Australia questioned whether koinonia had been made to bear too much, and Canon Baycroft noted the Church of England Evangelical Council thought koinonia was chosen to lead to primacy.

Sr. Boulding thought that all the earlier agreements presumed agreement on the Church.

Fr. Tillard explained that ARCIC-I began with Eucharist and Ministry as these were primary elements of the Church. He refused to separate the nature of the Church from its constituent elements.

Bishop Santer asked which issues the Commission really needed to note. He said there was anxiety in each community whether the other acted in the way it claimed in its theology. When discussing practical steps a sound ecclesiology needed to undergird recommendations.

Dr. Gassmann said ARCIC needed to present the existing theological consensus on justification to the Churches at large.

Bishop Lessard cautioned against too hasty work prior to responses to ARCIC-I.

Rev. J. Charley noted that Church of England Evangelicals spoke of "salvation with reference to justification". Salvation was part of the understanding of the Church.

Several members spoke of the importance of taking account of the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue on Justification.

Fr. Duprey found ARCIC-I's conciseness helpful but its ecclesiological introduction was so dense the reader needed to be in the bath a long time!! There was a need to give reassurance on both justification and ecclesiology. The two were linked by the understanding of salvation in the mystery of the Church.

Fr. Tillard said the Commission needed to see a link between the Church and grace. The Church was a prophetic sign of God's grace.



Fr. Thornhill replied to the discussion. He was confirmed in his earlier impression that a vast treatise on ecclesiology was not required, There was a sound implicit ecclesiology in the sacramental doctrine of ARCIC-I. What was required was discussion of the Church as the place of justification.

1600-1840

Bishop Murphy O'Connor in the chair said that in continuing the discussion we needed to delineate areas of disagreement more clearly. How, in terms acceptable to Anglicans and Roman Catholics do we express justification in meaningful terms and in what sense can we speak of growing in grace. We must also speak further of the role of the Church.

Fr. Duprey: There is no real Anglican/Roman Catholic divergence regarding justification but there is malaise: koinonia gives the context in which to explain what we understand by justification/salvation and its relation to the Church as sacrament.

Bishop Butelezi said how strongly Evangelicals in South Africa felt about this question.

Bishop Senter thought that in the West we suffer from Church/Clergy identification, so that the 18th century revival came about in parallel to the 'Church'. The role of the 'Church' is heard as priests telling people what to do. It is important to have greater understanding of the newer sacramental understanding of the Church.

Fr. Tillard spoke of the important open letter of Evangelicals in Vancouver and their emphasis that Churches with strong ecclesiological convictions were a basis of hope for the preaching of the Gospel.

Fr. Soane drew attention to basic moral issues arising in connection with ecclesiology and justification: the role and status of Church teaching on moral issues; the source of moral norms (nature ? Revelation ?); use of Scripture, reason, philosophy. What is the effect of sin (and of justification) on our ability to know God's will. To what extent are 'virtues' (habits), a settled disposition, and how does this relate to the sovereignty of God.

Some members then raised questions concerning the Roman Catholic understanding of indulgences and purgatory. To what extent are these expressive of the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification.

Bishop Cameron thought the conversation revealed there was material for some consensus on justification.

1. Justification to be given no greater or lesser place than it occupies in the New Testament.
2. Justification, as articulated in Romans, to be seen and interpreted as a forensic image i. e. law court verdict and acquittal.
3. Justification emerges as part of an argument which has the justification/wrath of God and the guilt of man as its premises.
4. There is an indissoluble relation between justification and Christ's atonement.
5. Justification in Romans confers a righteous status, does not of itself speak of moral betterment.
6. Justification is "Raw material" for a larger theological system - while in itself it is indispensable, it is also a factor to be integrated into such a system.

Fr. Thornhill: God acts in the Church through Word and Sacrament (cf. ARCIC-I Introduction): Word and grace are given to the whole people united with their pastors rather than to the pastors for the people.



Fr. Tillard thought the best way ahead would be to deal with the function of the Church as the reconciling community. He drew attention to the final two sentences of para. 8 of ARCIC-I Introduction.

Bishop Santer would add to Bishop Cameron's list the relationship of salvation to the sacramental order, especially baptism.

Canon Hill and Mgr. Stewart thought that difficulties concerning popular practices etc. could be discussed only when we had some agreement on the principles of salvation.

Dr. Davis pointed out that concern on these practices were real anxieties for many people. You cannot state a doctrine until you know how it is to be put to work - above all in prayer. How does prayer (and candles etc.) express people's understanding of the doctrine of justification. No-one wants to suggest God can be switched on and off at will.

Archbishop Butelezi thought many Catholics did not realize how much diversity there could be in devotion.

Prof. Wright thought we could clarify the relation of devotional aids to justification by faith. Roman Catholics could state they found them useful but did not think they were justified by them.

Revd. J. Charley said that if it is to help, a devotion must be the authentic expression of a true Christian faith. 'It helps me' is not enough. There are doctrinal implications and a pastoral task to be done.

Canon Hill thought ARCIC-I's approach to Eucharistic devotion might be more widely applied.

Fr. Tillard said we needed to distinguish (a) what belongs to faith as such and (b) what belongs to the religious expression of the faith. To realize communion we needed to concentrate on a while diversity is possible in b. This is not simply an ARC issue. It confronts the various cultures and so is at the heart of ecclesiology. ( Church in

Fr. Addapur said that questions of devotion and religious expression must not be reduced to merely rational categories. To neglect emotion aesthetics, mystery in the religious expression of various peoples and periods would be untrue to human reality.

Bishop Lessard said that as we seek to defend God's sovereignty and to find a place for the Church, we must not forget the person - whose sovereignty God's grace does not violate. This may accentuate some Catholic/ Evangelical differences, but we should advert to it.

In response to Sr. Boulding, Revd. J. Charley said we have different theologies. We must discuss whether this diversity is acceptable

and coherent with faith. Prof. Wright noted there were not just two theologies of justification.

Canon Hill said in our Churches' preaching of justification --what-ever terms we use - people need to be assured they have value in God's eyes despite lack of worldly success.

Bishop Santer was worried lest concern for God's sovereignty seemed to exclude the actions of his creatures.

Fr. Akpunonu said the Epistle of James should not be forgotten - in dealing with man God treats man as he is, not as object but as intellect and will as able to cooperate. He respects what he has created.

Fr. Some, agreeing, said that discussion of how man responds would lead us also to whether justification is a process.

Bishop Vogel noted the paradox that people with little appreciation of the riches of sacramental theology could show an equal grasp of God's initiative in their life. There can be a danger of using sacraments as "works".

After a brief break Mgr. Stewart informed the Commission of the Pope's request for prayers for it at the previous day's General Audience.

Fr. Yarnold spoke of the various stages of work on ecclesiology. When discussing practical steps the Commission would need to look at:

1. Models of unity - "sister"-Churches rather than "united" Churches.
2. Full and partial communion.
3. The compatibility of the koinonia-model with regional unity.

At this stage the Commission needed to tackle:

1. The ideal and the real.
2. The theology of Churches in schism (RC attitude to Churches not in communion).
3. The role of the Church in the economy of salvation - including moral issues.

and possibly:

4. Apostolic succession and Regula Fidei (noted by SCDF).

Bishop Santer spoke of moral issues. The role of teachers in articulating faith has received much attention from RC theologians, but for moral issues it appears that the laity are told what to do by clergymen. In doctrine bishops corporately discern the sensus fidelium this should more clearly happen over moral issues.

Mgr. Stewart noted that in Catholic/Methodist discussion an anti-thesis between "authority" and "conscience" was soon seen to be a caricature. He also drew attention to the process of preparation of the recent USA pastoral on the nuclear issue.



Prof. Wright agreed, comparing this favourably with "Inter Insigniores".

Fr. Tillard reiterated that Introduction n. 8 was a good framework for our future work - moral issues were not only a consequence of redemption but a part of the offer of redemption.

Bishop Gitari asked what "the Church" was - local, regional, synodical machinery etc.

Bishop Vogel referred to the opening sentences of para. 8 of the Introduction of Final Report.

Fr. Duprey agreed and saw this as a starting point for the integration of justification, salvation and the role of the Church and of the Word of God.

Prof. Wright found difficulties in the unspecified 'moral limits' ascribed to the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in ARCIC-I.

Bishop Vogel noted similar concern by members of non-episcopal Churches regarding the exercise of the monarchical episcopate. It was impossible to draw up canonical safeguards.

Royd. J. Charley stressed the link between ecclesiology and authority. At some point the question of the authority of curial offices would need clarification.

Fr. Thornhill noted Vatican II's difficulty in defining the scope of primatial teaching and authority: it was commensurate with the infallibility of the Church itself, but jurisdiction was not for the destruction of the episcopal nature of the Church.

Bishop Santer saw a danger in pinning down too absolutely, bishops could not be totally defined in constitutional terms.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor saw the RCC as bringing into reality Vatican II's teaching on the Church and bishops, bishops no longer understand themselves as delegates of the Holy See.

Prof. Wright thought that further attention would eventually have to be given to universal jurisdiction if it was to be recognized by Anglicans.

Bishop Cameron said that in Australia it had been agreed that (i) more attention to the Anglican understanding of primates was required; (ii) there were questions about developments which became "essential" (iii) the Declaration of Obedience to the Pope by a new bishop did not fit readily into an Anglican mind.

Fr. Yarnold called attention to ARCIC-I's view that some difficulties would not be resolved until there was a new relationship. This called for an examination of "unity by stages" !

Canon Baycroft thought it important to see the good things in the papal ministry. He had been helped by Fr. Tillard's book, but a stage of getting to know each other was essential.

Mgr. Stewart said it would be better not to return to work already done until more formal reactions had been received.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor summed up the discussion as showing need for work on:

1. Faith and religious expressions of faith,
2. The role of the Church and salvation: Introduction to ARCIC-I.
3. The real and ideal Church: authority and papal jurisdiction.
4. How Churches can live in partial communion.

Bishop Center thought (4) best treated after the discussion on the reconciliation of ministries.

Fr. Duprey urged great care in expressing the faith of the Church: it was important to state only what was necessary for faith. Moral issues were not on the same level as questions of faith.

Fr. Boane said that the Church was an instrument calling people to salvation. How was the Church to be faithful to the Word of God which, in Scripture, came in a particular place and culture ? How was the Church to bridge the gap between cultures ? This limited the Church's ability to pronounce.



Friday, September 2nd

0930-1245

Bishop Santer in the chair.

Professor Chadwick presented ARCIC-II 4 (83) "Mutual recognition of separated ministries and Churches". In the course of history non-recognition of orders has generally been a symptom, but a very prominent and deeply felt one, rather than a radical cause of division. Divisions have proved very deep-rooted and tend to be self-perpetuating. Moreover, it is difficult to define sacramental validity precisely. (Thus ARCIC I gave up attempts at a footnote on the subject) He thought that in a consideration of recognition it would be wise to include something on the eucharistic memorial: the Church of England Evangelical objection to ARCIC-I really expressed a Monophysite Christology. The mutual recognition of ministries is much more difficult if the ecclesiologies of the two Churches concerned are in opposition: ARCIC-I's large convergence in ecclesiology is a source of hope. History is not encouraging when we reflect on the world effects of schism. We need to take such effects to heart and to reflect on the large part played by disputes about ministerial validity.

Rev. J. Ch. play (ref. p.21) Evangelical's difficulty concerning ARCIC-I Euch. 5 was that it concentrated on the Eucharistic Prayer and apparently made no reference to communion.

In response to a question from Professor Wright, Professor Chadwick said the Church of England had not in fact recognized schismatic orders (cf p.20) - a matter of fact rather than of theory.

Professor Wright said ECUSA had recognized some, e.g. Reformed Episcopal Church.

Bishop Vogel said a Canadian commission was studying this. In USA the 'premature' ordinations of women had been deemed invalid because of their lack of ecclesial context.

Canon Hill said the 1920 Lambeth Conference had recommended that, other things being equal, clergy from vagantes sects should receive conditional ordination (very few cases). It was a different matter with schismatics from an Anglican Church.

Bishop Santer (ref. p.17 (a)) said of "permanent consequences for the person ordained" that this was because it was a ministry of the Church, not just of a particular church; that is the real difficulty about supplemental ordination.

Archbishop Butcher mentioned schisms (Rome-Constantinople; Rome-Old Catholics) that have not led to non-recognition of orders.

Fr. Soane asked whether Professor Chadwick thought it possible to see in the history of this question a constant policy whereby the Roman Catholic Church determines whether or not to recognize the orders of another body.

Professor Chadwick thought this true of the medieval period; but since the 16th century, with regard to Reformation Churches, the Roman Catholic Church has taken a consistent position of non-recognition.

Fr. Yarnold presented ARCIC-II 4/2(83) "Obstacles in the Way of Recognition of Ministries". In conclusion he spoke of the matter being political as well as theological. He urged the Commission should not waste time by exploring all the theological avenues, but from among these should choose the ones that seemed the most likely practical route to the goal we desire.

Bishop Lessard queried whether the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had said that it was a matter of faith not to ordain women. Some discussion on the implication of Inter Insigniores followed.

Bishop Lessard said the Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue (USA) saw the norm of apostolic succession as flexible in an emergency; the problem was what to do when the situation returned to normality. He also thought work on the Vatican archives might be important, but not on the understanding that the question depended upon it.

Dr. Gassmann added that the Lutheran/Roman Catholic International dialogue was working towards a common exercise of episcopate and common ordinations.

Professor Chadwick said that individual gestures from Roman Catholic bishops, while generous, would not do. They must be acting on the authority of their Church.

Bishop Giteri asked if there was any way of correcting past Roman Catholic statements.

Bishop Murphy O'Connor admitted that Roman Catholic authorities rarely did this but rather corrected the balance by a complementary positive statement.

Fr. Tillard pointed out that no-one had ever claimed Apostolicae Curae to be infallible.

Professor Wright asked who is the "Rome" that ARCIC was addressing. Should ARCIC be consulting the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith?

Fr. Duprey underlined Professor Chadwick's affirmation that the reconciliation of ministries must be seen in the context of the reconciliation of Churches. Are Anglican/Roman Catholics reconciled in faith? In this frame the question was put in a "new context". He felt that until both Churches could say they shared the same faith discussion about reconciliation of ministries was academic. It was unrealistic to go forward on "presbyteral succession" or any solution outside the Eastern and Western tradition of apostolic succession.



Professor Chadwick was not interested in asking Rome to recognize Anglican Orders as an end in itself. Though in itself a symptom, the non-recognition of orders was a cause of alienation in parishes, keenly felt by many clergy. There was a vicious circle as this prevented the desire for unity. A ray of light was needed on the ground.

Professor Wright assumed that it was for the Commission to decide whether it followed the methodology of its predecessors - While Apostolicae Curiae was a Roman Catholic problem, Anglicans had an obligation to help them find a solution.

Revd. J. Cherley insisted that our concern was for the unity of the Church. Headway would be made by an agreement in faith. Professor Chadwick had shown the Church's muddle over ministry as it was the biggest obstacle to reconciliation. But in the New Testament ministry is to serve the Church. The New Testament norm was fidelity to faith and Christlike character; ministry was to serve this.

Fr. Duprey said he had no intention of imposing a methodology, but the Commission needed to wait for an acceptance of ARCIC-I. He admitted that there were tensions in Rome; the reconciliation of Churches presented new problems and there were different approaches to them.

Bishop Vogel also spoke of some United States opinion on this being an inopportune time to raise the reconciliation of ministries; however this view ignored ARCIC-I. Time went on and people now ceased to expect anything to happen. The Commission could begin by saying what the "new context" was.

Archbishop Butelezi spoke of the pain of not yet being able to share communion, but this was a fruitful pain.

Canon Bayercroft said that if Anglicans and Roman Catholics could say they shared the same faith and Anglicans accepted some papal jurisdiction, the Pope would have to make a decision about the Anglican ministry. Anglicans, however, would have to be open to conditional or even absolute ordination.

Sr. Boulding said our already partial communion implied some degree of membership of the same Church. This was the insight of Vatican II. If we are partially in one Church then we share in some way in ministry.

Canon Hill said that work on steps or stages towards full communion would put the discussion on orders in context.

Fr. Tillard insisted on speaking of reconciliation rather than recognition of ministries. Many Evangelical friends of his needed to be reconciled! The Commission should begin with the Church as koinonia. The People of God preceded the ministers. He did not favour Conger's view of "economy". In the East this applied only within a Church.

Bishop Gitari found it difficult to accept 're-ordination'. Mutuality was important.

Dr. Gassmann asked whether ARCIC should be thinking of models of reconciliation or be concentrating on broadening agreement in faith.

Sr. Boulding thought the ordination of women an ecclesial question.

Fr. Yarnold thought the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's Declaration excluded the ordination of women as an area of permissible diversity - He thought work needed to begin now on mutual reconciliation of ministries in preparation for a hoped-for positive response to ARCIC-I.

Bishop Vogel asked whether there could be agreement on the level of faith but differences in theology. Was there a middle ground between 'de fide' and discipline?

Professor Wright argued for recognition as a stage towards full reconciliation.

Bishop Lessard asked what the Anglican Communion had to teach about relations between Churches which did and did not ordain women.

Fr. Akpunony thought the Commission was avoiding the actual arguments of Apostolicae Curac.

Mrs. Tanner and Canon Hill spoke of Lambeth Conference 1978 agreeing not to break communion over the ordination of women. But there were tensions in living this out. Mrs. Tanner continued that the Ministry text of ARCIC posed problems of reception for some as it was not clear whether it was inclusive or exclusive.

Canon Baycroft mentioned the problem of women and the episcopate.

Bishop Vogel spoke of some in ECUSA who held of faith that women must/could not be ordained. They remained in one Church because this was not at the top of the hierarchy of truths.

Bishop Gitari asked whether the solution was for Rome to abstain but Anglicans to go ahead.

#### 1700-1915

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in the chair explained plans for group work the following day. Under the general rubric 'The Ecclesiology of Reconciliation' two groups would consider 'Salvation and the Church' and two 'Steps towards Full Communion'. To make proposals concerning the problematic and the method of work.



Fr. Thornhill said Roman Catholics can give the impression of simply sitting tight concerning the ordination of women because of the authoritative attitude to this. It is a hard question about which to reach a judgement. It would be unwise for the Roman Catholic Church to make a sudden move to the ordination of women, but we are neglecting the development of many ministries already open to women, and that might help to a clearer judgement on the question. The complex values involved must be carefully weighed: the basic value of Christian unity and the need to avoid further obstacles; the aspiration, a sign of the times; ministry as service, not privilege, and the manner of service should not become an obstacle to unity.

Archbishop Butelezi: There is little controversy over women distributing communion and doing other ministerial works. The problem arises over ordination.

Bishop Santer said that while ordination was to a service, the Church was a human institution and in fact all the power was exercised by men since authority was linked with orders.

Mrs. Tanner said it was right to encourage women's ministries, but the question of the ordination of women would not go away and a way must be found of speaking to it.

Professor Pobee said that in Anglican discussion the thought was naturally towards nationally autonomous Churches. But sometimes an appeal to one's own culture could be an excuse for doing nothing. People need to be encouraged to examine the cultural and social context from a theological basis.

Bishop Vogel said the confrontation with cultures could not be avoided. New creation in Christ was a challenge to every culture.

Fr. Tillard spoke of a recent conversation with Orthodox in which it was said they were not 'formally' against the ordination of women but believed that such a decision must first be taken by all the Churches of the Catholic tradition together. Since such a decision dealt with the structure of the Church, it could be accepted by an Ecumenical Council. Otherwise it was 'a sin against catholicity'.

Fr. Akpunonu: the Biblical Commission has shown that Scripture as such does not exclude the ordination of women, though there are no apodeptic arguments against, we need to be gradual and respect people's cultural sensitivity. He hoped ARCIC could say there is nothing theologically unsound in the ordination of women but would other Churches hold on, so as not to hinder the supreme good of unity.

Professor Wright said that the Anglican Communion is a Church of the catholic tradition: each tradition (Anglican, Roman Catholic, Orthodox) had its own ways of doing things, each with its advantages and disadvantages. Could or should ARCIC say or do anything about it at present, given Anglican diversity and Roman Catholic/Orthodox reticence.

Rev. J. Charley with reference to Fr. Tillard, said the emphasis on 'Catholic tradition/apostolic succession' is a false way of thinking. We must not unchurch the non-episcopal Churches; the apostolicity of a Church is not to be determined by the succession of bishops.



Bishop Cameron said that the reasons brought forward against the Ordination of Women come from very varied traditions. The Evangelical tradition has found no Scriptural basis for the Ordination of Women. Is not this question a symptom such as Prof. Chadwick spoke of earlier. ARCIC-I looked at the RC model of authority and paid insufficient attention to Anglican models of authority and primacy.

Fr. Yarnold, with reference to Fr. Akpunonu, said it would be politically unwise so to say there were no theological arguments against the Ordination of Women. It would be better to explore pluriformity of practice and ask whether it is possible for the Roman Catholic Church to be in communion with a Church that accepts the Ordination of Women.

Canon Baycroft, speaking of the Canadian experience said, there are theological arguments for the Ordination of Women and there is an urgency about this you realize only when you have ordained women. The issue is too urgent to be postponed. To wait for an Ecumenical Council is to propose a perfect solution in a united Church: we have not got one. If we really believe we discern the Spirit calling a person we must be prepared to act.

Canon Hill said in a divided Church no Church can say it ceases to have authority to take important decisions. Is Ordination of Women so intimately linked to the structures of the Church that it requires a Council? Can a separate Church take decisions and in the end say to the Universal Church "is this of God"?

Mgr. Stewart referred to the Versailles A/RC Consultation on Ordination of Women (1978). He was disappointed that more had not come of the relevant resolutions of ACC-4 (1979).

Fr. Duprey explained something of the background of the Versailles paper and its reception.

Dr. Gassmann mentioned the Anglican-Orthodox document (1978); the Lima text; the Lutheran/Roman Catholic Report on ministry. Is the problem to be seen at the level of discipline or of faith (as an Ecumenical Council would suggest)? Is the real problem for Roman Catholics the role of tradition?

Fr. Tillard asked whether we have the right to do something which makes unity impossible on a matter which is not of necessity. Should the R.Catholic Church or Anglicans ordain a woman bishop the Orthodox would find an Ecumenical Council impossible.

Bishop Vogel thought that given the integrity of our Churches, each with its own authority style, it would be absolutely wrong for



Roman Catholics to ordain women and absolutely right for Anglicans to do so. Even so each Church could honestly recognize the other sacramentally.

Revd. J. Charley asked whether Ordination of Women was to put a block in the way of unity. The Spirit has led the Church to changes through the centuries in a ministry for the service of the Church. Ordination of Women is not altering the structure but widening eligibility for service.

Canon Baycroft said unity is more than patching hierarchies together. We must look to the unity of humanity.

Archbishop Butelezi said the Roman Catholic Church could be ready to move in a different direction if shown complementary aspects etc. which made this not a reversal of tradition. But how can this be related to the understanding of the ministry as such?

Prof. Wright said that for Anglicans it was a necessity to say "yes" to the Ordination of Women, given the local style of Anglican (representative) authority structures.

Fr. Thornhill said that an unquestioned tradition was not necessarily an obstacle. Vatican II norms for a binding tradition were that a question had been raised critically and decided.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said that Roman Catholics did have theological reasons against the Ordination of Women, e.g. the celebrant's identification with Christ the High Priest.

Prof. Chadwick noted, in response to Bishop Murphy-O'Connor, that Anglicans did not take a purely functional view of priesthood. However, was it of the substance of what the priest did in the the Church Eucharist that it could not be performed by a woman? Trent had said/ could change all but the substance of the Sacraments. - Some acceptance of Ordination of Women had been necessary at Lambeth 1978 as the consequences of not changing were more serious than change.

Mrs. Tanner said interpreting the celebrant as persona Christi in terms of the maleness of Jesus had the consequence of denying that it was the humanity of the risen and ascended Christ that is represented by the celebrant. Christ represents the whole of humanity.

Mgr. Stewart said that "reasons of fittingness" sometimes had to be reassessed. At Lambeth 1978 the will to maintain communion was impressive.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor thought that the unchanging tradition of something so central to the actual life of the Church was itself



significant.

Sr. Boulding, referring to St. Thomas, said a sign did not need to represent naturally what was signified. Further, the primary sign in the Eucharist was not the priest. In some societies a sign of leadership was aptly male, but not in others.

Fr. Duprey said that Roman Catholics and Orthodox had the duty of explaining more adequately their opposition to the Ordination of Women. In front of the fact that this has never happened, can it be interpreted as the will of Christ or in sociological terms? He did not think there were weighty theological reasons other than the fact of tradition.

Canon Baycroft noted that there had been a faulty theology tradition of submission of women to men.

Prof. Pobee thought more inter-Anglican and inter-confessional dialogue was needed, but 'political' difficulties were raised for Anglicans when the other Churches which do ordain women were also taken into account.

Revd. J. Charley noted it was not until 18th century that the Church saw that slavery was against the will of God.

Prof. Chadwick noted that the late patristic and medieval view had been influenced by the thesis of Ps - Ambrose that women were not made in the image of God. Augustine thought otherwise.

Sr. Boulding called for wider discussion on what it is to be a woman in the Church.

Bishop Vogel noted arguments against Ordination of Women based on the Eucharistic imagery of Christ as the Bridegroom.

Prof. Wright wondered whether the way forward would be to set out possible options.

Revd. J. Charley cautioned against wasting time; there was a diversity of views on both sides. ARCIC should indicate the problem, state that something had happened and state how far this was a blockage.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor thought the Commission must ultimately tackle the problem.

Canon Baycroft wanted to know whether the Roman Catholic 'political' negative was short or long term. Unity with Rome would curtail Anglican flexibility.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor thought the Church of England Synod indicated that many Anglicans were prepared to wait, for the sake of unity.

Fr. Yarnold believed the issue had to be examined in relation to the recognition of ministries.

Mrs. Tanner said many people thought that, as ARCIC-I did not deal with Ordination of Women, ARCIC-II must.

Revd. J. Charley replied that the Ordination of Women did not change the nature of priesthood as explained in ARCIC-I.

Prof. Wright said if this was the case, then nothing in the nature of priesthood (according to ARCIC-I) demanded masculinity. Did ARCIC-II need to say this ?

Fr. Soane thought change in the Roman Catholic Church followed a long timescale. The immediate question was whether we can live with the ordained ministry of women. What of the episcopate ?

Fr. Yarnold enquired "simplistically", what was the Anglican reaction to Roman Catholic recognition of male priests only.

Prof. Chadwick concluded that Roman Catholics would thereby be entering what the Anglican Communion lived with every day !



Saturday, September 3rd

0915

Bishop Santer, in the chair, introduced the day's group work as set out on the sheet circulated to members.

The groups met 0920-1215 and 1630-1830.

The Patriarch of Venice, Cardinal Marco Cé, presided at lunch.

Sunday, September 4th

0930-1215

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in the chair.

The Revd. J. Charley introduced the Report of Group A: ARCIC-II 8 (83). He was struck by the closeness of the Report to Group B; but Group A also contained references to Baptism and Eucharist (2), assurance (3), New Testament teaching on rewards (4).

Fr. Tillard liked A; but B insisted more on the role of the Church. A and B are complementary.

Fr. Duprey looked to a substantial continuation of ARCIC-I. In response to ARCIC-I many had asked about the Word of God in the life of the Church.

Professor Pobee presented the Report of Group B: ARCIC-II 9 (83). He drew attention to the references to context (b); the contemporary context looks beyond Europe, e.g. liberation discussion. The Group had also raised some questions of method not included in the Report. Should the papers proposed be severely criticised by smaller groups (whether or not these could actually meet before our next meeting)

Dr. Gassmann asked whether the Commission should continue to treat two subjects or major on one.

There was a discussion whether study of the Marian Dogmas should form part of this programme. This would be logical but a) could present us with too much material and b) might better be linked with the discussion of steps towards unity as a difficulty which 'will not be wholly resolved until....our two Churches have lived together more visibly in the one koinonía' (Authority II.33). There was need to distinguish the content of Marian doctrines and the binding force of the Marian dogmas. There is relevant material in USARC's imminent paper on anthropology. (Baycroft, Stewart, Cherley, Yarnold, Hill, Lessard).

Professor Wright said the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had raised the issue of ecclesiology.

Bishop Santer said the reaction from the Roman Catholic Church is not yet complete.

Mgr. Stewart thought that the programme proposed in A and B would include much ecclesiology.



The Revd. J. Charley noted the relevance of the work the Commission would eventually have to do on matters not fully settled in the Final Report (Infallibility, Reception, Marian Dogmas).

Group B had had some discussion of purgatory and Indulgences. Though not central doctrines, practice and misunderstandings could make it necessary to speak of these - whether incidentally to a treatment of 'growth' and 'rewards', or as a later elucidation. As yet the shape of a Statement on Salvation cannot be clearly foreseen, but a background paper on their historical context and present Roman Catholic practice (very different from that which Luther criticized) would be of value. People need reassurance if practices in some places seem contrary to what we have told each other in dialogue. Paul VI's document Indulgentiarum Doctrina was clearly relevant. These questions should be taken seriously but kept in proper proportion to the overall work (Gitari, Charley, Santer, Chadwick, Pobe, Tillard, Gassmann, Cameron, Soane, Stewart, Murphy-O'Connor).

Fr. Yarnold was uneasy about the latter part of Group A's para. 3 on the logical priority of justification.

Revd. J. Charley said the stress was meant to be on 'logical' rather than to suggest a time sequence.

Fr. Akunonu thought para. 3's 'God's declaration of acquittal' was still in over forensic language.

Revd. J. Charley pointed to the words 'emphasizes the new standing of believers in Christ'.

Fr. Thornhill said para. 3 referred to one image. It was qualified by para. 1.

Professor Wright asked why para. 3 referred only to the death of Christ.

Revd. J. Charley referred to Romans 3:24 and Bishop Vogel to Eucharist 5.

Professor Wright also asked about para. 3 'appropriate by faith' (once for all? often?).

Revd. J. Charley referred to New Testament use of the aorist: the step of faith and the continuing attitude of faith.

Dr. Davis said we were engaged in a catholic and universal exercise to try to state the aspirations etc. of a world-wide community of faith, expressed in many ways, cultures etc. This is a 'vicarious' task. He pointed to four concerns which should be borne in mind: 1) The need for the de-privatization of religion, salvation, justification. This had political implications. The individualism of the Reformation period found new expression in colonialism; 2) De-absolutisation - we must not absolutise any one culture. Surprisingly, the list in A's para. 1 did not include 'liberation' and 'emancipation'; 3) Salvation is for the whole



creation. We must not forget the ecological dimension - man must free himself to be in harmony with the whole created order; 4) There are ever new manifestations of sin in the world, e.g. the shooting down of the Korean jumbo jet this week. We need to look at all these aspects of sin.

Bishop Githari agreed, but warned against making salvation too wide; personal regeneration etc. must not be left out.

---

Bishop Santer took the chair.

Fr. Yarnold outlined Group C's presentation, ARCIC-II 10 (83). He noted that the quotation on p.2 was from Lima. The group had come to the conclusion that ARCIC should do some preliminary work on "Steps towards Full Communion", but its priority should be on a matter of faith, "Salvation and the Church" (i.e. A and B recommendations).

Mrs. Tanner noted a difference of usage between papers C and D due to confusion over the meaning of "partial communion", i.e. for ~~some~~ it was the present state, for others the next step.

Bishop Vogel called for an historical investigation of the sister churches model.

Bishop Lessard reminded the Commission of the A/RC Marriage Commission's 1975 Report (with reference to n. 4 of the paper). Work had also been done on marriage by Diocesan Ecumenical Officers in U.S.A. He asked whether the reference to the role of the laity in 1,b was exclusively Anglican. He wanted an examination of R.C. developments as well.

Mrs. Tanner and Canon Hill said it was intended to be inclusive.

Fr. Thornhill thought the new Canon Law allowed for the possibility of the laity sharing some jurisdiction.

Prof. Wright asked for some amplifications of the para 3, n. 1. Anglicans have determined to maintain communion between and within provinces which do and do not ordain women. The Anglican Communion must not expect more of RCC than it does of itself.

Prof. Chadwick then introduced the work of group D: ARCIC-II 11 (83). The group was concerned for the meaning and consequences of "partial communion".

Archbishop Butelezi asked if the group had touched on Church/State relations. Was the English establishment a problem? Anglicans coming to South Africa sometimes felt "room to breathe".

Sr. Boulding, agreed that the Royal Supremacy and appointment of bishops in England was a problem.

Dr. Davis was concerned, that moral issues were to be left till Prof. O'Donovan joined the Commission. In the Caribbean gambling was an issue in the raising of Church funds. He also thought liturgical pluriformity an issue of major importance. Church and State issues were wider than the Church of England; the Pope was head of the Vatican State. What of the mission of the Church; these could be helped from Faith and Order and other dialogues.

Fr. Tillard put before the Commission the choice of concentrating on divisive issues or on the whole life of both Churches. Our mandate was to look at areas of division so that the Churches could come together in one communion. ARCIC was not a council giving to the Churches what they need for their internal life.

Bishop Murphy -O'Connor saw the need for work on both misunderstandings of practices and the lack of joint pastoral activity. He asked whether the Churches were not already living in partial communion.



Dr. Gassmann: ARCIC now moves into a new situation, not only because of the wider membership, but also because steps to full communion involve the concrete life of the Churches. ARCIC-I spoke mainly of the ideal, not the actual.

Bishop Vogel agreed with Fr. Tillard that they must pursue obstacles to communion. In U.S.A. all the Malta recommendations had taken place, but with little effect. There was a need for sacramental unity. It was like two people at a cocktail party who say they must have a meal together, but never do.

Mgr. Stewart said ARCIC was not the only point of contact between our Communion. There were ARCs, ACC/SPUC discussions, and bishops' meetings etc. There was need for closer collaboration between ARCIC and ARCs.

Bishop Santer was glad Church/State relations had been raised. It was not only the appointment of bishops but the parliamentary brake on worship and doctrine. He was glad group C raised the question of Sister Churches in the same region. Institutions side by side go their own ways; competition results; and they go on to justify their differences. He doubted the permanent viability of two communions side by side in one culture.

Bishop Gitari spoke of the pain of not being able to receive Holy Communion at the Roman Catholic Eucharist (in the Commission, and also with reference to an exchange of pulpits, Group D, 4f). Was there a way of receiving special permission for occasions such as ARCIC ?

Fr. Duprey complained of a deep allergy to ecclesiastical parallelism from his experience in the Middle East. It was Catholic tribalism. Chalcedon had decreed one bishop in one place. But parallelism was the best that could be done in some circumstances.

Revd. J. Charley insisted that agreement on the fundamentals of faith was the priority. Only then could each communion recognize the other. He spoke of an unresolved tension because RC teaching seemed to say it was the only Church. He was not convinced by the 'subsistit' language and was concerned with real mutuality.

Sr. Boulding called for pressure from authority for more than casual collaboration. We must not do separately what can be done together.

Prof. Wright pointed out that what was already happening demonstrated an existing, partial communion. What did it mean that there was already so much agreement in faith that the Malta recommendations were being carried out ? What could ARCIC say about our present state ?

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor said the main aim was to express a common faith but he was concerned about the next 15 years. The Churches were closer but this made things more difficult. While seeking agreement in faith, was the Commission to try to speak to the local Churches in the meantime ?

Prof. Chadwick spoke of the recognition of the Roman primacy as crucial to the achievement of full communion. What was the criterion for the recognition of catholicity ? There was a paradox in that the more RC claims were orchestrated full brass the more difficult it becomes for Anglicans to accept them. If the Pope said he was not necessary there would be an Anglican landslide. Authority II was addressed to this question and pointed to the recognition of the see of Rome as the focus of unity.

Archbishop Butelezi explained that Vatican II did not solely identify the Church of Christ with the RCC. 'Subsistit in' did not mean this.

Rev. J. Charley replied that the Church of Christ could be said to 'subsistit in' the Anglican Communion.

Bishop Santer said the Anglican Communion had never claimed to be the whole Church.

Rev. J. Charley said "mercifully not".

Canon Baycroft saw mixed marriages as an area for an immediate step. It was frequently on the agenda of bishops' meetings of ARCs. A move forward would be a very powerful stimulus to Anglican/Roman Catholic relations.



MONDAY, September 5th

09.30 - 12.30

Bishop Santer, in the chair, proposed a programme for the Commission's future work.

1. It should take as priority preparation for a paper on "The Church and Salvation" (including Justification) in the hope of making substantial progress towards an agreed statement. There would be need for three preparatory papers in the light of groups A and B:

- (a) Scriptural background on doctrine of Salvation, etc.;
- (b) Historical controversies and their modern evaluation;
- (c) Doctrinal paper on the role of the Church in the dispensation of grace.

These papers could be the basis of the work of a sub-commission before the next full commission. Dr. Gassmann would supply material on relevant Lutheran/ Roman Catholic discussions.

sight

2. We must not lose sight of the concern for "Growth towards Full Communion" (Groups C and D). He proposed that the North American ARCs be invited to take up two overlapping themes: (a) the exploration of the notion of partial communion; (b) further study of the reconciliation of Churches and Ministries.

3. The co-chairmen proposed that they write in their own name to the chairmen of national ARCs to ask whether there are ways in which ARCIC can help them and they can help ARCIC.

In discussion it was agreed that North American ARCs should be asked to make a contribution to the Commission's work on the basis of the Report of Groups C and D (not provide a draft statement).

Revd. J. Charley hoped that in view of the degree of unanimity already shown, some sort of preparatory draft on Church and Salvation would be ready for the next meeting. A statement would be a real boost to relations.

Fr. Tillard hoped that the work of North American ARCs would involve not only presentation and evaluation of existing partial communion but also some critical explanation of recent loss of enthusiasm.

Bishop Santer also hoped for some theological explanation of less than full communion and not ~~hasten~~ to canonical regulations.

It was asked whether such 'practical' work should be restricted to one region. Because of the over-view at the start of this meeting, it was more important to get the 'why' of partial communion than its concrete expression. The theology was the same even if the situation varied. Response to the proposed letter of the Co-chairmen to all ARCs would help towards a wider view.

Fr. Adappur spoke of the need in many regions for further study of the Final Report. It is clear that there are areas where it is still unknown. The Commission recommended that the two offices (SPCU/ACC) should continue their efforts to encourage wide study of the Final Report (This could be raised at the forthcoming 'Informal Talks' in November).

Several members of ARCIC were members of National ARCs. Their advocacy of ARCIC concerns could well be helped by the Co-Chairmen's letter. It must be remembered that National ARCs varied in structure, status and efficacy. Some would be glad of information about study material and the English bibliography (Mrs. Tanner). The Co-Chairmen's letter was a preliminary operation and should be distinguished from the precise request to the North American ARCs.

Since U.S. ARC and Canadian ARC are distinct bodies, care would be needed to achieve their co-observations with each other (Dr. Davis to join). Group Reports C and D would be a basis but should not restrict them unduly.

Fr. Tillard, Revd. J. Charley and Fr. Duprey reminded the Commission that Church and Salvation was to be its primary work. Experience had shown the need to concentrate on one thing at a time. It was agreed that approximately six days of the proposed eight should be devoted to the primary theme. This would leave space for progress reports on the other issues.

Knowledge that we are looking at Justification could assist reception of the Final Report in some places and was in no way a criticism of the former commission.



The Commission then agreed it required three papers on Church and Salvation:

- a) Scriptural - Professor Pobee (in consultation with Fr. Akpunonu)
- b) Historical - Professor Chadwick (in consultation with Fr. Yarnold)
- c) "Church and Dispensation of Grace" - Fr. Tillard (in consultation with Mr. Charley)

The papers would be prepared by the end of April with a view to a meeting of a sub-commission (to be named by the Co-Chairmen) in May/June. This would hope to produce a final draft to be distributed well before the next full meeting of the Commission.

Don Germano Pattero came to bid farewell to the Commission and was warmly thanked for the warm welcome we had received in Venice.

#### Dates of next meetings

- 1984: Wednesday, August 22 (p.m. - arrivals) to Friday, August 31st (a.m. - departures). Probably at Llandaff, Wales.
- 1985: Tuesday, August 27 (p.m.) to Thursday, September 5th (a.m.)
- 1986: Tuesday, August 26th (p.m.) to Thursday, September 4th (a.m.)

It was reported that 25,550 copies of the Final Report had been sold by SPCK/CTS. This took no account of the North American publishing figures, nor of those of the French edition. German, Spanish and Japanese versions were also mentioned.

Professor Chadwick asked at what stage a paper on the teaching authority of the Church on morals would be required. Bishop Santer said Group A had felt this should be left until "justification" was under way. Perhaps initial papers might be commissioned next year for work the following year. But the North American ARC's treatment of partial communion should speak of moral issues if they were an obstacle. Fr. Soane agreed, as did Fr. Duprey. Fr. Tillard insisted that the Commission should not deal with all moral issues but in relation to authority. Fr. Soane, agreeing, also spoke of pluralism. Rev. J. Charley asked where moral issues fitted into the logical progression of work. He too thought they came into the wider discussion of authority, perhaps with remaining issues of ARCIC-I.

It was agreed the Secretaries would summarize reactions to ARCIC-I as they became available.

On the issue of confidentiality it was agreed to follow the practice of ARCIC-I. Papers could be used freely with the permission of their author. Drafts could be shared with responsible persons especially in relation to work invited by the Commission; they should however be "restricted". Minutes should remain confidential to the Commission.

1610-1700

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor in the chair.

The Commission discussed the draft Press Release, ARCIC-II 12/(a) (83), prepared by the Secretaries. After discussion, in which a number of points were raised, it was agreed that the Secretaries should redraft it for approval by the Co-Chairman. (Later they approved ARCIC-II 12/(b) (83) Final Version.

Bishop Murphy-O'Connor thanked members and staff and Fr. Duprey expressed the thanks of the Commission to the Co-Chairmen. The meeting closed with Evening Prayer.