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Centro Pro Unione - Via S. Maria dell'Anima, 30 - 00186 Rome, Italy
A Center conducted by the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement
The text of the Fr. Paul Wattson/Mother Lurana White lecture: “In Defense of the Body: Writings on ‘Being Church’ in Ecumenical Conversation” given by Dr. Anna Marie Aagaard, professor emeritus of systematic theology at the University of Aarhus, Denmark appears in this issue. We are pleased to announce that Prof. Robert Taft, SJ will give this year’s lecture to be given on December 12, 2002. His theme will deal with the implications of the recent document concerning the validity of the ancient Eucharistic anaphora of Addaï and Mari. As is our custom, we continue our celebration on the following evening, with a concert offered by our good friend, Maestro Serguej Diatченко and the Orchestra of the Academy “ART MUSIC”.

In addition to the text of Dr. Aagaard, this Bulletin offers our readers the text of Prof. Jared Wicks, SJ given during the annual celebration of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity in January. This year’s celebration was co-sponsored by the Lay Centre at Foyer Unitas, the Vincent Pallotti Institute and the Centro Pro Unione. An ecumenical celebration of the Word, presided over by the recently installed Pastor of St. Andrew’s Presbyterian Church, Rev. William McCulloch with a homily preached by Bishop Richard Garrard, the new director of the Anglican Centre in Rome followed the excellent lecture of Fr. Wicks.

The Centro Pro Unione began a series of lectures entitled: “Liturgical Renewal: A Way to Christian Unity”. Speakers in this series included Drs. David Holeton, Geoffrey Wainwright, Horace Allen, Teresa Berger and Canon Donald Gray. A second round will follow in the Autumn and it is our hope to publish these as part of our series “Corso Breve di Ecumenismo”.

The British Ambassador to the Holy See, Mark Pellew gave an interesting presentation on the history of the relationship between the Holy See and Great Britain from Henry VIII to the present day. This lecture was co-sponsored by the “Circolo di Roma–Approdo Romano” and the Centro Pro Unione.

Together with the ecumenical institutes of San Nicola di Bari and San Bernardino of Venice, the Centro Pro Unione organized a two day course for professors of ecumenism entitled “Toward Full Communion”. The animator of the course was Walter Cardinal Kasper, President of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity. The course studied two themes: the necessary structural elements for full communion and the question of intercommunion. Over 40 professors from all over Italy participated. Two study groups led by Prof. William Henn, OFM Cap and Prof. Vladimir Zelinsky took up the two themes. An invited guest, Prof. Jörg Lauster offered observations from a Lutheran perspective on the two themes.

I wish to end this issue by expressing my deepest gratitude to two members of our staff who have retired. Giovanna Maria Berardelli who has led many groups through the ancient sites of early Christian Rome has been an energizing spirit to all with whom she has come in contact. Likewise our receptionist, Olga Beal who has greeted so many students over these years with her pleasant smile and willingness to help has retired. My deepest thanks to both who have collaborated so generously in our ecumenical ministry.

Lastly, we welcome on staff Barbara Giambartolomei who takes Olga’s place. Barbara is also a trained librarian and therefore looks after our periodical section as well as helping our librarian.

A Pleasant Spring and Summer to all of our readers. Peace and all good!

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Floor., Chicago, IL 60606 (http://www.atla.com).

For more information on our activities, visit us at: http://www.prounione.urbe.it

James F. Puglisi, sa
Director
Introduction

It is a particular honor for me to address you this evening in the house where so much of the thinking of Vatican II was tested in extensive discussions with Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox observers. Only after the Council, in 1968, did I become familiar with this hall, and the groups which in the early years after the Council occupied the Pamphilj palace—the Ladies of Bethany and IDOC, the International Documentation Center. It was on this floor and on the floor above that IDOC struggled to keep the then new periodical “Concilium” afloat and to interpret the Council to Christians around the world. At an IDOC board meeting I first heard it said, “De jure you are broke. De facto you will make it.” Subsequent ecumenical history has often reminded me of the sentence. Finances have been tight more than once in the ecumenical institutions with which I am familiar, but “de jure you are broke; de facto you will make it” also makes an adequate summary of years of experiences in the ecumenical movement. De jure, the movement seems broke in the complacency with which most Christians remain divided. Christian unity has a hard time, and at the beginning of the new millennium most churches are preoccupied not with ecumenism, but with refining their own identity-sustaining traditions. De facto, however, the ecumenical movement will make it, but the churches’ part of making it will mean more hard work, than waiting for a miracle.

The title of my presentation, “In Defense of the Body,” may seem more than a little contrived, but I found no better way of indicating both an ecclesiological topic and my assessment of the scope and the direction of the hard work currently needed. I shall first apply the phrase to the current discussions about the church and the churches within the World Council of Churches (WCC). I shall concentrate on the Council’s self-understanding and the Orthodox-Protestant divide. Then I shall use the title as a key to some current interpretations of “being church” in the Oikoumene, and, finally, I shall stick my neck out and indicate the ecumenical strategy mostly needed “in defense of the body.”

The WCC and the churches

A fellowship of churches

The WCC is unique in bringing divided churches together from all over the globe, and the Council is unprecedented in nudging churches of both the Christian East and West towards common worship and witness. If the WCC was nothing more than a functional agency of service and socio-political advocacy, it would suffice to describe the organization in sociological terms, but the features of the Council as a living reality point to a bonding that goes beyond the nature of secular agencies. The accumulated tradition of the WCC names this bonding a “fellowship of churches”. It is further described as “a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior according to the scriptures and therefore seeks to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit”¹. A Trinitarian faith, a confession of Christ Jesus as Lord and Savior, and, in most member churches, the rite of baptism in the name of God—Father, Son and Holy Spirit: it is difficult to overlook the significance, indeed, ecclesial significance of a bonding that in terms of faith and the gifts of Spirit is “not nothing.” But experience with the WCC in the fifty years of its existence demonstrates that the “not nothing” of the bonding may be so elusive that it amounts to nothing more than a void far too easily labeled koinonia, the New Testament word for fellowship or communion (2 Cor 13:13).

Who is the “we”?

The Basis of the WCC speaks of “a fellowship of churches which confess...”. The churches, in plural, confess; not the fellowship. The “body” disappears behind the bodies; the fellowship empties into the divided churches. The formulation cannot but raise questions. Is there at all a “we” that confesses; a

for real fellowship, however frail and nigh impossible to describe? or must the WCC be described as a co-existence of churches which recognize the sin of their dividedness but cannot (or will not?) find the spiritual resources to overcome a logic of division which shapes their liturgical worship and their understanding of “being church”? Who is the “we” praying and worshiping God at the WCC’s services? Christians of both Eastern and Western traditions find the subject of the ecumenical worship nebulous—to say the least. More than Orthodox member churches assume that the WCC’s worshipping “we” in reality is a conglomeration of pious individuals, but few have voice it so clearly as the Eastern Orthodox churches, when they, a few months before the 50th anniversary of the WCC, decided to down grade their involvement in the Harare Assembly (December 1998): “Orthodox delegates will not participate in ecumenical services, common prayers, worship and other religious ceremonies at the Assembly”.

The internal contradictions of conciliar ecumenism, revealed by a Basis speaking of “a fellowship of churches which confess,” have repeatedly been addressed. In line with the Toronto Statement of 1950, early attempts at defining the nature and vision of the Council have focused on articulating what the Council is not, but might become. They have denied an exclusive alternative between the Council as already “being church” and the Council as an organization with no significance beyond the pragmatic value of furthering an exchange of goods and ideas. There is something in between secularizing the Council and regarding it a manifestation of the una sancta of the creeds. Defining this “in between” has, however, proven to be difficult.

Ecclesiological significance?

The most recent defense of the WCC as a body with an “ecclesiological significance comes from metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon. At a 1995 inter-Orthodox consultation he described the Council as “an event of communion” and substantiated his claim by reflecting on three marks that identify the Council as such “an event of communion”. It something to do with it stemming from faith in the Triune God and from Baptism; there is some progress towards acceptance of the Nicene Creed as the creedal basis of ecclesial unity, and there are common social and ecological activities that may indicate the adumbrations of a common vision. To the esteemed ecumenist it follows that we cannot go on for ever and ever holding different or contradictory views of the Church. It was wise to begin with the ecclesiological. “laissez-faire” of Toronto but it would be catastrophic to end with it... In the process of ecumenical reception the “fellowship” of member Churches will have to grow into a common vision and recognition of what the true Church is... The Toronto statement will have to be stripped of its ecclesiological pluralism. I do not agree with the view that the WCC should not develop an ecclesiology. On the contrary I believe this to be a priority for it.

Metropolitan John revives the old question about the relation between the WCC’s “fellowship” and the member churches. Who is the primary agent, the “we,” developing a common ecclesiology and thus growing into common recognition of the one, true church? Is the “we” the institutionalized fellowship with an evanescent “ecclesial” identity alongside or apart from the churches, or is the “we” particular churches striving to adopt a common ecclesiology and thereby manifest the unity of the body of Christ?

Churches in fellowship

Prolonged and often cumbersome processes resulted, in 1997, in a policy statement “Towards a Common Understanding and Vision of the World Council of Churches.” The document affirms the nature of the WCC as a “fellowship of churches” but distinguishes between the fellowship and the organization:

The essence of the Council is the relationship of the churches to one another. The Council is the fellowship of churches on the way towards full koinonia. It has a structure and organization in order to serve as an instrument for the churches as they work towards koinonia in faith, life and witness (§3.5.2)

The Policy Statement makes the member churches themselves, not the Council, the primary agent of seeking the unity of the body of Christ. An Interim Report from the “Special Commission,” established by the Harare Assembly to deal with the Orthodox criticisms of the Council, repeats (rather bluntly)


3The negative formulations of the Toronto Statement of 1950 (what the Council is not) have stood the test of time, while the positive formulations have been either superseded or benignly neglected, cf. “The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches”, in M. KINNAMON and B.E. COPE, eds., The Ecumenical Movement, ... op. cit., 463-468.


6WCC, September 1997.
The member churches are the subject of the quest for visible unity, not the Council. The member churches teach and make doctrinal and ethical decisions, not the Council...

The report continues by speaking about a Council that will hold churches together in an ecumenical space — where trust can be built, — where churches can test and develop their readings of the world, their own social practices, and their liturgical and doctrinal traditions while facing each other and deepening their encounter with each other” (§ 8)7.

These more recent reflections on the Council and the churches have laid to rest the older debates about the ecclesiological significance of the Council itself. The emphasis now lies on the churches and their responsibility for making the WCC a safe ecumenical space where churches will “give account to each other of being church” (Interim Report 6.1) and participate in developing both “the sensibilities and the language that will allow them to sustain a dialogue with each other” (Interim Report 8.3). These changes in ecumenical thinking did not come as a surprise. They were shaped concomitantly with the disappearance of modernity’s old certainties about a single system of truth based on universal reason and about history as single story with a single, coherent plot. Whatever the theological responses may be to post-modernity’s lurking nihilism also ecumenical theology has shred the illusion that there is some universal viewpoint, situated in no particular tradition and inhabited by an abstract “we,” from which the questions of Christian unity can be addressed. On the contrary: “Before there can be an articulable Oikoumene there is the resonance in which diverse local communities of faith recognize and share the forming, energizing power of the Holy Spirit”.8 Before there is “fellowship” with some features of the Pauline koinonia, there are traditioned churches in which Christians learn (if they learn it) thus to worship God and identify what they have to do in the world so that the story they tell of the great things God has done (cf. Acts 2:11) becomes the story they inhabit. A “fellowship” which confesses can only gain substance by churches acting bilaterally or multilaterally in their local contexts. Rather than the perpetuation of a concept of the WCC as a global, nebulous something apart from the churches, a fellowship of churches presupposes particular churches practicing “being church” by breaking down the barriers that hinder their mutual recognition as churches sharing one faith, one Eucharistic body and one baptism for the remission of sins (Interim Report 8.6). Current ecclesiology within both the Orthodox and the Reformation traditions understands “being church” as at once a community and a history—a community embodying and passing along a story that shapes the language as well as the practices of self-giving love and forgiveness through which people gain and sustain their identity as Christian believers. Christian faith is ecclesial. The biblical narratives are not self-referential, but received in faith they shape a community capable of being the continuation of God’s story with human beings. In short: the generating events and the community generated cannot be separated.

The prophetic voice?

The emphasis on the churches themselves as the subject of any ecumenical movement on the move has exposed deep-seated differences within the Council’s Protestant membership9. The following lines capture the problem,

...there is... a danger for the ecumenical movement to be deserted because of its absence of relevance to the issues of our time... There are many, among the laity particularly, who would wish the ecumenical movement to deal with the whole inhabited world more than with the world of the churches10.

What is going on here? I think the lines speak to fears of silencing “the prophetic voice” of a Council able to go against the churches and speak to both the world and the churches11. The quote sets the world of the churches over against the whole inhabited world with its issues relevant to human persons, and it puts an emphasis on the churches equal ecclesiastical navel-gazing. Assuming such fundamental polarity between world and church presupposes secular modernity’s belief in a wider and deeper and broader human community than the community in the body of Christ and a more unified world than the world that holds together in and because of Christ. “Social groups and movements” are consequently better positioned than the churches to witness to

---


9Naming WCC’s member churches is a daunting task. No member church can legitimately be referred to just as “non-Orthodox,” and neither the Anglican churches nor the Old Catholic church can legitimately be labeled “Protestants.” Here I use “Protestant” as a reference to mainline churches with an acknowledged Reformation heritage.

10Cf. Background Material, Special Commission (Jean Fischer).

a human community with no other limits than the human race\textsuperscript{12},
and most proponents of this view understand the optimal church-
world relation as a grafting of Christian faith into the endeavors of
social NGOs trying to mend the fabric of life. The consequences for 
“being church” are summed up by a Swedish theologian: “I 
think it is misleading to perceive the church as being able to create 
communities outside the general conditions of the world and of 
humanity”\textsuperscript{13}. More is at work — and at stake — in this sentence 
than a reference to the changes of history.

The World Council’s Protestant member churches might share 
the knowledge that it takes distinctive social environments to 
shape distinctive identity, but there is no agreement on which 
communities help create what desired form of Christian identity.
Confidence in faith-generating churches with an ecumenical 
commitment to develop their social practices while facing each 
other (Interim Report 8.4) is conspicuously absent in much 
protestant opposition to the Council’s emerging emphasis on 
facilitating community in and between the churches.

\textbf{We have all it takes}

Visions of an Oikoumene with churches as the primary agents 
of building community run, however, into more than one set of 
difficulties. For all the successes of the ecumenical movement 
the main divisions of the Christian church remain. Ecumenical 
parlance refers to families of churches (Orthodox, Roman 
Catholic, mainline Protestant, and Pentecostal/Evangelical), but 
the vocabulary only hides that churches continue to be divided\textsuperscript{14}. 
Might happen ecumenically, but nothing changes, and most 
Christians are ecumenically indifferent. They couldn’t care less. 
Each attempt at doctrinal agreements and common witness, not to 
speak of proposals of shared liturgical calendars, activates 
conflicts in the churches threatening to create new splits between 
the churches. The \textit{de facto} preference for staying divided has not 
been reduced by a century of ecumenical endeavors and it is 
difficult to see how it could be otherwise because each of the 
divided churches maintains that, in principle, if not always in lived 
fact, it has all it takes to be truly the body of Christ in history.

In a review article American theologian Bruce Marshall 
comments on the state we’re in ecumenically: Churches take the 
integrity of their own particular ecclesial tradition for granted, as 
to both the absence of qualitative defects and the sufficiency for 
Christ-formed communal living. Bruce Marshall continues,

\begin{quote}
(Each church) is convinced that it has all it needs, 
doctrinally and otherwise, to be Christ’s faithful people. It 
has no defects which cuts to the heart, and certainly none 
which might be made good by coming to share a common 
Eucharistic life with another church. Convinced of our own 
self-sufficiency, we sense as divided churches no use for 
any goods we might receive from each other, and so in the 
end no need for each other\textsuperscript{15}.
\end{quote}

Churches may not agree on what is sufficient, doctrinally, 
liturgically or ethically, for “being church” with an ecclesial 
Christ-formed life, but each church perceives what it has as being 
self-supporting of the one holy church. Changes in ecumenical 
practice can consequently only be thought of as “our” corporate 
growth in holiness, and not as “our” corporate repentance and 
extension of mutual forgiveness.

Konrad Raiser, the General Secretary of the WCC, formulates 
the ensuing problem for the WCC by asking: “In what sense can 
we continue to speak of a “fellowship of churches” as long as the 
ecclesial identity of the separated communities is uncertain?” The 
affirmation of the fellowship remains weak, Konrad Raiser 
claims, as long as it is not sustained by member churches’ 
commitment to one another in the center of their ecclesial identity, 
and, he continues, precisely at this point we encounter the greatest 
challenges to the WCC and other conciliar bodies\textsuperscript{16}. If “being 
church” in conciliar fellowship means commitment to one another 
in the center of ecclesial identity, how can “a fellowship of 
churches” come into existence, when some member churches 
regard other member churches as \textit{essentially} incomplete?

\textbf{Being church in a fellowship of churches}

An exchange between two Danish bishops points to the 
thological center of the problem. Responding to a Danish 
Lutheran bishop’s argument with \textit{Dominus Iesus}, the Roman 
Catholic bishop of Copenhagen suggested that the dialogue be 
continued in respect for each other’s ecclesiological self-

\begin{quote}
I am convinced (but I cannot verify the claim) that “independent 
groups under the roof of the church” during the last decade of the 
Communist regime in the former DDR helped, decisively, to shape 
the thinking on “groups and movements” within the WCC. On 
the situation in the former DDR, cf. D. STEELE, “At the Front Lines 
of the Revolution: East Germany’s Churches Give Sanctuary and Succor 
to the Purveyors of Change”, in D. JOHNSTON and C. SAMPSON, eds., 
Religion, The Missing Link of Statecraft (NY: Oxford University 
Press, 1994) 119-152, esp. 141: “In the case of the 
independent groups under the roof of the church,... the themes of 
“peace,” “justice,” and “integrity of creation” taken directly from the 
themes of peace, justice, and integrity of creation”.

\textsuperscript{12}E. GERLE, “Contemporary Globalization and Its Ethical 

\textsuperscript{13}Cf. U. KÖRTNER, Herder Korrespondenz 54, 11 (2000) 562: 
“.die ökumenische Lage har sich seit den achtziger Jahren stark 
gewandelt. Nicht erst seit \textit{Dominus Iesus} liegt offen zutage, dass sich 
die ökumenische Bewegung in der Krise findet. \textit{Von 
Aufbruchstimmung ist kaum etwas zu bemerken}” (my italics).

\textsuperscript{14}B. MARSHALL, “Review Essay: The Divided Church and Its 

\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Report of the General Secretary, WCC, Central Committee 
2001, available on http://www.wcc coe.org/wcc/who/cc2001/gs2-
e.html
understanding. To which the Lutheran bishop replied, “Does it mean that we must respect that the Roman Catholic Church does not respect us as a church?... I will accept that the attitude exists in the Roman Catholic Church... but nothing can shake (the Lutheran bishops’) understanding that our Lutheran church is a church”.

I have no intention of re-opening the discussion on *Dominus Iesus* but I do wish to question the wisdom of having a conciliar fellowship of churches entertain ecclesiological neutrality to the extent that some members of a Council of Churches regard other member churches as not being church. Let me begin to sketch an argument by suggesting an answer to the question: Why does the de-churchifying of what Vatican II names ecclesial communities make these churches react so vehemently to *Dominus Iesus*? What’s new? Ever since Vatican II and the entry of the Orthodox churches into the WCC (1961) the ecumenical movement has confronted Anglican and Protestant churches with a vocabulary that makes “church” a word carrying analogical meanings. It may mean one thing when applied to own church and own family of churches and an incomplete or deficient ecclesial entity when applied to other churches. The more unexamined the own ecclesiology has been, the less attention have churches within the Reformation traditions paid to the many meanings of “church.” That picture has, however, changed dramatically, because the last decade has seen most mainline churches with Reformation heritage concentrate on ecclesiology and “being church” in a radically changing world. Having gained a sense of the story of faith as an ecclesial story and the concrete, traditioned church as a particular community nurturing a particular people, it becomes a serious matter to be de-churchified. As long as the fellowship of the WCC was some nebulous universal supposed to be in the process of becoming a concrete, embodied *koinonia*, it didn’t matter what member churches thought about each other, provided all churches put in some efforts to sustain the Council itself. The meaning of a conciliar fellowship of churches struggling to become together the *eucharistia* they celebrate evaporates however, if the Council’s member churches de-churchify each other.

If “joining a council of churches means accepting the challenge to give account to each other of being church and to articulate what is meant by the visible unity of the church” (Interim Report 6.1) the churches in the Orthodox families cannot avoid the sharp question now being asked by the Special Commission: “Is there a space for other “churches” in Orthodox ecclesiology? How would this space and its limits be described?” (Interim Report 6.2).

The Jubilee Bishops’ Council of the Russian Orthodox Church addresses the question in a declaration on “Basic Principles of the Attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church toward the other Christian Confessions” (August 2000)\(^7\). The declaration begins, The Orthodox Church is the true Church of Christ established by our Lord and Savior Himself, the Church confirmed and sustained by the Holy Spirit, the Church about which the Savior Himself has said: “I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Mt 16:18). She is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the keeper and provider of the Holy Sacraments throughout the world, “the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim 3:15).

The Jubilee Council does not make any new or exceptional ecclesiological claims. It repeats the Orthodox position that the communion of Orthodox churches is the One, true Church of Christ in history:

The Orthodox Church is the true Church in which the Holy Tradition and the fullness of God’s saving grace are preserved intact. She has preserved the heritage of the apostles and holy fathers in its integrity and purity. She is aware that her teaching, liturgical structures and spiritual practice are the same as those of the apostolic proclamation and the Tradition of the Early Church (1,18).

It is an integral part of this Orthodox position that “communities which have fallen away from Orthodoxy have never been viewed as fully deprived of the grace of God... (In) spite of the rupture of unity, there remains a certain incomplete fellowship which serves as a pledge of a return to unity in the Church, to catholic fullness and oneness” (1,15). Various rites of reception (through baptism, through chrismation, through repentance) reveal the Orthodox Church’s graduated relations to the “non-Orthodox confessions” (1,17). There is, indeed, a space for the WCC’s non-Orthodox churches in Orthodox ecclesiology. It is a space of separation from the one, true Church. It is a space of “division or schism” which always “implies a certain measure of falling away from the plenitude of the Church” (1,14).

It is possible to argue that any ecumenical movement with the Orthodox churches ends at this point. By explicitly asking the Orthodox member churches to situate other churches in Orthodox ecclesiology the WCC’s Old Catholic, Anglican and Protestant churches can only expect to hear about schism. The WCC’s emphasis on “being church in fellowship” may precipitate an ending — a “point of no return” in more than one sense of the phrase.

The WCC’s current ecclesiological debate cuts both ways, however. Orthodox refusal to acquiesce in the ever growing number of Protestant member churches makes it imperative for Protestants to answer the question: how does your affirmation of the one, catholic church affect your “being church in fellowship”? (*Interim Report 6.3*).

The first answer to the question must admit that the faith affirmation has limited impact on the understanding of the fellowship of churches. None of the recent doctrinal agreements between churches of the Reformation tradition has prompted these churches to question their denominational autonomy and

\(^7\)Cf. Kristeligt Dagblad, Dec. 21, 2000 (in Danish).

\(^8\)Available at http://www.russian-orthodox church.org.ru/s2000e13.htm
confessional self-sufficiency. The unity of the body of Christ disappeared long ago into the defense of theological systems with convenient assumptions of a disembodied, invisible church. The one, catholic church of the baptismal Creeds disappeared into the abstractions of philosophical traditions where universals live a life of their own.

Drawing upon recent studies with emphasis on an ecclesial mediation of Christian faith, Michael Kinnamon focuses his attempt at an answer on the catholicity of the church19. Kinnamon asks the Reformation and Free churches, now in dialogue with the Orthodox, how they can think of themselves as “catholic,” when most lack concrete forms of communion with other churches and a good many have no connection to the Body of Christ across time through an apostolic succession in ministry”?

The WCC’s Uppsala Assembly (1968) understands catholicity to be “the quality by which the church expresses the fullness, the integrity, and the totality of its life in Christ”. Most Protestant members of the WCC will link catholicity with an emphasis on each gathered community of baptized believers as the catholic church in which the whole Christ is present, through faith, in human time and history. This combination of fullness and local community means that only in the eschatological consummation will the church of Christ be realized fully and completely as catholic. Meanwhile, the church must exist as the ever reforming church—a church that avoids to identify divine character with specific historic expressions of the church. Ministries, offices, structures are contingent on Christ, the Word, and connectional structures are supposed to help keeping the legitimate diversity within the bonds of biblical faith and the acknowledged authority of the ecumenical creeds.

The second half of Kinnamon’s essay deals with “a council of churches (conseil)—locally, nationally, regionally, and globally” that will challenge “the temptation toward confessional or denominational autonomy” and add “a crucial dimension to the understanding and expression of catholicity…”

If councils have ecclesiological significance (cf. John of Pergamon), because, through them, the church can be built up and its catholicity more fully expressed, we are back at the question: why the lack of concrete forms of communion with other churches?

A textbook reply would be: a conciliar existence may be a desideratum, but a conciliar existence does not belong to the esse of the church. There is no “divine character” (no necessity) linked with conciliarity or with other provisional representation of the Kingdom. The “extra-calvinisticum” (God’s freedom vis-à-vis the mediation of grace) still applies.

But Kinnamon’s paper opens up for a more constructive reply to the questions about Protestant preference for autonomy and denominationalism. Kinnamon writes: “The church in history always fails to express the full character of Christ...this means that catholicity involves repentance...”.

The politics of pardon

It is premature to prophesy about the future of the Orthodox-Protestant encounter within the WCC. Unless one harbors the illusion that the present crisis will evaporate quietly and leave the Council unscathed, there is, however, no way around beginning the practice of “being church together” in a fellowship of churches. The question is: what would it take that the divided churches have not already tried with so little effect?

In the current Orthodox-Protestant debate metropolitan Gennadios of Sassima has suggested,

Christians have to begin to know the truth, the “aletheia” of the Good News, to believe and to love the Ecclesia, the Church of Christ, to embrace it even in difficult circumstances and painful moments of its history, to suffer, witness and confess it, to defend it even if martyrdom be the cost. This is the Christian way of worshiping...20.

I understand metropolitan Gennadios to say: What about beginning to love the church? not just some abstract idea of one, holy church behind or beyond the concrete assemblies of the faithful, but the living and suffering church of living and suffering believers who cannot but in a confession of sins give up every idea of successful performance of a Christ-formed living. What about putting a stop to separating the holiness of the church from holiness in the church? what about learning from Dietrich Bonhoeffer that “the only profitable relationship to others...is one of love, that is the will to hold fellowship with them”?

The pastoral and ecumenical consequences of beginning to be churches together by practicing ecclesial love are far-reaching. It would imply — with Bonhoeffer — to give priority to the love of the other in God and situating the knowledge of another within the bonding of love. Beginning with the will to hold fellowship with the other will, in turn, situate the problem of divisions not in conceptual divergences, but in the lack of ecclesial love.

In his erudite, difficult, and deeply disturbing book The End of the Church Anglican theologian Ephraim Radner argues that from the will to divide and the practice of living apart emerged that “separative logic” which buttressed the divisions in the Western Church. The theological divides were not the cause of the splits, but the results of the cooling of love. Reflecting on medieval theology’s decoupling of the Eucharist from the church’s corporality Radner writes

particularly of late, there has grown an increased appreciation of the subordination of such conceptual divergences to social realities, which themselves embody theological commitments far more pointedly than does their

---

19Prof. Michael Kinnamon is a former Executive Secretary of the WCC’s Faith and Order Commission. His paper was discussed at the Special Commission meeting in Berekfürdör, Hungary, Nov 15-20, 2001.

20Special Commission on Orthodox Participation in the World Council of Churches, Documents from the Meeting of Subcommittee II, WCC 2000.

verbal articulation. And these are the realities that eclesial division contradicts in a basic fashion, acting as a ground to theological development, and not merely as its response. In other words, it is possible that the contradiction of ecclesial love in the sixteenth century in and of itself altered the significance of a theological terminology that before that time... was bounded by a realm of meaning wholly divergent from its postdivisional articulation22.

But what would it look like, if divided churches began approaching “being churches together in fellowship” by practicing ecclesial love? Some would say that it is a moot question, because any living and lived communal confession of the one, holy church cannot be divorced from the inherited theological systems. The “we versus them exclusions” have been built into the oppositional systems of habits and institutions in which every ecclesial community is deeply convinced that it has all it takes for successfully performing the body of Christ. Ecclesial love between divided churches does not make sense. Exactly because the unity of the church must begin with the concrete historical realities it seems futile to assume that Christians should be capable of unlearning the logic and the practices or division.

And yet? And yet there is a way to act in the “always already destructive structures of ecclesial unrelatedness” which assumes that they can be broken. This way is called “forgiveness.”

Shortly after World War II Hannah Arendt, the Jewish philosopher, turned to the predicament of human action. In The Human Condition (1951) she argues that there is a redemption, as she names it, from the irreversibility of all human action, namely forgiveness. If women and men could not forgive and receive forgiveness for the consequences of what was done, we would be confined to one single deed, from which we would never recover. We would remain forever its victims. Forgiveness is, according to Hannah Arendt, a human faculty. But nobody can forgive himself or herself. Forgiveness thus belongs to the social conditions of being human, and it can never be predicted:

(Forgiveness) is the only reaction that acts in an unexpected way and thus remains, though being a reaction, something of the original character of action. Forgiving, in other words, is the only reaction which does not merely re-act but acts anew and unexpectedly and therefore freeing from its consequences both the one who forgives and the one who is forgiven (241).

Hannah Arendt’s seminal analyses moved “forgiveness” from the religious/Christian context into the political context. Forgiveness became a secular possibility — in international law; in criminal law and in psychology. All-pervasive evils like the Holocaust, the apartheid regime and ethnic cleansings demanded new politics, and new politics can only emerge from a change of practices. It is in this context that the efforts to devise a politics of pardon are situated.

I am convinced that the current theological interest in forgiveness has been prompted by political philosophy and new social practices. Nothing indicates that churches practicing forgiveness of each other have provided secular societies with tested practices able to break the irreversibility of past actions.

Neither a particular church nor an existing ecumenical community appears in recent literature as the “we” of Jesus’s prayer: Forgive us the wrong we have done, as we have forgiven those who wronged us. Prayers for God’s forgiveness abound in current theological reflection and liturgical material, even prayers of God’s forgiveness of sins committed in the cast by individual believers in one church against sisters and brothers in another church. But an ecclesial public does not appear as the “we” extending and receiving forgiveness in relation to another ecclesial public. Sins, also social sins, remain the sins of an individual. That churches begin to forgive each other for wounding the body and keeping it divided may not be an impossible, but in the state we’re in, a very improbable scenario. It has not yet dawned upon the divided churches that forgiveness may be the only action that can break the irreversibilities of our sinful divisions. The secular states are beginning to learn it23.

But there is in more recent ecumenical history evidence of at least one occasion, where divided churches turned to an act of forgiveness. Walter Kasper is aware of its ecumenical significance. In an 1987 article Kasper revisits the lifting of the mutual excommunication of 1054 between Rome and Constantinople24. Kasper quotes Orthodox metropolitan Meliton who at the time (at the very end of Vatican II) insisted that the act did not imply any changes in “dogmatic thinking, canonical order, divine worship, and Church life generally.” What happened in St. Peter’s on Dec. 7, 1965 was an encounter “conducive to the restoration of charity, to obliterate the grievous acts of the past which then banished charity between the two churches, helped to break their links, and in time became symbolic of their divisions”25. The act of lifting the mutual excommunication was an act of ecclesial love allowing for the purification of memories, The “Common Declaration” of Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras identifies this act of love as “expressive of justice and mutual forgiveness” opening up “in a spirit of trust, esteem,


and mutual charity” a dialogue aiming at restoration of communion in faith and sacramental life. 

I know of no other reference to churches forgiving each other in an act of trust and love and thus, by leaving illusions about their own successful performance of Christ-formed community, begin to deal constructively with a past of divisions.

I know of no other references to churches beginning exactly right: beginning with love and forgiveness, the only Christian practice through which the occurrence of community, in pursuit of the things that make for peace (Rom 15), may be mediated.

---

26Ibid. 128.
Lights and Shadows over Catholic Ecumenism

Jared Wicks, SJ
Professor of Fundamental Theology and Ecumenics, Pontifical Gregorian University

(Conference held at the Centro Pro Unione, Tuesday, 22 January 2002)

We are now one year and 22 days into a new century, which gives us some perspective on the century just past. The distance is surely not enough for marking the truly defining moments of the past century and seeing them in meaningful connection. But still, a simple chronicle of church-related events suggests that, among all else, the Twentieth was the ecumenical century.

The Ecumenical Century
One starts with the founding in 1910, at Edinburgh, of the International Missionary Council. Moving along the time-line, one has to mark 1948, for the founding at Amsterdam of the World Council of Churches. These are churches which, as the Basis of their fellowship and collaboration, “confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior, according to the Scriptures, and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.” — A remarkable way to come together, later acknowledged by a clear echo of this World Council text in Vatican II’s Unitatis redintegratio, no. 20.

In the chronicle, Vatican II looms large, where the delegated observers gave an ecumenical dimension to each day’s assembly in St. Peter’s. The Council’s Decree on Ecumenism remains a major conciliar text of assessment, of methodology, and above all of commitment for Catholic ecumenism, as made clear by its updated re-presentation in Pope John Paul II’s encyclical Ut unum sint of 1995.

A month ago, from this lectern, Anna Marie Aagaard reminded us of the singular action taken on penultimate day of the Council, December 7, 1965, when the churches of Rome and Constantinople, heretofore estranged, lifted their mutual excommunications. This act intended to consign to oblivion a sizeable residue of suspicion and hostility, so that the dialogue of love might begin, leading to a theological dialogue of truth between the Orthodox Churches and the Catholic Church.

Late in the century, one topic of dialogue matured, after twenty years of work, to the point that on Oct. 31, 1999, at Augsburg, Lutherans and Catholics could sign their Joint Declaration of consensus on the doctrine of justification, solemnly confessing together that “by grace alone, in faith in Christ’s saving work, and not because of any merit on our part, we are accepted by God and receive the Holy Spirit, who renews our hearts while equipping and calling us to good works”.

These are bright lights in the ecumenical century (and others could be easily mentioned). But at the end, during the one-hundredth and final year of the century, in 2000, some clouds moved from the horizon to cast shadows over areas of ecumenical life and action.

In the World Council of Churches, during 2000, the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation, a group 60 experienced representatives, held five tension-filled meetings. By the end of 2000, the process had brought to light, with all desirable clarity, major discomforts of the 21 Eastern Orthodox and Ancient Oriental member-Churches of the WCC. These touch on the ways of prayer and worship at WCC assemblies, which include forms in which Orthodox Christians cannot in conscience participate. The Orthodox would have World Council make decisions on issues touching doctrine and ethics not by “parliamentary” majorities but by a genuinely “conciliar” consensus. The Orthodox are concerned that member-churches really ground their lives in the faith set forth in the World Council Basis, with its profession of the Trinity and of Jesus as God and Savior. At any rate, this “shadow over Geneva” is bringing home that conclusions reached in one church—about Scripture, the Creeds, and forms of Christian life—can in fact weaken or even impair


4 A generous offering of documentation from the first year’s labors of the Special Commission on Orthodox Participation is give at the internet site www.wcc-coe.org, under the rubric “Who are we?” in the box “WCC Self-Understanding and Policy”, giving the section “Special Commission”.
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fellowship with other communities also making the ecumenical journey.

The WCC Special Commission is a wrenching experience for those committed to seeing it through to the conclusion planned for this year. Anna Marie Aagaard gave testimony in December to the impact of the Orthodox challenge, raising questions about the ecclesial identity and ecumenical goals of the Anglican and Protestant majority, about repenting for wounding the ecclesial body, and about the consequences entailed in truly loving the Church of Christ in this world.

Other shadows over the ecumenical landscape appeared during 2000. In July, at Emmitsburg Maryland, the 8th plenary session of the Orthodox-Catholic commission for theological dialogue ended in an impasse over questions about the Catholic Oriental Churches. The dialogue-session left such a negative impression that one peritus of the commission, Dimitri Salachas, had to clarify in Il Regno, that the dialogue has not been broken off, whatever may be the reports of discord and recriminations voiced at Emmitsburg 5. But the Commission does face a challenge of “re-starting its engine”, so it can deal with the important issue, already prepared for discussion, of how the sacramental structure of the church comes to expression in synodal forms of authority.

Then in September 2000, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued the Declaration Dominus Iesus, in which Ch. IV, treated “The Unicity and Unity of the Church,” and most readers will know that this one chapter brought on countless expressions of aggravation, offense, and dissent by spokespersons of churches with which the Catholic Church is conducting bilateral dialogues. But more about this below.

So the Twentieth Century ended with the ecumenical landscape being well-lighted but also shadowed in certain sectors. To now probe this situation more in detail, passing into our new century, I want to focus selectively on just two areas, out of many, of Catholic ecumenical engagement, first to identify in each the bright lights of progress, then to name some darker shadows, but also to point to promising efforts underway to dissipate the shadows.

Broadening the Consensus on Justification

I mentioned already the Lutheran-Catholic Joint Declaration on Justification. Today, a new chapter is unfolding in the history of that declaration of 1999. What was signed in Augsburg has become something of a pole-star in the ecumenical firmament. It is attracting others. In November 2001, a four-sided world-level Consultation was held in Columbus, Ohio, at which Lutheran and Catholic representatives took up, with representatives of two other confessional communions, the possibility of the other two, by way of procedures now taking shape, coming to adhere to the consensus on justification. The two communions are the World Methodist Council (77 member-churches) and the World Alliance of Reformed (or Presbyterian) Churches (with 215 member-churches). Processes are now beginning by which they may become, along with the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church, signatories of the declared consensus on God’s justifying work in human lives 6.

From one perspective this is not too surprising. Both the Methodist Council and the Reformed Alliance have carried on bilateral theological dialogues with the Lutheran Federation and the Catholic Church, dialogues which have already expressed a large measure of consensus on justification, with characteristic theological differences around this center. The differences come from special emphases of one partner, which however the other partner can appreciate, without adopting them. The Lutheran-Methodist document of 1984, The Church: Community of Grace, features four paragraphs of central consensus combined with different emphases on “Salvation by grace through faith” 7. Also, the Reformed-Roman Catholic bilateral dialogue issued in 1990 the report, Toward a Common Understanding of the Church, containing a “common confession of faith”, both in Jesus Christ as sole Mediator and Reconciler of humankind with God and, most remarkably, on “Justification by Grace, through Faith” 8.

These bilaterals are similar to the process that led to the Joint Declaration itself, namely, earlier Lutheran-Catholic dialogues on justification by theologians, who—it turned out—prepared the way for an affirmation at the highest level of their churches. In the Joint Declaration the churches received the dialogue-results, so that the consensus may be widely know and enter into the lived religiosity of neighboring Catholic and Lutheran parishes and affect members of the two communions.

Now the question is whether Methodists and Reformed-Presbyterians can move from the preparations in the bilaterals through a similar process leading to official “reception” in their churches of a consensus with Lutherans and Catholics on justification.

Representatives at Columbus of the Methodist Council and the Reformed Alliance recognized the signing of the Joint Declaration as a watershed in Church history. To be sure, the Declaration of consensus on justification does not create full communion between the member-churches of the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church, but it remains a momentous step, because these two bodies had issued condemnations with a
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5 Information on and reactions to the Emmitsburg meeting are listed in the Fall 2001 issue (No. 60) of this Bulletin, “Bibliography of Interchurch and Interconfessional Theological Dialogues,” Sixteenth Supplement, 37f.


church-dividing effect. Lutherans and Catholics had kept these 16th Century “anathemas” on the books for over 400 years. The simplified but antagonistic formulae on “faith alone” and “merit of salvation by good works” had long had a divisive effect in theological education and catechetical instruction of Lutherans and Catholics.

But the Joint Declaration of Augsburg, based on minute examination of official Lutheran and Catholic teaching, is an act by which the two bodies—formally, publicly, and in an act of shared confession before God—express agreement without reservation on the core-truths of God’s forgiving and renewing grace. Then the Declaration shows that when Catholics and Lutherans articulate different theologies of God’s word and faith, of sin and grace, of assurance and good works, what they teach are not mutually exclusive doctrines, but in fact compatible differences.

Truly a watershed, as a consensus in the substance of faith based on God’s revelation, while admitting differences in the manner of further explication, based on the different “cultures” of the two communions. It is a prime example of discovering unity on a truth of faith, while retaining diversity in the way this faith is elaborated theologically, but this diversity is reconciled while remaining diverse. In a short-hand designation, it is “a differenti-ated consensus”.

At Columbus, Methodist leaders were very clear on wanting to be associated with the graced good work of Augsburg and wanting to take part in the movement forward from it. They can subscribe to the Declaration, but they also bring an enrichment. Their doctrinal heritage adds emphases on holiness, on “fruits of the Spirit” in human lives (Gal 5:22), and on our rejoicing before God in his gift of reconciliation. One Methodist at Columbus, Geoffrey Wainwright, found the Lutheran-Catholic agreement at Augsburg notably lacking “joy in the Lord” over His gifts.

The idea is not to change the Joint Declaration, which stands as signed at Augsburg, but to bring to it an official Methodist statement of adherence to the consensus, perhaps along with a Methodist “Annex”, similar to the explanatory Annex already appended to the Declaration.

The Reformed delegation at Columbus was a diverse group: from Indonesia, South Africa, Brazil, Germany, and the United States. They brought a span of different opinions, leading to a lively exchange. Considerable clarity came from the Catholic side, in George Tavard’s careful survey of justification in Calvin, in the Reformed Confessions, and in the “concordats” of altar and pulpit between bodies like the Presbyterian Church USA and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Clearly a Reformed “annex” to the Joint Declaration would speak of God’s call of justified persons to obedience in good works unto His glory. But the most serious issue, especially urgent for Reformed churches in the Southern hemisphere, is the connection between God’s justification of humans and the promotion of justice in this world. It must come out that God’s grace is highly relevant for people whose lives are enveloped by a web of evil and exploitation. Justification has ethical, especially social ethical, consequences.

The Lutheran-Catholic Declaration confesses a truth about God’s saving work, and announces our agreement on how this unfolds. This is right to do, something good in itself, not good for what it promotes in the world. Further, it is hard indeed to move from our saving faith in Christ to draw out mandates of social action.

But against this, one Reformed intervention underscored the bond between the truth of faith, the vitality of hope, and the costly outpouring of self in love. Christian existence in this world is by faith in God who is merciful beyond all human deserving, but faith is linked essentially with hope and love. The world as populated by many despairing people. The message of gratuitous justification is what the whole Bible proclaims, namely, God’s fidelity to his human creatures, who therefore can keep their hopes alive, even in their broken and needy condition.

From this perspective, the Joint Declaration leaves significant traits of the God of revelation hidden among its presuppositions, and does not go on to underscore that persons made righteous by God are taken up as witnesses and agents into God’s project of healing a whole human race and promoting his reign of justice and peace.

So there is a shadow over our Joint Declaration. The Consultation made it clear that the Methodists and Reformed, as they move toward association with the consensus, have significant insights to bring. Catholics and Lutherans have to admit that their Joint Declaration is not complete in its witness to God’s saving work. But how to dissipate the shadow and incorporate new lights while respecting the integrity of the Augsburg Declaration?

One way to promote harmony is for Catholics to explicate the vision of human life set forth in Vatican II’s Gaudium et spes, where the term “justification” does not appear, but its reality is present. The Pastoral Constitution speaks of persons restored to dignity in Christ, loved personally by the Father and anointed by the Spirit, and so empowered to struggle daily against evil. Christ gives new depth to human solidarity, uniting believers in the Paschal Mystery of his movement through death to resurrection. Essential to God’s plan is our activity in preserving and developing creation, but, in Gaudium et spes, it is God’s grace and Spirit, given in justification, that “quickens, purifies, and strengthens the generous aspirations of humankind to make life more humane”. For “the Spirit makes human beings free, ready to put aside love of self and integrate earthly resources into human life” (GS 38).

Our shared confession on justification by grace, with empowerment for good works, rests in fact on faith in Jesus Christ crucified and risen as the definitive word about human life and the key to tackling the main problems of the world today (GS 10, 45).

— At Columbus, such a vision opened up a “lighted corridor” of a fresh approach to the consensus on justification for the new participants.

At the end, the participants saw the Consultation as a good beginning, but the way ahead is complicated, if only because each of the four partner-communions has its own method of decision-making. The questions raised, especially about ethics, justice, and hope, require further work, beginning with time for “process-
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9 Joint Declaration, 43-47.
The widely-accepted leitmotif is...
his Spirit, gave to his followers.

First, the opening of the *First Letter of John* gives apostolic witness to the word of life made manifest in Jesus, “that which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you, so that you may have communion (κοινωνία) with us; and our κοινωνία is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 Jn 1:3). Here the Apostles’ Gospel calls believers together, to assemble them in common adherence to the word of life, and this life is “with the Father and the Son”—clearly in the Spirit.

Second, this ecumenical ecclesiology draws much from the eucharistic text of 1 Cor 10: “The bread which we break, is it not a participation (κοινωνία) in the body of Christ. Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread” (1 Cor 10:16f). The Church’s unity is not “worked up” by our intent and effort of voluntary association. Instead, it is consolidated sacramentally by Christ’s gift of Himself to be shared by many, requiring then life in harmony, which was Paul’s overriding concern all through *First Corinthians*.

Third, the ecclesiological dialogues find the church described primordially in *Acts*, in the 3000 who responded to Peter’s Pentecost Kerygma: “And they devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and fellowship (κοινωνία), to the breaking of the bread and the prayers.” (Acts 2:42) Here the elements of communion fuse into a unity of prayer and sacramental celebration, of a teaching being transmitted and the Apostles’ ministry serving unity. And what a remarkable unity it was! Naturally it included local residents of Jerusalem, but also Parthians and Medes, Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, even “visitors from Rome, both Jews and [gentile] proselytes” who, at Peter’s behest, received baptism for the forgiveness of sins and found themselves made anew by the Holy Spirit. Here is the exemplar of all ecclesial communities, a catholic exemplar, sacramentally united in one place, served by apostolic ministry, but oriented to a mission to the whole world, as *Acts* will narrate. It began, though, in the *communio* of Jerusalem from the outpoured Spirit and Peter’s witness to the risen Lord Jesus.

Surveying the families of churches, one sees that communion in Christ is not uniform, for it is shaped by particular paradigmatic charisms and lived experiences, in short by different spiritualities that penetrate the churches today from the example of key figures, some from past history, who remain in an uncanny way ever present (Francis, Luther, Xavier, Bonhoeffer), and the prayer and spiritual witnesses present to us and impacting our communalities. Life together in Christian faith can bear the deep impress of the icons in Orthodoxy, of Wesley’s hymns in Methodism, or of the force and beauty of language for Anglicans in Tyndale’s Bible and Cranmer’s *Prayer Book*. These charismatic realities create an ethos logically prior to any institutional form. It penetrates the living of communion and gives a particular tone to the ecclesial fusion of the fundamental elements of faith, worship, and ministry in a particular communion.

A *communio*-ecclesiology, that is, based on the Gospel and apostolic tradition, on the Eucharist, and on a public ministry amid the variety of charisms, is a vision which exorcizes from our dialogues secular socio-political models. The vision shows that an ideal of intimate familial dealings and friendship falls short of what New Testament requires the church to be. While eucharistic celebration is central, this approach calls for awareness in our worship that our own community is linked with all others who share in the movement toward glorifying the Father, through Christ, in the same Spirit, and who partake of the one bread of Christ’s body. *Communio* as a leitmotif protects us from introjecting alien or insufficient notions into our dialogues about the church.

But while ecclesiological dialogues are enlightened by the leitmotif of *communio*, shadows are not lacking. Even good friends had difficulties with Ch. IV of *Dominus Iesus*. Bishop John Baycroft wrote in the Anglican Centre’s newsletter that the text struck a “sour note” in our ecumenical concerto. The Winter 2001 issue of *Pro Ecclesia* offered a ecumenical symposium on *Dominus Iesus*, with appreciative readings of its main chapters on Christ’s unique saving work, but with grumbling over Chapter IV, for instance, that it in effect “unchurched” other Christian bodies. In the symposium, the Lutheran Eugene Brand found quite inadequate *Dominus Iesus*’s view of the bodies issuing from the Reformation, since it takes no account of how in them the “elements of truth and sanctification” have a corporate cohesion for an *ecclesial* mediation of the Gospel and grace of salvation.

Clearly, *Dominus Iesus* leaves Christians of the Reformation traditions suspecting that the Catholic Church, after all these dialogues, does not esteem their communities. It seems imperative to claim that “the Church of Christ continues to exist fully only in the Catholic Church” by a unique subsistence, while the ecclesial communities lacking the Eucharist in its integral reality “are not Churches in the proper sense” (*Dominus Iesus*, nos. 16, 17). When others find this off-putting, they could well turn inward toward working out confessional *communio* ecclesiologies, undercutting the coherence gained by the wide penetration of the theme of ecclesial κοινωνία.

Catholics must be aware of the impact of their language and declarations. It does not help to claim that *Dominus Iesus* was an internal text recalling Catholics to fundamental principles of their own church’s doctrine. The “ecumenical century” has in effect erased the line between what is “internal” to the Catholic Church and what will be examined intensely by Christians of other communions. If W. A. Visser ‘t Hooft, the General Secretary of the World Council, could say of the calling of Vatican II, “*Nostre res agitare*” (“It concerns us!”), how much more is Ch. IV of *Dominus Iesus*, on the churches in their unity and sad divisions, a concern of all Christians.

But something can be done. Cardinal Kasper has said that, 15 *Pro Ecclesia. A Journal of Catholic and Evangelical Theology* 10, 1 (2001) 5-16. The problematical “unchurching” of non-Roman Catholic Christians, is spoken of by the Episcopal theologian, Ephraim Radner (p. 9), while E. Brand’s critical remarks are on pp. 7-9.

however unfortunate the tone of Dominus Iesus, its ecclesial chapter does remind us that none of the dialogues, even though illumined by communio ecclesiology, have manifested consensus on the concrete embodiment of ecclesial koinonia in history and today.

Furthermore, the question of being or not being “churches in the proper sense” can send one to the Acta of Vatican II, to find out what was and is still meant by calling the Reformation churches “ecclesial communities”.17 This was an innovation and came as the fruit of debate. The official explanation was that the terms “communities” or “separated brethren”, used in the initial draft, are not adequate regarding bodies stemming from the Reformation, because they do not express how the saving “elements” (Gospel, Scripture, Baptism, biblical prayer, ideal of discipleship) confer on these communities “a truly ecclesial character”.18 There is, therefore, for Catholic teaching, a true ecclesiality in the bodies in which, according to Ut unum sint, the one Church of Christ is effectively present, being operative to unite and sanctify their members, equipping them for their Christian vocation (no. 11).— This may not dissipate the shadow cast by Dominus Iesus, but it does help Catholics approach Reformation Christians with more respect, and with a real if reserved acknowledgment of their community life as a koinonia given by the Lord and his Spirit.

Like Elijah’s servant, I see another cloud, now no larger than a human hand, rising on the horizon (1 Kings 18:4). It is the new book of Fr. Frank Sullivan on the early development of the episcopate.19 I suspect it will make life difficult in dialogues of Catholics with the Reformation ecclesial communities even when the dialogue is illumined by a communio ecclesiology. For such dialogues inevitably raise the issue of the structured ministry given by God to serve believers’ shared faith, worship, and witness in the world. Fr. Sullivan’s work makes it hard to take the episcopate, and ministry in episcopal succession, as having only a sign-value, or even less, in constituting the Church of Christ. It makes a remarkable case for episcopacy having developed so smoothly, so organically, in the Second Century that it appears as a Spirit-guided development to meet needs inherent in the life of the early communities and in a universal mission. The episcopal college thus “moves up” in the hierarchy of truths held by Catholics, Orthodox, and Anglicans. The specific ministry of bishops who by ordination become members of a universal collegium succeeding the Apostles takes on new significance as constitutive in serving communio in faith and sacramental life. It is going to be harder to work ahead from a shared faith, as on justification, and from the new life of baptism toward fuller Catholic recognition of apostolicity in churches and communities outside episcopal apostolic succession.

But no one thought that when we appropriated the ecumenical commitment, we were entering a rose garden. The goal remains the same, well illumined by communio ecclesiology. For Catholics, the goal is full communion in faith, sacraments, and ministry, with others who now really and corporately share common gifts of the Lord, but at present our sharing is incomplete.

Movement toward full communion involves the gradual discovery and recognition of the Church of Christ present in other communities as they now exist and are developing. This goal of communion rules out notions of fusion or amalgamation into some new reality to be created anew. But we do have to grow, and growth can spring from the dynamism of the gifts in our own ecclesial patrimony.

We Catholics have the Pope’s reminder, “It is not that beyond the boundaries of the Catholic community there is an ecclesial vacuum,” but that by God’s gifts which others cherish and actualize, “the one Church of Christ is effectively present in them” (Ut unum sint, 13, 11). I hope that others can think the same way even now about the Catholic Church. And even more, I hope that our Catholic Church will grow and develop in ways to make the discovery and recognition in it of the Church of Christ a more natural perception by other Christians. The special claim that we make, namely of the Church of Christ subsisting in the Catholic Church, brings a special obligation, an imperative, to make what we claim transparently visible to others.

Conclusion

We are all developing, for to live is to change, but if our changing is to be ecumenically constructive it has to also promote moments of recognition of God’s work in other communions.

Ecumenically we are an interim stage, between the times, with no prepared formulae for dissipating the shadows. For such a time, the challenge is to promote growth all across the ecumenical landscape of a “spirituality of communion” about which the Pope has spoken.20 This is an ethos of growing love and mutual forgiveness, of more sensitivity to what offends other Christians—so as to avoid what bruises and hurts, and of a deeper desire—passionate desire penetrating our prayer—for a future life in more complete, even full, communion of faith, sacraments, and ministry.

If this sounds abstract and theoretical, we can learn much from certain present-day ecclesial movements, the Focolari, Sant’Egidio, and Chemin neuf, which concretize, live, and spread

---

17 There are five such references in Unitatis redintegrato: in the title of Ch. III, in the further title and twice in the text of no. 19, and in no. 22.


this spirituality of communion in striking ways.\textsuperscript{21}

Along this path, which the Pope in November said may well be long and arduous, the transformations already given us suggest expelling from our ecumenical vocabulary terms like “crisis”, “immobilism”, and “compromise”. Fully aware of the difficulties, John Paul II invites us to adopt the key words, “confidence”, “patience”, “constancy”, “hope”, and also “fervor for a great and good cause” with “courage to change”.\textsuperscript{22}

But such an attitude is a grace of God, an increment of his wisdom and a brighter light of his loving-kindness shining on us in the face of his Son Jesus (2 Cor 4:6). Rightly, we turn to listening to the word of life and begging in prayer the new light we need. A brighter ecumenical landscape will not be produced simply by our theological and ethical efforts, but by Spirit of light and truth acting in and on our communities.


\textsuperscript{22} Message of 10 November 2001 to Cardinal Kasper and the Plenary of the Pontifical Council.
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