

PROBLEMS OF CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGY (WITH SOME REFERENCE TO "JUSTIFICATION")

Prepared for ARCIC II, Venice, 1983

ARCIC I recognized that what it had achieved presupposed a large measure of agreement concerning 'the true nature of the Church'; it was recognised that a common understanding of 'koinonia' and its place in 'the mystery of the Church' contributed to this agreement (Final Report, Introd. nn 4,5).

Further, it was agreed that the Church's koinonia is realized, before all else, through the Word (n.8), and through a sacramental economy (n.7).

It was this common ground, no doubt, which led the second Vatican Council to speak of the Anglican Church as occupying 'a special place' among those who have been separated from the Roman Catholic Church since the 16th century (Decree on Ecumenism, n.13). It seems only logical therefore that ARCIC II should explore further this accord concerning basic principles of ecclesiology. The present paper takes up this question by discussing the problems which confront contemporary ecclesiology.

HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS TO TODAY'S PROBLEMS

The Preface to the Final Report notes that, while what is essential is 'to discover each other's faith as it is today', that may necessitate an 'appeal to history...for enlightenment'. This is certainly the case if one is to appreciate the way in which the problems of ecclesiology present themselves today within an ecumenical context. The most basic problem is the integration of the insights of different eras of self-awareness in the Church. In particular, the shared ecclesiological principles which were brought to light by the work of ARCIC I are characteristic of the awareness of the Patristic era; since the middle ages, on the other hand, ecclesiological reflection has often been somewhat narrowly concentrated upon issues of jurisdiction within the economy of the koinonia. Today's most basic problem is that of finding a theological understanding of the manner in which what is valid in these latter reflections is to be integrated into the more comprehensive appreciation of the Church's mystery which characterized the patristic period.

The holistic ecclesiological awareness of the patristic period

Patristic awareness of the Church's mystery was profoundly holistic. Yves Congar sums up this outlook: 'at this period in fact the primal reality in ecclesiology was still the ecclesia itself, that is the totality, the continuity, the unity of the faithful... Then, in the ecclesia, come the praepositi ecclesiae, the presidents or heads of the Christian community'⁽¹⁾. Congar sees this observation as an insight of first importance for the ecclesologist.

The contrast with a later ecclesiological perspective is indicated, for example, in Augustine's allegorical interpretation of the incident of the lepers sent to show themselves to the priests (Lk 17). Having interpreted the leprosy as representing 'false teaching', he sees the Jewish priesthood as standing, not for the Church's authoritative ministry (as a later perspective would confidently anticipate) but as 'a figure of the royal priesthood with which all are consecrated who belong to the body of Christ'. It is Christ who heals, through his doctrine, using 'the society of the assembled faithful' to dispense his healing Word and Sacrament (Quaest. evang. 2:40 PL 35:1355).

In this outlook, the Church's life is a mystery, a living tradition maintained by God, which embraces many elements, especially the liturgical actions. Joseph Ratzinger describes this integrated economy of the Church's life in the early patristic period: 'Church is "communion". The gathering is a eucharistic gathering. In such a purview there can be no distinction between visible and spiritual Church, between Church as organization and as mystery. The concrete communio is the Church, and this communio means not only cultus but also love, peace, and sharing. If the Church is Eucharist, then Church office is essentially responsibility for the Eucharistic Assembly, which is identical with the Church. But the process of this Assembly encompasses the totality of life'⁽²⁾ Bernard Dupuy describes the living tradition which is the Church's life as 'the mystery, the deposit, the Truth left by Christ and his apostles and handed on after them'⁽³⁾. This mystery is seen as something objective, which rules the Church by an authority intrinsic to itself⁽⁴⁾. Associated with this understanding of tradition as the principle of the Church's life is the notion of apostolicity, for the mystery has its source in the apostolic witness and ministry⁽⁵⁾. In practice, this finds expression in a veneration for the apostolic Churches⁽⁶⁾.

Within this perspective, however, ecclesiological analysis remained rudimentary⁽⁷⁾. Even in the 4th century, the mystery of the Church remains a reality which is 'more lived than thought about'⁽⁸⁾. J.N.D. Kelly considers that ecclesiological reflection in the East 'remained immature, not to say archaic' even after the Council of Nicaea⁽⁹⁾. Little theological reflection was given

for instance, to the nature of the bishops' collegial authority, everywhere exercised in practice from the third century⁽¹⁰⁾. Kretschmar writes of the 3rd century, 'neither Cyprian, nor Rome, nor Origen has what could be called a theology of the synod'⁽¹¹⁾. The ecumenical synod which became possible in the 4th century was little reflected upon⁽¹²⁾. If the authority of the synod was not the object of theological analysis, however, it was clearly taken for granted; it was seen as inextricably associated with the authority of the living tradition itself⁽¹³⁾. In the judgment of Bernard Dupuy, critical reflection was not given to the Church as possessing infallible authority during the first eight centuries⁽¹⁴⁾; rather, the patristic concept of the ecclesial mystery tended to identify the indefectibility found in the Church's mystery with that of God himself, the author of the Church's living tradition⁽¹⁵⁾. Dupuy considers that critical reflection is occasioned especially by developments within the Latin Church⁽¹⁶⁾ which we are to consider presently.

For the believer of the patristic period, therefore, the ecclesiological problem was not one deriving from theological speculation, but rather the practical problem of maintaining communion with the 'catholica'⁽¹⁷⁾. This overriding concern⁽¹⁸⁾ was given constant practical expression. Associated with it was a 'rigorous uniformity in faith'⁽¹⁹⁾. In keeping with the holistic thought pattern we have been emphasising, union in faith and union in love were so closely associated that we must wait until Augustine and Jerome for a clear distinction between heresy and schism⁽²⁰⁾.

It seems true to say that the Eastern Churches have maintained an ecclesiological awareness which has much in common with that of the patristic period which we have been describing⁽²¹⁾. One may ask whether the same may not be said of the Anglican Church.

A preoccupation with powers of jurisdiction characterizing theological reflection since the middle ages

The emphasis upon the Church authorities' jurisdiction which we must now consider developed in response to practical problems, rather than as a fruit of theological speculation. According to the historian A. Landgraf, during the medieval period the Church and her organization are a fact of experience rather than an object of study⁽²²⁾. The important part played by the canonists in the Church's intellectual life, after the struggles of the Gregorian reform in the last decades of the 11th century, is of great significance in medieval doctrinal development - this crisis of authority shook the institutional structure of medieval Christendom to its foundations, and gave a new importance to canonical jurisdiction in the Western Church. According to Congar, this

development profoundly affected the ecclesiological awareness of medieval thought⁽²³⁾.

It would be an oversimplification, however, to see this development as an unqualified transition from awareness of the ecclesial mystery to a juridicised ecclesiology. Innocent III (1130-1143) whose pontificate was a highpoint in the exercise of jurisdiction by the Roman See during the middle ages, can give expression to the Church essentially sacramental character in the following terms: 'The visible aspect of the sacraments is established in the Church of God, that through the external realities which we perceive, we may pass to the hidden things which we understand (in them)' (Register 1,519). Aquinas represents the best ecclesiological thought of the period when he brings together both sacramental and juridical realities, for instance in his discussion of schism (S.theol. 2-2, 39, 1). George H. Tavard's investigation of the manner in which the thought of the 15th century took for granted the 'mutual coinherence' of the Scriptures and the Church⁽²⁴⁾ makes it clear that the middle ages transmitted to the early modern period rich ecclesiological resources, whatever shortcomings there may have been in medieval attempts to give them a theological elaboration.

But it can not be denied that ecclesiological developments increasingly lost sight of these resources and their essential place in the theology of the Church's mystery. Joseph Ratzinger, whose description of the patristic outlook we have already cited, goes on to describe the change which came about during the middle ages: 'How did the middle ages alter this situation? The question is extremely involved. The most decisive element in the Latin West seems to be the ever greater sundering of sacrament from jurisdiction, of cultus and liturgy from administration'⁽²⁵⁾.

The first ex professo ecclesiological treatises were written in the 14th century (by James of Viterbo and Giles of Rome); and they concerned themselves with a clarification of the Church's jurisdictional powers vis-à-vis the autonomy being claimed by civil institutions disengaging themselves from the consecrational society of the middle ages.

The Great Western Schism and the associated theological disputes concerning the demarcation of papal and conciliar jurisdiction, carried forward this preoccupation with the juridical structures of the Church.

To ecclesiologists who overlooked the challenge to renewal in the Gospel inherent in the developments which took place in the 16th century, the Reformation crisis seemed one of Church authority. Counter-reformation ecclesiology concentrated its energies upon an apologia for the Church's authoritative structures.

With the first Vatican Council this tendency to reduce ecclesiology to a study of the Church's authoritative structures reached the limit of its development. Father Tillard has discussed the significance of this Council's teaching in the light of conciliar debates⁽²⁶⁾. He notes the manner in which 'jurisdiction' (the term is not defined by the Council, although it raises complex issues calling for precise definition⁽²⁷⁾) is given 'pride of place' in the Council's teaching, giving rise to uneasiness on the part of an historically aware conciliar minority and provoking the essential debate of the Council. According to Tillard, these discussions clarified the following points: 1) that the primatial authority must, by divine ordinance, build up rather than undermine the episcopal authority; 2) that this authority is essentially episcopal, though essentially different from that of the other members of the episcopate; and 3) that this difference, coming from the very 'officium' of the pope, is given for the maintaining of unity in the Church.

Father Tillard sees the second Vatican Council as having given back to the episcopate 'its traditional form' - though he adds 'we may regret its timidity on this point'⁽²⁸⁾. This was done, he notes, by commencing not from the papal office but from that of the bishops: 'we have the Church presented in its "apostolic" origin and nature, with the bishop of Rome's function placed within that apostolicity which guarantees but at the same time limits it'⁽²⁹⁾. The 'emergence of an ecclesiology of communion is the great new departure of Vatican II compared with Vatican I - more than the rediscovery of episcopal collegiality which at bottom depends on it'⁽³⁰⁾. 'Ecclesiology of communion, sacramentality of episcopal munus regendi, collegiality - these dominant features of Lumen gentium condition one another'⁽³¹⁾. These elements, set as they are within the Council's teaching on the mystery of the Church, bring us close once more to the patristic awareness of the integral economy of the Church's life.

The central problem confronted by the second Vatican Council was practical and pastoral: how the Church could undertake its mission in our times. It was this concern which threw the central questions of ecclesiology into relief: if the Church was to understand its task it must reflect more deeply upon its deepest identity, as a mystery of God.

CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Following the lead of the second Vatican Council, we may speak first of problems concerning the mystery of the Church, and then of problems concerning the Church's mission.

The Church's mystery

The most basic problem facing ecclesiology today, as we have said, is that of integrating the insights available to us as we review the Church's self-awareness outlined in the previous section. Roman Catholic teaching sees the developments which have taken place since the middle ages - whatever one may say concerning the shortcomings of theological reflection upon these developments - as being the expression of the Church's nature as intended by our Lord. In an ecumenical context, this gives rise to two orders of problem:

1) on the theoretical level:

- a) in what terms is the Church's nature intended by our Lord?
- b) can these developments be shown to be, not only compatible with the deepest reality of the Church's mystery, but also apt to foster this reality?

2) on the practical level:

how can the Roman Catholic Church give practical expression to these juridical realities in a manner which more effectively commends their authenticity to our separated brethren?

Descending to details, one may identify the aspects of our problematic within the framework of the sacramental economy: koinonia in the Christian mystery takes place through a God-given economy which is essentially 'sacramental' (32).

The constituent elements of this sacramental economy may be identified as follows: 1) the divine saving mystery which is manifested and mediated; and 2) the elements within the world of human experience which manifest and mediate the presence of God's saving action.

The saving mystery which is sacramentalized

What is the divine mystery which is manifested and mediated through the Church's koinonia? In other words, what is 'the Christian mystery' which is the achievement of God's final intervention on man's behalf in Jesus Christ? Clearly, we have here the basic point of contact between the ecclesiological question and the question of 'justification'.

What is mediated to the world is the Christ-event in all its significance

for man's destiny in God's saving plan. But the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ belong themselves to God's plan in a manner which could be described as 'sacramental': they point to the deeper mystery of God's self-giving which they make effectively present. When Paul (cf. Rom 5:5,7; 8:38-39) and John (cf. 3:16; 1 Jn 4:9-10) seek to sum up the ultimate significance of the Christian mystery they do so in terms of God's love. Can one, therefore, agree with Hans Urs von Balthasar when he says that what distinguished those who belonged to the Church of the beginnings was 'their faith that God has given all in Jesus (Rom 8:32)'; that the Church of every age is 'those who accept God as love manifest in Jesus'?⁽³³⁾ If I understand the words of Father Tillard rightly, he adopts a similar point of view when he writes of the Eucharist: 'strictly speaking...it is not so much a question of the gift of a presence as of a presence which fulfils the gift of God'⁽³⁴⁾.

It is of fundamental importance for an understanding of the place of the confessing Church in God's saving plan to ask what divine love is manifested in the Christ-event, and therefore in the sacramental economy through which it is expressed in every age: is it the love of God for those who are elected to share in the koinonia - as most Christians seem to have uncritically presumed - or is it the saving love which God has for all mankind? This is a question to which we must return below.

The elements making up the sacramental economy

We note that theologians discuss the precise manner in which the Church may be called 'sacrament'⁽³⁵⁾.

What elements belong to the complete economy of the koinonia? It seems that this question can only be answered through reference to the two divine 'missions'; the externalized mission of the Son, and the interior mission of the Spirit⁽³⁶⁾. Can it not be said that the historical economy associated with the life, death and resurrection of the Saviour sacramentalizes the interior economy realized through the mission of the Spirit?

The i n c a r n a t i o n a l economy is centred in the anamnesis of God's definitive saving act in the LIFE, DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST: through this anamnesis, he who is the eternal Word expresses himself through the WORD OF SCRIPTURE and its proclamation by the Church; he in whom God's saving love is expressed in the world continues to act as the world's Saviour in the SACRAMENTS; COMMUNION in this saving mystery is found within a CHURCH ORDER maintained through the MINISTRY OF PASTORAL OVERSIGHT; this communion endures as a TRADITION and finds expression in DISCIPLESHIP and MISSION.

The realities making up the p n e u m a t i c economy (which has a reciprocity with the incarnation economy grounded in that of the trinitarian missions) are more difficult to itemize: PASSOVER REGENERATION AND DESTINY, PERSONAL PRESENCE of the Trinity, TRANSCENDENT LOVE, PROPHETIC GIFTS . . .

A framework such as this - which no doubt calls for much discussion - provides a context for the more problematic areas in the Anglican/Roman Catholic dialogue: the individual sacraments and the Church order willed by the Lord.

As far as the first is concerned, ARCIC I has already made a significant contribution. As far as Church order is concerned, discussion has already been fruitful. Moreover, discussion is taking place within Roman Catholic theology. Joseph Ratzinger has pointed out, for instance, that Rome's function as a principle of unity in the Church has had very different expression in various historical periods, and has not always been seen as involving a legislation for the whole Church. Within this context, he has also pointed out that Western theologians and canonists have not always clearly distinguished the peculiar function of the Roman See within the Western Patriarchate from that of the Petrine office within the universal Church⁽³⁷⁾. As Tillard has pointed out, in the article already cited, Vatican Council II merely initiated reflection upon the collegial function of the episcopate, as a fostering of a catholic diversity within the Church's unity⁽³⁸⁾.

The problem of formulating an adequate understanding of apostolic succession belongs to this context, related as it is to the divine tradition which is essential to the Church's mystery and to an understanding of Church order. Various elements essential to this formulation are emerging in contemporary discussion: 1) apostolicity touches the whole life of the Church as faithful to its beginning on the 'foundation' of the apostolic ministry; 2) this foundation involves the rule of faith, the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, within a Church order presided over by episcopal oversight - so that the authenticity of the charisms of proclamation and service constantly raised up by the Spirit within the Church is recognized with reference to these enduring realities; 3) it follows that the charism of episcopal office, and historical succession in that office is only a sign and not the essence of apostolicity⁽³⁹⁾.

The essential question for our discussions is the identification of those elements in the sacramental economy of the Church's mystery which have been established by the Lord himself and are beyond the discretion of human authority. This question gives rise to two problems.

How can an understanding of this question be clarified which is sensitive to the framework provided by recent scriptural and historical scholarship? Until fairly recently Catholic apologetics envisaged divine institution too narrowly, in terms of initiatives taken by Jesus during his earthly life. Today it would be generally recognized that this perspective was inadequate, and that whatever initiatives Jesus may have taken during his earthly life, by way of anticipation of the coming into existence of a new Israel, the mystery of the Church has its source in the Saviour's Passover Mystery as articulated through the apostolic ministry.

The most pressing problem, however, is that of a theological interpretation of what the 'divine institution' of the economy implies. What are the limits of the Church's power to reconstruct itself? Recent discussion of this question would have astounded their predecessors of the early 20th century⁽⁴⁰⁾ by Roman Catholic theologians. Avery Dulles summarizes positions which have replaced the 'non-historical orthodoxy' of earlier thought.

'According to Rahner, the notion of ius divinum should not be restricted to a structure "imposed upon the apostolic Church by Christ himself"; it may be extended to free decisions made by the Church in apostolic times, provided that these decisions were consonant with the basic nature of the Church and, having been made, were irreversible'⁽⁴¹⁾.

Schillebeeckx speaks of 'structures of the Church which are essential and "dogmatically inviolate"'. These may be adapted but only according to principles beyond the discretion of the Church, such as the following: 'that office in the Church be "serving leadership" according to the model of the apostolic leadership in the N.T.; that ecclesiastical office represent Christ to the community and the community to the world; that the universal Church be made present in each place by a local Church; that the local Church, as a realization of the total Church, have a right to order itself according to its own needs; that every local Church maintain communion with the other local Churches and with the Church in which he who bears the function of Peter resides'⁽⁴²⁾.

Dulles himself takes a far more flexible position: 'what is unchangeable about the Church, therefore, would seem to be best described in relational rather than essential terms. The Church is constituted on the one hand by its relationship to Jesus Christ, and on the other by its relationship to those to whom it mediates the presence of Christ'⁽⁴³⁾.

It is clear that this discussion is only in its initial stages. Reviewing its present state, as reflected in the passages cited, one is struck by the emphasis upon the juridical structures of the Church. The same principles apply to the canonical Scriptures and to the sacraments in the abiding reality of the Church's life. One is also surprised that distinctions have not been made more clearly, between the intention of Jesus within the context of the kenosis of his earthly life, on the one hand, and his intentions, on the other, as the risen Lord of the apostolic community, expressed through the Spirit's guidance as the living Gospel became a living Tradition. And among these intentions, one may distinguish intentions which were reversible and those which were the expression of the very nature of the Church's abiding presence if it was to sacramentalize the Christian mystery in every age.

Contemporary ecclesiology must ask how this sacramental economy relates to the eschatological 'kingdom' preached by Jesus, since it is this 'kingdom' which must be ^{the Church's} central message. J.C.Haughey, after examining the complex question of the relation between Church and 'kingdom', points out the price Roman Catholic and similar theological traditions, on the one hand, and those of Protestantism, on the other, have paid for failing (in opposite ways) to account for this relationship⁽⁴⁴⁾.

The mission of the confessing Church

The question which has just been raised is immediately related to that of the confessing Church's mission within the broader human community.

To understand the Church's mission we must understand the meaning of 'election' in the saving plan of God. Joseph Ratzinger writes: 'election is not a privilege of the elected but the call to live for others... Being a Christian means essentially changing over from being for oneself... This also explains what is really meant by the often odd-seeming concept of election ('predestination'). It does not mean a preference that leaves the individual undisturbed in himself and divides him from others, but entrance into a common task'⁽⁴⁵⁾.

When the Church's mission is reflected upon in this light, the question is raised of the presence of God's saving action and grace outside the confines of the confessing Church. This new concern is reflected in recent theological discussion⁽⁴⁶⁾. Perhaps, in the end, Christian theology must have a certain agnosticism concerning the manner in which the mystery of salvation is realized

in the broader human community.

On the one hand, the Church must deepen its sense of mission as a 'servant' presence in a broader humanity which is not abandoned by the God who gave his Son for their sake. On the other hand, must one not agree with Hans Urs von Balthasar when he writes: 'But is the problem about the borders of the Church solved by...analysis of the N.T.? Yes and No. Yes, insofar as by grace the Church can give a Yes of faith and life to this Love. No, insofar as the Church can never control the principle which establishes it' (47).

The confessing Church is called to be a 'sacrament' to the broader world 'of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind' (Lumen æntium, n.1); it is to be a 'sort of first-fruits of all that he created' (James 1:18). This deepened sense of the confessing Church's mission to the broader community of mankind makes more urgent the ecumenical task of removing the divisions which so greatly impede this task.

We meet again the question raised already: what love of God is shown forth by the confessing Church? Is it God's merciful love for the whole of humanity that is proclaimed, or is it God's love for the people who are the object of his election, a love which invites the broader community of mankind to be confident that God will have the same love for them? How are the love which the Father has for Christ, the love he has for his elect of the confessing Church, and his love for mankind, related to each other? This may seem an overly subtle question; but it may be argued that the answer will profoundly affect the Church's understanding of its mission to the broader world.

"JUSTIFICATION" AND THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH

If we are to appeal to history only for enlightenment, not as a way of perpetuating past controversy' (Preface to Final Report, ARCIC I), is there not a danger in a too narrow concentration upon the term 'justification' in discussing the issue it raises? J. Jeremias concludes that in Paul's thought 'justification' is but one of a manifold of 'illustrations' to describe the receiving of God's grace, having equal importance with them; he summarizes this manifold: 'you are washed; you are cleansed; you are sanctified; you are buried in the water and by this burial you get a share in Christ's death and resurrection; you are putting on Christ like a garment; you are incorporated into his body; you are adopted and become sons of God; you are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, that is, you are made members of God's

people, in short, you are included in the kingdom' (48). Jeremias sees 'justification' as inseparable from the ritual of baptism in Paul's thought - an important link with the sacramental dimension of the Church's life we have been discussing.

Having made this observation concerning terminology, we must say that it is clear that the whole economy of the Church's mystery is concerned with 'justification': the 'sacramental' economy as a whole points to the generous initiative of God's love which calls the whole of humanity to share in the passover destiny of the Saviour; the koinonia of the confessing Church is before all else a sharing in awareness of this passover destiny.

Leaving aside the problems of the 16th century controversy concerning man under the grace of God, we may point to the ecclesiological problem of membership in the Church on the part of those whose lives are a refusal to accept God's grace. The second Vatican Council made only a passing reference to this complex problem, relying upon the authority of Augustine: 'He is not saved, however, who, though he is part of the body of the Church, does not persevere in charity. He remains indeed in the bosom of the Church, but, as it were, only in a "bodily" manner, and not "in his heart"' (Lumen gentium, n.14). The footnote to this passage cites more fully the text of Augustine which has been referred to: 'It is certainly clear that when we speak of "within" and "without" with regard to the Church, our consideration must be directed to what is in the heart, not what is in the body'.

But this passage leaves much to be further clarified. In the judgment of Joseph Ratzinger, Augustine's thought was not the final word on this difficult subject, and it was to give rise to developments he did not foresee. He writes that, challenged by the disunity coming from the Donatist dispute, "Augustine felt misgivings about the visibility of the Church. How could it consist in that frail group of men who went to Mass today but by tomorrow might have gone over to the Donatists? What is really meant by Church must, then, be the "elect" to be gathered eventually and definitively under God's call. Augustine's speculative amalgam of ecclesiology with predestination gave rise to an eventual, though unforeseen sundering of the concrete cultic fellowship-phenomenon from the invisible reality. The elect are the true Church; the assembled community is only an "appearance" in comparison to the being of the true Church' (49).

Perhaps the problem, of how the Church can be the sign and effective principle of the 'justification' which comes from God's grace, and at the

same time bear the marks of man's sinfulness, the very negation of that 'justification', can only be solved by recognizing the dynamic nature of the Church as a community sharing in Christ's passover destiny.

The Church will find her true lineaments in the mystery of Christ, in which she is a communion. Now although it is impossible that there should have been any sin in Christ, as the N.T. declares, in his state of kenosis Christ took upon himself a solidarity with us in the consequences and marks of sin, first and foremost the condition of our mortality (Rom 5:12; 8:2). Through his passover mystery, he shares with us the achievement of the final kingdom. But the pilgrim Church's existential state is one of transition and conversion, in which the modality of the saving realities is different from what it will be in their final fulfilment - for when the perfect comes the imperfect will pass away⁽⁵⁰⁾.

John Thornhill, S.M.

NOTES

- (1) Problems of Authority, ed. Todd, London, 1964, pp.132-133.
- (2) From "Leadership among God's People", Theol.Digest, 21(1973)p.101. Concerning the place of the liturgical actions in this patristic awareness, see B. Dupuy, Infailibilité de l'Église, ed. Rousseau et al. Chevetogne, 1961, p.68; Congar, Irénikon, 23(1950)p.4.
- (3) Dupuy, op.cit., pp.62, 66.
- (4) Cf. Dupuy, *ibid.*; D.Van den Eynde, Les normes de l'Enseignement Chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles, Paris, 1933, pp.32, 158, 291, 312; P. Smulders, Rech.Sc.Rel. 40(1951-2)pp.40, 45; P. Camelot, Divinitas, 3(1961)p.610; R.P.C.Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church, London, 1962, p.101; Y.Congar, Tradition and Traditions, London, 1966, p.23.
- (5) Cf. J.Ratzinger, The Episcopate and the Primacy, Freiburg, 1962, pp. 46-54.
- (6) Cf. Ratzinger, op.cit., pp.56-57; Van denEynde, op.cit., pp.165-167; Dupuy, op.cit., p.66.
- (7) Cf. G. Bardy, La théologie de l'Église de S. Irénée au concile de Nicée, Paris, 1947, pp.6-13, 164.
- (8) Cf. Bardy, op. cit. p.8; J.N.D.Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, London, 1965, pp.189-190.
- (9) Op.cit., p.401.
- (10) Cf. G. Kretschmar, The Councils of the Church: History and Analysis, ed.Margull, Philadelphia, 1966, p.6.
- (11) Op.cit., p.22.
- (12) Cf. Dupuy, op.cit., pp.72-73, 78, 85.
- (13) Cf. T. Camelot, Le Concile et les conciles, ed. Rousseau, Paris, 1960, pp.63-66.
- (14) Op.cit., p.84.
- (15) Op.cit., p.85.
- (16) Op.cit., pp.85-86.
- (17) According to Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.190, a technical term for the universal Church from the 2nd century; cf. B.Potte, Le Concile et les conciles, ed. Rousseau, p.15.
- (18) Cf. Dupuy, op.cit., p.64; Congar, Tradition and Traditions, pp.33, 36, 49, and Dict.Theol.Cath., art. "Schisme", 14:1288; Van den Eynde, op.cit., p.271; A.Harnack, History of Dogma, N.Y., 1961, 3:219.
- (19) Cf. Congar, *ibid.*; Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, London, 1964, p.95.
- (20) Cf. Congar, Dict. Theol. Cath., 14:1289, 1293.

- (21) Cf. Congar, Tradition and Traditions, pp.102, 182-183, 322-323.
- (22) Theol.Studies, 7(1946) p.577.
- (23) Cf. Congar, Lay People in the Church, London, 1957, p.315; Tradition and Traditions, pp.134-137; Problems of Authority, ed. Todd, pp.132-133.
- (24) Cf. Holy Writ or Holy Church, London, 1959, ch.4.
- (25) Theol.Digest, 21(1973)p.101. In this same article, Ratzinger points out the way in which the 'communion' model of the Church was discredited during this period by the politicizing of 'excommunication', p.103.
- (26) Cf."The Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome", Theol.Studies, 40(1979) pp.3-22.
- (27) Tillard commends G. Alberigo's "La juridiction", Irénikon, 49(1976) pp.167-180.
- (28) Art.cit., p.3.
- (29) Art.cit., p.15.
- (30) Ibid.
- (31) Art.cit., p.16. The Council set out to link the two poles of unity and plurality. This link is forged by the entry of the bishop into the episcopal college: 'the munera or charges' of the bishop derive from the sacramental consecration itself; the 'potestates' come 'through the canonica determinatio'. This latter, it is noted, is realized in a manner which leaves 'a large margin of freedom to the churches - but it is always in a certain way related to the See that has special responsibility for what is universal in the Church and for its unity', art.cit., pp.17-18.
- (32) One takes this approach with some confidence given the remarkable consensus on sacramentality evidenced in the ARCIC I statements; see the writer's Comments on Elucidations of ARCIC (1979) prepared for Anglican/Roman Catholic Meeting, Sydney, 19/8/80. It could be asked whether this principle can not provide a starting point for ecclesiological reflection for those also who accept only the Word of Scripture as mediating God's justifying grace - since in such a view the Word of Scripture fulfils a function comparable with that of other sacramental realities.
- (33) From "Frontiers of the Church", Theol.Digest, 25(1977)p.240.
- (34) Comment on WCC Lima Document, Geneva, 1982.
- (35) J.Hamer writes: 'I should say, in opposition to Father Rahner, that Church, taken in the formal biblical and theological sense of the word, implies the inner reality, not only in obliquo, but must signify it in recto; together with the external reality and in the context of the close relationship that binds one to the other', The Church Is a Communion, London, 1964, pp.90-91.

- (36) Cf. J.H.Newman: "God the Son has graciously vouchsafed to reveal the Father to His creatures from without; God the Holy Ghost by inward communication", Parochial and Plain Sermons, II, p.217. Cf. in this context W.Thüsing, "The N.T. and Church Offices", Theol.Digest, 22(1974) pp.121-124, on the "two-fold legitimation" of Church office.
- (37) Cf. "Primacy and Episcopacy", Theol.Digest, 19(1971), pp.200-207.
- (38) Art.cit.p.19.
- (39) Cf. Jos. Finkenzeller, "Toward an Understanding of Apostolic Succession", Theol.Digest 24(1976)pp.246-251; L.Bouyer, "Ecclesiastic Ministry and Apostolic Succession", Downside Review 90(1972)pp.133-144.
- (40) Cf. K. Rahner, "Reflection on the Concept of Ius divinum in Catholic Thought", Theol.Invest., 5:219-243; P.Huizing, "Divine Law and Church Structures", Theol.Digest, 18(1970)pp.144-150; C.J.Peter, "Dimensions of Ius divinum in Roman Catholic Theology", Theol.Studies, 24(1973)pp. 227-250; A.Dulles, "Ius divinum as an Ecumenical Problem", Theol. Studies 38(1977)pp.681-708.
- (41) Dulles, art. cit., p.693. He judges Peter to be "in substantial accord with Rahner".
- (42) Dulles, art. cit., p.697.
- (43) Art.cit., p.699.
- (44) Cf. "Church and Kingdom: Ecclesiology in the Light of Eschatology". Theol.Studies, 29(1968) pp.72-86.
- (45) Introduction to Christianity, London, 1969, pp.174, 190.
- (46) Cf. J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, Philadelphia, 1982; A.Dulles, "The Church, the Churches and the Catholic Church", Theol. Studies 33(1972) pp.199-234; P.Schineller, "Christ and the Church: A Spectrum of Views", Theol.Studies, 37(1976)pp.545-565; Jn Hick and B. Hebblethwaite, eds., Christianity and Other Religions: Selected Readings, Glasgow, 1980; Jn Macquarrie, "Commitment and Openness: Christianity's Relation to Other Faiths", Theol. Digest, 27(1979)pp. 347-355.
- (47) Art.cit., Theol.Digest, 25(1977)p.241.
- (48) The Central Message of the N.T., London, 1981, p.60.
- (49) Art.cit., Theol.Digest, 21(1973)p.103.
- (50) Cf. I Cor 13:8-13. This thought is further developed in our "The Pilgrim Church and Penitence for Christian Disunity", Clergy Review, 50(1965)pp.26-39.