

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT OF ARCIC 1

March 1992

+ P J Cullinane

PART I

QUESTIONS FOR THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPATE

Introduction

Towards the end of 1991, the Holy See issued its response to the Final Report of ARCIC

1. Responses to the official Catholic response have included appreciation, disappointment, politeness, and brave statements about continuing the ecumenical effort.

While the disappointment is manageable for those whose commitment to ecumenism is strong, the effect of the Vatican response must also be viewed against a wider background. For some, the Catholic Church's response will seem to reinforce their view that organic unity is neither possible nor desirable. That disposition, already widespread and increasing, should concern all of us who believe that the true goal of ecumenism is unity in faith, sacraments and ministries.

It seems to the present writer that the official responses of the Anglican Communion and the RC Church to the Final Report set the scene for deeper involvement by the world-wide episcopate of the RC Church. There are questions which call for conciliar treatment. This view is not based on a negative attitude to the official RC response. It is based on the kind of questions that now need to be addressed.

What is not in question here is the right of the Catholic Church to ask for further clarification where this seems to be needed. True agreement cannot be based on different understandings of the same statements. Moreover, as the Final Report itself acknowledges, there are still serious differences. These have been carefully and properly identified in the RC Church's official response.

At the same time, it is also important that we sustain people's sense of hope and worthwhileness in the ecumenical enterprise. With that in mind, the important questions

that need courageously to be faced are not only those which the Vatican response raised about the Final Report, but also some relating to how the Catholic Church goes about formulating a response. If there were to be on-going dissatisfaction about that, it could have a discouraging and damaging effect on the work of ecumenism.

Obvious Questions

It is not unreasonable to ask whether the Roman Catholic episcopate is satisfied that it took our Church ten years to produce its official response. As I have said elsewhere, "if there is reason to avoid harmful mistakes through improper haste, and there is, there is greater reason to avoid the more serious harm being caused by disunity itself and by delays in resolving our differences." (1) This harm includes the erosion of christian doctrine and moral teaching. It also includes the reaction of those who give up on hoping for ecclesial unity, and who settle for joint action on social issues as a substitute. There is a definite need for urgency, and we are entitled to ask whether this is reflected in the RC Church's official response.

It is also reasonable to ask how far the Vatican response concurred with the responses of the Bishops' Conferences. There seems to be a perception that these were more positive than the Vatican response. If this is not correct, it needs to be shown. If it is correct, it needs to be explained. The assumption here is that the responsibility of the Catholic episcopate did not end with the earlier consultation of the Bishops' Conferences.

Whose Responsibility?

The organs of the Holy See, like the Holy See itself, are in the service of unity; first of all unity within the Catholic Church, but also the reconciliation of all christians. Responsibility for this service was aptly stated by Cardinal Cassidy in his address to the Special Assembly for Europe of the Synod of Bishops, December 1991:

We in the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity have been given the task of

working for the unity of Christians; but the task is one that the Second Vatican Council entrusted to all the bishops and local churches (CIC 755)

We look to you in this Synod to speak to us and to illumine us on this aspect of evangelization. We hope that the Synod will deepen the awareness of the Church in Europe to the need to strengthen our commitment to what our Holy Father has often described as a "pastoral priority" of his ministry, and therefore of our ministry.... Not enough has been done as yet in general in the Catholic Church to put into practice the ecumenical principles set forth in the Council documents, and particularly to discern their pastoral consequences. (2)

How the Pontifical Council sees itself is thus made very clear. How does the universal episcopate see itself? Does it recognize the co-responsibility of which Cardinal Cassidy speaks? Or will the episcopate simply defer to the competence of the Holy See in a way that falls short of collegial responsibility?

Do we agree that "not enough has been done as yet to put into practice the ecumenical principles set forth in the Council documents", and if so, why is this?

Having acknowledged the special obstacle to ecumenism arising from the experience of Eastern Europe, Cardinal Cassidy presses his point by referring to the Church in general. In the case of ARCIC, it is naturally the special responsibility of the Bishops' Conferences of the English-speaking world to take a particular interest in this dialogue.

The Question that must be faced

Two significantly different approaches to the question asked of the two Churches is highlighted clearly and courteously by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his official comment on the RC response to ARCIC 1, December 1991:

Both Communion were asked the same question: "Are the agreements contained in the Final Report consonant with the faith of the Roman Catholic Church/Anglican Communion?" At the 1988 Lambeth Conference it was my privilege to present the Final Report on behalf of the Primates and to move the related motion which was overwhelmingly carried. We recognised that not everything in the Report was expressed in the terms, language, thought-forms and even theology of the 39 Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Nevertheless we believed that the documents on the Eucharist and on Ministry and Ordination were "consonant" with the faith of the Church as expressed within the Anglican Communion. In the case of the Roman Catholic Response, however, the question to our two Communion appears to have

been understood as asking: "Is the Final Report identical with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church?" The argument of the Response suggests that a difference in methodology may have led to this approach. If either Communion requires that the other conforms to its own theological formulations, further progress will be hazardous.

The Vatican response does seem to merge these two different questions. Henry Chadwick has commented that "there are moments in the Vatican verdict when what is under fire is not what ARCIC set out but what some in the Curia think Anglicans might be able to say if the Final Report alone were taken to be sufficient. Therefore, there is a kind of search for unidentified submarines below the surface of apparently tranquil waters." (3) What Chadwick describes is a known and not unreasonable concern. Nevertheless, it answers a different question from that which the Churches were asked to answer.

It is not being suggested here that "consonance" with the Catholic faith allows room for anything that conflicts with Catholic doctrines. Rather, it is a matter of acknowledging that the Catholic faith is larger than its particular formulations, and then acting on that fact. (4)

The difference between the two questions referred to above reflects the difference between what Catholics expected before the Second Vatican Council (viz simple "conversion" to the Catholic faith based on acceptance of Catholic doctrines as then formulated) and what the Second Vatican Council envisaged by authorising a new era in ecumenical relationships. Whatever else is necessary for a proper understanding of ecumenism, at the very least something different from straight out multiple conversions was intended. Otherwise, what was different and what was it all about?

The ecumenical process embarked upon by the Catholic Church with the endorsement of the Second Vatican Council presupposes that it is possible to "get behind" the formulas on which we had reached impasse, and draw from our common tradition new, as well as old, ways of expressing our faith. This is precisely what would be different, and yet without prejudice to the integrity of Catholic faith. But is this basic point being respected when

the Vatican response seems to require the use of RC confessional language to express doctrines which the Vatican response itself acknowledges were already agreed upon? The Vatican response acknowledges, for example, that the following formula expresses agreement concerning the Real Presence:

Before the eucharistic prayer, to the question: "what is that?" the believer answers: "it is bread." After the eucharistic prayer, to the same question he answers: "it is truly the body of Christ, the bread of life". (Eucharist, Elucidations, n.6)

But then, in the context of wanting assurance that all such agreed formulas are being "understood in a way that conforms to Catholic doctrine", it speaks of "a substantial change in the elements" and of Christ being present "sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of his body and blood, soul and divinity." Likewise, it seems to require RC confessional language when it speaks of the "character" of priestly ordination.

It has been claimed that the official Catholic response was not asking for the adoption of confessional language, but rather was pressing the question: does the new language of ARCIC bring us to the same point as that which is intended by the terms and formulations which the Catholic Church uses? Are the agreed formulas "understood in a way that conforms to Catholic doctrine?"

Up to a point this is an acceptable requirement. After all, how can we speak of "consonance" with Catholic faith if the new language and the confessional language were not consistent with each other? However, the Vatican response seems in fact to go further: it speaks of the need for statements to "correspond fully to the Catholic doctrine" and it sees itself as looking for "the identity of the various statements with the faith of the Church." The problem with this is not that what is stated in new language needs to conform fully with Catholic belief; the problem is rather with an assumption with the necessary criterion for judging conformity is current RC confessional language. On this premise, everything still comes back to the use of current RC confessional terms and formulations ! Isn't this what gives point to the response of the Archbishop of

Canterbury as mentioned above ?

In 1980 Pope John Paul II had commended the method being used by ARCIC when he said:

Your method has been to go behind the habit of thought and expression born and nourished in enmity and controversy, to scrutinize together the common treasure, to clothe it in a language at once traditional and expressive of the insights of an age which no longer glories in strife but seeks to come together in listening to the quiet voice of the Spirit.

Moreover, in an address to ARCIC II in 1987, he repeated this commendation.

Pope John XXIII had set the tone with his famous comment that "the substance of the ancient deposit of faith is one thing; and the way it is presented is another." Debate over his exact wording does not alter his substantive point. Indeed, since then, Pope John Paul II has commented that even the definition of the Council of Chalcedon is able to be expressed in other ways of wording.

Can the world-wide episcopate of the Catholic Church sit comfortably with a reply issued on behalf of all Catholics which seems to insist that the ultimate criterion of agreement is conformity with post-Reformation language - even where agreement has already been acknowledged?

PART II

DEEPER QUESTIONS

The questions posed above lead to further questions which are crucial to the ecumenical process. How do we ultimately come to know whether or not we mean the same thing? The view being proposed here is that it is not possible only by the intellectual analysis of doctrines. It requires that we somehow share the experience which gives birth to our doctrinal statements.

The development of doctrine is a fact of the Church's life. It didn't stop at the time of the divisions of the 16th century. And so some developments and refinements of doctrine within the Catholic Church have taken place without the involvement of christians in the other traditions. This does not mean these developments are wrong or unimportant. But it does mean they have not been part of other christians' experience.

I use the word "experience" deliberately, because the Church's life - what it does and how it prays - is the context in which the faith is perceived and its meaning formulated. Consequently, those who are not part of the Roman Catholic experience cannot easily arrive at the same ways of perceiving and formulating the faith as Roman Catholics perceive and formulate it.

It further follows that a more shared experience of the Church's life is the pre-condition for a more shared perception and more agreed formulation of the faith. Achieving unity involves more than an intellectual exercise focused on doctrinal statements. It engages the whole life of faith and the experience of believers. There are profound reasons for this. Even the sciences now accept that "every question concerning any object whatever also formally implies the question of the knowing subject." (5)

...the issue is one's notion of objectivity. If one considers logical proof to be basic, one wants an objectivity that is independent of the concrete existing subject. But while objectivity reaches what is independent of the concrete existing subject, objectivity itself is not reached by what is independent of the concrete existing subject. (6)

The relationship between experience and understanding is also the reason why it is in order to ask how the Catholic Church can bridge the gap between those whose knowledge of what the other churches are saying comes out of first hand experience of ecumenical dialogue, and those (including some who speak for the Catholic Church) whose knowledge is not recently rooted in that experience. This is not some kind of anti-Curia statement; it is related intrinsically to the ecumenical process. In other contexts, we have no difficulty in acknowledging that "the less one has participated in the christian religious experience, the less one is capable of appreciating the doctrines that articulate

the meaning of that experience." (7) But we are strangely slow to acknowledge the ecumenical implications of this same important fact. The context in which the different christian denominations perceive and formulate the meaning of their faith results from the different historical, cultural, social and theological environments in which they live their faith. And the less one has participated in their experience of faith, the less one is able to appreciate what they mean.

There is evidence for this in the history of ecumenical experience. At the Council of Florence, significant doctrinal agreement was reached. But the agreement meant little to those who had not participated in the experience out of which the agreed formulations emerged. And so, nothing came of it. (8)

There are present-day ecumenical efforts which reflect the same problem. V. Marron has shown from the experience of the Third World Conference of Faith and Order (Lund, 1952) and the subsequent work of the Theological Commission (1954) that no progress could be made simply by comparing doctrinal positions. Such an approach starts from a given disunity. The need was felt to start from the God-given unity already possessed and "to draw the consequences of this existing unity for the actual life of the church and for the togetherness of the denominations." (9)

ARCIC I had already reached the conclusion that "some difficulties will not be wholly resolved until a practical initiative has been taken and our two Churches have lived together more visibly in one koinonia". (9) Whatever the shape of such "living together more visibly" may or may not be, it is at least certain that doctrinal differences cannot be resolved on the basis of intellectual comparisons of formulated teaching.

The human mind never verifies this agreement (between the convictions of different people) simply by establishing the identical nature of the conceptual content. Real community, identical utterances (as opposed to purely abstract thinking), and common concrete action are necessary elements in verifying the sameness of many people's convictions.

....Common concrete activity (in the broadest sense) is not only the result of a shared

conviction; it is also the way in which we fashion this common conviction and come to take cognisance of it..... Indeed we will find a oneness that can never be provided by concepts alone.

If we wish to achieve credal oneness and to verify it, then we must utter this profession together, concretely celebrate the death of the Lord together, execute the sacraments together, and engage in one joint activity in the world. Through these activities, the oneness and sameness of our credal profession will become real, whatever pluralism may (continue to) exist in theology. (11)

The late Bishop C. Butler responded to ideas such as these with the appropriate reminder that there are necessary limits to how far we can speak of unity before there is doctrinal agreement:

A church consists of people in full communion each with all the others on the basis not only of a common sharing of faith in Christ but also of a common profession of faith. (12)

One can only agree that full communion necessarily includes the profession of the same faith. However, we need to analyse further what "profession of the same faith" really means. As Rahner has shown in several of his writings (13) there is an unavoidable gap between the contents of individuals' own personal, explicit faith and the full contents of the Church's faith. Because the world of ideas in which we live our faith has become so pluralist, it is no longer possible for individual believers - and communities of believers - to attain a complete synthesis of their faith.

Notwithstanding this "gap", all the truths of faith are encompassed by the act of faith which is directed towards the total reality of faith. This is also the teaching of St Thomas (14). As the believer's faith develops, it gradually assimilates and situates the various "objects of faith". (15)

The same is true for particular groups within the Church, in the particular churches within the Church, and at particular epochs in the Church's history. (16)

People are not excluded from full membership on account of any gap between the

teaching of the Church and their own more limited, personal acceptance of the Church's teachings. The Church does not always require explicit faith in all the Church's doctrines as a pre-condition for participation in the Church's life. The obvious example is the Church's practice in regard to the confirmation and first Eucharist of children. This is not a mere concession to childhood. In the early Church, the adult catechumen was required to make a confession of faith (the Creed) which was only a summary and did not even include such an essential doctrine as the Eucharist. (17)

Similarly,

....Doctrinal developments, formulations and enunciations of the past or of a different cultural area, however legitimate and orthodox, do not necessarily have to become the content of the explicit faith of believers in another epoch or of another culture.
(18)

The possibility of gaps between personal faith and the doctrine of the Church is also acknowledged in the Church's practice of sanctioning the rights of dissenters. (19)

It is also implicit in the ancient practice of *oikonomia*:

Economy is not an attitude of doctrinal liberalism, for it does not consist of keeping silence on a point of faith, or of reducing necessary belief to a common denominator or dogmas acceptable to all; nor is it a matter of minimising the meaning of doctrine, but of keeping silence for the time being concerning certain aspects or certain logical consequences, for reasons of charity; of not making explicit certain formulations which would unnecessarily hurt the weak from the time they accept to profess the common faith in equivalent terms. (20)

In this way, the Church acknowledges that we grow into the truth, and that a certain incompleteness in the beliefs of individuals and groups is not incompatible with a "common profession of faith".

In line with that tradition, the Second Vatican Council decided:

In order to restore communion and unity or preserve them, one must "impose no

burden beyond what is indispensable". (Acts 15:28) It is the Council's urgent desire that every effort should henceforth be made towards the gradual realisation of this goal in the various organisations and living activities of the Church, especially by prayer and by fraternal dialogue on points of doctrine and the more pressing pastoral problems of our time. (21)

At this point one could make a useful excursus into what kind of pluralism is consistent with unity in the faith. G. Dejaifve SJ has argued that in the Decree on Ecumenism (nn 13 & 17) the Council's understanding of "theological pluralism" is tantamount to doctrinal pluralism. (22)

Whatever about that, the same Decree did call on us to recognise a hierarchy of importance within the Church's teachings. A satisfying interpretation of this has been given by the International Theological Commission which explains that since the subject (the "I") of the Creed is the Church, those expressions of faith which are more universal are more expressive of the Church's identity and therefore of its faith. On this basis, scripture takes priority over all subsequent formulations; the ancient Creeds over the Councils; the Councils of Nicea and Chalcedon over all other Councils (because they were concerned with the most central and therefore most universal truths of the Creed); and those dogmatic formulas which more directly relate to the facts of salvation history over those which involve theological reflection on those facts. (23)

At the very least, the Second Vatican Council was saying that the truths of our faith, even though they all belong, do not all have the same importance, and that in some way this difference between them has implications for the restoration of christian unity.

When all is said and done, we acknowledge that the apostolic Church already enjoyed the fullness of christian revelation even though the first generation of christians could not have said all that we now say as part of our faith. In other words, such is the "development of doctrine" that those christians who live sooner and those who live later (in a vertical line down through history) both possess the fullness of the christian faith, but differently. What makes the difference is ultimately their different experience of the same faith due to the different historical, cultural, spiritual and theological environments

in which they live their faith. Have we fully explored the extent to which this might also be true horizontally between contemporary christians living within their different denominational contexts?

This is not to say that we can ignore or acquiesce in real differences. It is to say that because development in how christians come to perceive and formulate the meaning of their faith depends on the context in which they live it, they can only come to a more common perception and formulation of doctrines through a greater sharing of christian life and worship. It does not work the opposite way round;

Creeds may be regarded as resulting from the inner exigencies of a lived faith; they should not be forcibly imposed, by external authoritative action, upon peoples not prepared for them by their corporate historical experience....

In the last analysis, I suspect there are no adequate extrinsic norms for measuring the validity of confessional statements. They cannot be tested against other biblical or credal utterances by merely syllogistic logic. The norm must be to some extent existential. It is necessary to enter into the spiritual world of the other church with true empathy, and in this way to assess its declarations in relation to ones sense of the christian reality. Christian reunion therefore presupposes a certain sharing of religious experience on the part of believers of different denominations. (24)

In contrast to this, the Vatican response to ARCIC I seems to suppose that acceptance of the recent Marian dogmas will be resolved by acceptance of the Petrine ministry. Logically, of course, this is correct !

Of course, as well as those doctrines which have resulted from different developments in our understanding of the faith (e.g. the more recent Marian dogmas), there are others which christians have formulated in opposition to each other. But here, too, the new context resulting from a more shared christian experience is required as the precondition for the eventual resolution of unacceptable differences. After all, the experience from which doctrinal formulations emerge is, at its deepest level, christians' experience of, and response to, the person of the risen Christ in the community which is united to him and lives by him. This experience is grasped in only limited understanding, which in turn is conceptualised, articulated and communicated. Such sharing leads to a further common

understanding of the experience, and may eventually become a formulated expression of the faith of the community. Dogmas are limited formulations of limited understanding, which in turn is an abstraction taken from what has been experienced.

Even allowing for that wholeness which the Roman Catholic Church claims for itself, it must still be said that the perception, formulation and teaching of christian truth suffers by that lack of full communion which, when restored, will enrich us all. This claim is indirectly supported by the distinction J. Ratzinger makes between "real" and "juridical" ecumenicity, when he explains why the ecumenical councils of the Middle Ages are less important for us than the earlier ones, in spite of the fact that they too were "ecumenical":

The relationship between these Councils and the Pope assures them of an ecumenicity "of right". But the absence of the Oriental Churches signifies nevertheless an incalculable lack of real ecumenicity, which at the same time limits the importance of their role in christian ecumenism. Only a dialogue which includes all the different traditions could make possible the full ecumenicity of their propositions. (25)

We could well learn another lesson from the Church in earlier times: when faced with dissension, a usual practice was to look beyond what was being said to what was being done (and therefore believed) in the liturgy and life of the dissenting group. In our circumstances, we need to create the conditions which would allow for a kind of transfer from that deeper unity already experienced in the context of prayer and christian living to that lesser unity which we experience when trying to articulate our faith. (26)

This brings us back to the question about how much doctrinal agreement is necessary for a common confession of faith.

Cardinal Ratzinger has stated (27) that "Rome must not require more of a doctrine of primacy from the East other than what was formulated and experienced in the first millennium" (emphasis mine). Is the same not also true of other doctrines, especially those which have been the subject of further clarification, development and definition since the time of our divisions? That is a very specific question which urgently needs the attention of the world-wide episcopate.

In the meantime, it is surely not sufficient for the Vatican response to test the statements of the Final Report against formulations of the faith which have been made during the period of our separation. We cannot simply separate the experience of faith from the understanding of faith. Moreover, what reason would be left for the method adopted by ARCIC and commended by Pope John Paul II, of "getting behind" the language and patterns of language we had been using since the time of our divisions, in favour of a dialogue "founded upon the gospels and on the ancient common traditions"? Indeed, that was the mandate given to ARCIC 1 by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Ramsey in 1966 and it seems inappropriate to assess the results by any other standard.

The Final Report itself acknowledges points on which agreement has not yet been achieved, and the Vatican response rightly notes the need for further study on these. But in order even to gauge the results of further study, we need to clarify whether they ought to be measured against the gospels and our ancient common traditions, or against "Catholic doctrine" as it has developed since the Reformation and often in the language of controversy. Is it only those later developments of doctrine that constitute the yard-stick of unity?

Conclusion

Our obligations towards the Church are ultimately towards the Church's reason for existing, which is to be a sign and agent of the reconciliation of all things in Christ. Ultimately, the formulation of Church teaching must be determined by the Church's obligation to preach the gospel and be understood. This is why, historically, the Church has always known how to "get behind" its existing formulations of doctrine for the sake of proclaiming their truth. According to Kasper, the functional ability of dogmas to stimulate faith, hope and love in any era is constitutive of the very truth of those dogmas. (28) von Balthasar reminds us that dogmas do not have any purely theoretical, i.e. non-experiential, truth. (29) Don't we have to avoid the kind of introverted concern for orthodoxy that fails to get behind existing formulations for the sake of pushing forward the reconciliation of all things in Christ? There is more than one way of letting the Church down.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cullinane, P., One Lord One Faith One Baptism, 1989, p.2
2. Catholic International, vol.3, n.4 (1992) p.158.
3. The Tablet, London, 1 Feb 1992.
4. Cf *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, 1973.
5. Rahner, K., Theology and Anthropology, Theological Investigations, Vol. 9, p.34.
6. Lonergan, B., *Method in Theology*, DLT (London), 2nd ed. 1973, p.338.
The relationship between understanding and experience, between objectivity and subjectivity, the roots of pluralism in human understanding and therefore in theology and doctrine, the significance of "forms of perception" (Schlink) and "differentiations of consciousness" (Lonergan), of how the living context determines both the development of doctrines and their meanings, are the subject of fuller study in *Christian Experience, Doctrinal Formulation and Church unity*, Cullinane, P., (Thesis for Degree of M.Theol., University of Otago, 1980; unpublished.)
7. Chirico, P., Religious Experience and Development of Dogma, The American Benedictine Review, vol. 23, n.1 (1972) p.70.
8. cf Macha, J., *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations*, Rome, Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1974, p.122.
9. Marron, V., The Ecumenical Development of Theology, in Lash ed. Doctrinal Development and Christian Unity, London, S & W, 1967, p.76.
10. Authority in the Church II, Statement, n.33.
11. Rahner, K., Pluralism in Theology & the Unity of the Church's Profession of Faith, Concilium, Vol. 6, n.5 (1969), p.57.
12. Reported in The Times, London, 23 Feb. 1971.
13. Cf, e.g.: What is Heresy? Theological Investigations, vol. 5, ch.19; On the Theology of the Ecumenical Discussion, Theological Investigations, vol. 11, ch.12; Heresies in the Church Today? Theological Investigations, vol. 12, ch.7;

The Faith of the Christian and the Doctrine of the Church, Theological Investigations, vol. 14, ch.2.

14. Cf Summa Theologiae, Pars II, Questio 1, art. ad 2am.
15. Cf Rahner, K., The Faith of the Christian and Doctrine of the Church, Theological Investigations, vol 14, pp 39-40.
16. ibid p.40
17. Schillebeeckx, E., Revelation and Theology, Theological Soundings, vol. 1, part 1, London & Sydney, S & W, 1967, p.231
18. Sala, G., Dogma e Storia nella dichiarazione *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, Bologna, Edizione Dehoniane, 1976, p.184. cf also Pope Paul VI, Discourse, 10 December 1969, Insegnamenti di Paolo VI, Vol. 6, p.777 ff.
19. Cf Dulles, A., The Resilient Church, Dublin, Gil & MacMillan, 1977, p.107 ff.
20. Lanne, E., Les Differences Compatibles avec L'unite Dans La Tradition de L'Eglise Ancienne (jusqu'au XII siecle), Istina (1961-62) p.246.
21. Decree on Ecumenism, n.18.
22. Diversite dogmatique et unite de la revelation, Nouvelle Revue Theologique 89, (1967), pp 19-23.
23. cf Ratzinger, J., ed. Pluralismo: unita della fede e pluralismo teologico: Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1974, pp 43-48.
24. Dulles, A., Dogma as an Ecumenical Problem: Theological Studies, 29 (1968), p.412, 415.
25. Pluralismo, pp 47, 48 and passim.
26. On this interesting phenomenon, cf Schlinck, E., The Structure of Dogmatic Statements as an Ecumenical Problem in The Coming of Christ and the Coming Church, London and Edinburgh, Neilson, 1967, p.16.
27. cf The Tablet, London, 26 Oct. 1991.
28. Kasper, W., The Relationship between Gospel and Dogma: an historical approach, Concilium, vol. 1, no. 3, p.74 & passim.
29. von Balthasar, H.U. Truth and Life, Concilium, vol. 1, no.3, p.45.

cf also Schillebeeckx, Revelation and Theology, Theological Soundings, vol. 1, part. 1, London & Sydney, (S. & W.) 1967, p.238.

