

ty, equal to the whole of its many aspects, may, for convenience sake, be represented by one of them just so long as the importance of each is respected.

Edward Enright viewed Newman's tests through the eyes of four Protestant reviewers of the 1845 Essay: William Josiah Irons, Frederick Denison Maurice, George Moberly, and James Bowling Mozley. Irons dismissed the tests as useless because all seven tests could validate Nestorianism or other heresies. Maurice judged that Newman substituted papal infallibility for the invisible truth of God guiding Christianity. Moberly thought the tests unnecessary since everything needed for salvation is to be found in the New Testament. Mozley claimed that tests two through seven only expanded upon the first test, and for it a corrupt development seems as natural an outcome as a genuine development.

Since the presentations were limited to fifteen minutes each, there was ample time for lively discussion. The following topics surfaced: What earlier writings of Newman anticipated his later treatment of doctrinal development? Do these tests make sense to anyone operating with a modern or postmodern hermeneutic?

EDWARD JEREMY MILLER

*Gwynedd-Mercy College
Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania*

YVES CONGAR ECUMENICAL COLLOQUIUM

- Topic: Congar on Authentic Expressions of the Apostolic Faith
 Convener: Mark E. Ginter, St. Meinrad School of Theology
 Moderator: Catherine E. Clifford, University of St. Michael's College
 Presenter: Susan M. Brown, King's College, London, Ontario
 Respondents: Frank Macchia, Southeastern College of the Assemblies of God
 Stanley S. Harakas, Archbishop Iakovos Professor of Orthodox
 Theology, Emeritus, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox
 School of Theology

According to the established custom for this Colloquium, a Catholic perspective on the work of Yves Congar was first presented, followed by two responses: one from the non-Catholic Christian West and one from the non-Catholic Christian East. After these three presentations, an open discussion followed. Below are the summaries of the papers and discussion.

Susan Brown argued that Yves Congar saw diverse faith expressions as arising both from the partial adequacy of particular ways of expressing the content of the faith as well as from the human capacity for spiritual and intellectual growth. She went on to describe Congar's understanding of the nature of doctrinal development and how it occurs. Noting that Congar's resistance (on account of his concerns about effective evangelization and ecumenism) to an unwarranted uniformity of faith expression within Catholicism was balanced by

a concern to discriminate between authentic expressions of the apostolic faith and others, Brown proposed seven criteria of fidelity which she found to be operative in Congar's evaluations of new faith expressions and proposed ecclesial reforms. Since, in the face of apparently unresolvable differences between East and West about how to speak of the procession of the Holy Spirit, Congar took piety and daily living to be indirect indicators of the fidelity of Orthodox pneumatology, Brown suggested that such criteria might be more widely employed to evaluate unusual doctrinal formulations arising from contexts whose orthodoxy and orthopraxis are in other respects uncontested.

According to Frank Macchia, Professor Brown presented an excellent survey of Congar's complex handling of the issue of doctrinal pluralism in relation to the development of dogma and the unity of the church. From the vantage point of the Pentecostal Movement, which historically sought unity among Christians by cutting through the "dead forms and creeds" of Christendom in order to return to the "living, practical Christianity" of the Apostles, experience and praxis were more important than the development and diversity of tradition (which tended to be viewed as a hindrance to unity). Yet, the Pentecostals sought to situate themselves in the mainstream of Christian affirmation by avoiding "wild fanaticisms" that contradict the apostolic witness. "Love, Faith, and Unity" were their watchwords. Yet, the early formation of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement (which denied the dogma of the Trinity in order to advocate a christocentric unitarianism) forced Pentecostals to consider the importance of dogma as a basis for unity and apostolic identity. Congar can help us to discern authentic fundamental dogma in the midst of increasing Pentecostal pluralism. In addition, the Pentecostal accent on lived experience coincides with Congar's accent on the same in his understanding of tradition. And the Pentecostal emphasis on prophecy and the role of the charismatically empowered laity in discerning truth can find resonance with Congar's ecclesiology, but challenges his Catholic hierarchical understanding of the church and the discernment of truth. Congar's (and Rahner's) complex elaboration of how revelation decisively and fully revealed in Christ can still develop and diversify historically (as traditions grasp and draw out the implications of tradition once and for all delivered to the saints) can aid Pentecostals, even in their understanding of the revelatory role of prophecy in the church. As Catholics embrace diversity in their own communion, they will be willing to accept a degree of unity with other churches. In this way, pluralism is not only a challenge to unity and a necessity of human limitations, but also a gift of the Spirit of God to the world.

Stanley Harakas thanked Professor Brown for providing a nuanced and comprehensive description and analysis of Congar's approach to a wide range of concerns dealing with issues of theological epistemology. Richard Beauchesne's work helps to elucidate particularly well Congar's concern to relate a wide range of issues to the quest for ecclesial unity. Several writers have traced out Eastern Christian influence on his thought, evaluating his ecclesiological thought patterns and discussing the implications of his thought for Eastern Orthodox-Roman

Catholic relations, including Joseph Famerée, the late Metropolitan of Philadelphia Iakovos Canavaris, and Bishop Kallistos Ware. Much of Congar's view on theological epistemology resonates with an Orthodox approach to ethics and mission theology, e.g., concern for the authenticity and mechanics of inculturation, ecclesial reform, doctrinal development, and alternate faith expressions. But among some elements of discomfort, for example, is the apparent contradiction between the method of a "return to common ancient tradition" and the concurrent appeals to history and contemporary experience that arise from Congar's inclusive and open ecumenical stance. Is there, in spite of his remonstrances, an opening to "a too loose and overly relativistic approach to the church's beliefs"? Does Metropolitan Iakovos have a point when he fears that Congar may be turning "theology into philosophy"? Not so much to reject the movement Congar has properly fostered, but to indicate that the pendulum may have swung too far in the direction of maximizing diversity and away from the uniquely revelatory core of the gospel; that is the Orthodox concern.

In the follow-up discussion, comments focussed on the Orthodox concern that Congar may be turning "theology into philosophy." The irenic exchange provided an opportunity to explore more deeply the Orthodox approach to theological ideas. For example, doesn't the Scholastic approach—including Congar's—seek a comprehensive explanation of revelation instead of allowing the paradoxes to exist without explanation because respect should be paid more to the canon of faith as already developed rather than to attempts to recontextualize it? Catholic participants responded strongly along the line of the compatibility of faith and reason.

MARK E. GINTER

St. Meinrad School of Theology

St. Meinrad, Indiana