

Time ran out on animated discussion of main points in all three papers. The presence of two authors, each of whose work was a resource for a paper, Professors Bernd Jochen Hilberath (Tübingen) and Robert M. Doran (Lonergan Research Centre, Toronto), added to the acuity of observations.

THOMAS HUGHSON  
*Marquette University*  
*Milwaukee, Wisconsin*

#### EX CORDE ECCLESIAE AND COMMUNION THEOLOGIES

- Topic: *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*:  
 Its Implementation and the Supporting Theologies of Communion
- Convener: Elena G. Procario-Foley, Iona College
- Moderator: Margaret Pfeil, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia
- Presenters: Edward J. Miller, Gwynedd-Mercy College  
 J. Augustine DiNoia, O.P., NCCB Secretariat  
 for Doctrine and Pastoral Practices  
 Elena G. Procario-Foley, Iona College  
 Dennis Doyle, University of Dayton

The select group on *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (ECE) and communion theology arose from the desire to plumb the important theological issues at the heart of ECE that are frequently overshadowed by the necessary discussions about the practical and legal issues. The session presented four perspectives that provided a basis for a very productive debate from the floor. Miller and Doyle offered insights into the applications and forms of communion theology, while differing interpretations of trinitarian theology led Procario-Foley and DiNoia to opposing conclusions about communion theology.

Miller's paper was titled "Some Critiques on using '*Communio*' to Advance the Program of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*." Miller described the complex analogical nature of *communio* and suggested that it is an excellent heuristic tool for describing the relations between the academy and the magisterium if the concept is appropriately "faced in the right direction." The questions, for Miller, are: what interpretation of *communio* best serves the ideals of ECE and how is the integrity of free inquiry in the academy to be insured? Miller explains that ECE and the Application want *communio* to imply distinct groups with complementary roles imbedded in a prior unity—the unity of faith. The thorny issue is how to describe (or "face in the right direction") the multifaceted relationships within the primary unity. Miller referred to lectures delivered by Anthony Cardinal Bevilacqua and DiNoia to present the trajectory of communion theology that calls for juridically structured relationships. Miller determined that the goals of ECE would not be well served by a juridical interpretation of *communio*. Rather, using Newman's

thinking about diverse roles in unity, he eschews the familiar description of the relationships between the hierarchy, the theologians and the faithful as distinct and complementary and ultimately juridical and hierarchical. Instead, he describes the relationships of *communio* as being dialectical or in polar tension. Miller opines that parenting provides an illuminating model of *communio*. Just as good parents support each other and provide counterbalances to each other in a process that has no predetermined outcome, so too should the *communio* of academy and magisterium be based on an abiding trust and patience so that, as Miller stated, "healthy unity [will be] maintained by healthy tensions."

DiNoia's presentation, "The Ecclesiology of Communion and Catholic Higher Education," argued that the Application of ECE is simply a basic implementation of the theology of communion developed during the Second Vatican Council. DiNoia presented the position that communion is a reality and not, *pace* Miller, hermeneutic or heuristic. The reality of communion is prior to any theology of communion and requires embodiment in structured relationships and expression in canonical forms. DiNoia offered ten theses to highlight the basic outline of his position (see *Origins* 29, 1999 for an earlier version of his remarks). He begins with the thesis that ecclesial communion finds its source in the Trinity. This principle is the foundation for the rest of his argument. DiNoia emphasized the importance of the Second Vatican Council's development of communion, the idea that ECE and the Application cannot be understood without a correct comprehension of the ecclesiology of communion and his premise that, as an invisible reality, communion becomes visible only through "canonically ordered" social and institutional structures. He contends that such structures preserve the distinctive roles of the participants in communion. Further, DiNoia explained that the theology of communion provides the right for the Church to create universities and sustain appropriate relationships with them. He underscored the very positive epistemological discussion raised by ECE about the unity of knowledge while also raising the question of the sustainability of the Catholic identity of institutions without structured juridical relationships. His argument culminates in the description of the theological disciplines as derivative from revelation leading him to conclude that the *mandatum* merely expresses the derived character of theology. Miller's concern about the integrity of inquiry is addressed by DiNoia's conclusion that it is precisely the role of the Magisterium to ensure such integrity. Thus, the *mandatum* "is merely the public affirmation and social expression" of the basic idea that theology is derivative and theologians have academic freedom.

Procario-Foley's remarks, "Implementation, the Trinity and Christian Feminism," employed the trinitarian work of Catherine LaCugna and Elizabeth Johnson to explore the trinitarian theology operative in the communion theology evident in the Application and the CDF documents "Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian" and "Letter to the Bishops on Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion." She suggested that the feminist characterization of the trinitarian relationships as those of mutual relation, radical equality, and community in

diversity are fairly close to the characteristics of trust, cooperation and dialogue that are central to ECE and the Application. Following LaCugna's retrieval of the Cappadocian understanding of the Trinity, Procario-Foley argued that the trinitarian theology supporting the implementation of ECE is based on a substance ontology that yields hierarchy and subordination, thus undermining the documents' stated values of trust, cooperation and dialogue. Cappadocian trinitarian theology is based on a person ontology that emphasizes radical relation within a communion of diverse persons. Procario-Foley explained that the theological anthropology that follows from a substance ontology involves complementarity which, again, supports hierarchical and subordinationist relationships. (There was no time in discussion for Miller and Procario-Foley to discuss any differences in their uses of complementarity.) Feminist theology suggests replacing complementarity as the model for relationships with the concept of perichoresis. The image of relationship as dance synthesizes the radical equality of a person ontology.

Doyle's address, "Communion Ecclesiology, *Mandatum*, and Prudential Judgments," provided a bird's eye view of the debates surrounding communion ecclesiologies. In a masterfully succinct manner, Doyle offered insight into the conflicting claims about *communio* and the implementation by characterizing communion ecclesiology A and communion ecclesiology B. Communion ecclesiology A represents the understanding of Church that is worked out through the sixteen documents of the Second Vatican Council. It locates the Church in relationship and sacramentality, a church engaged with the world, and moves away from an idealized and juridical concept of the Church forged as a defensive reaction to the Reformation and Enlightenment. Communion ecclesiology B, articulated by some of the same theologians who were responsible for communion ecclesiology A (e.g., de Lubac), is a particular version of communion ecclesiology A, not an opposing ecclesiology. It arose from "a defensive reaction against overly liberal implementations of the Council" and its emphases are those of the journal *Communio*. Based on the two ecclesiologies, Doyle could both register his agreement with much of what DiNoia espoused and disagree with the *mandatum* as a way to implement ECE. Doyle suggested that prudential judgments are needed when discerning how best to embody communion ecclesiology. Doyle concluded on a note of hope implying a positive outcome for the implementation of ECE and the *mandatum* if it is based on a communion ecclesiology that strives to account for the "full range of witness of the Second Vatican Council."

ELENA G. PROCARIO-FOLEY

*Iona College*  
*New Rochelle, New York*