

out of teaching philosophy "on Thomistic principles" by codifying those principles in twenty-four formulas. Lonergan, Rahner, and "transcendental Thomism" seem not to have been directly affected by the controversy around the encyclical. One could claim that Rahner's supernatural existential attempts to deal with the problems raised by de Lubac.

The whole discussion back memories for several participants: Pierre Charles, S.J., leaving his courses in Louvain-Egenhoven to prepare for the "reopening" of Vatican I; the way in which the theological differences also reflected internal French political division between Vichy and the *résistance*; and how Cardinal Billot lost his "red hat" over *Action Française* (I should emphasize that no member of the group claimed to recall this 1927 event personally).

MICHAEL SLUSSER  
*Duquesne University*  
*Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

#### COMMUNION APPROACH TO MISSION

Topic: Conflicts on Mission:  
 Toward Mutual Understanding and Reconciled Practice  
 Convener: Thomas Hughson, Marquette University  
 Presenters: Mary Ehle, Creighton University  
 Ralph Del Colle, Marquette University  
 Thomas Hughson, Marquette University

Theologians need not hurry toward mediating positions on every conflict in the Church or theology. Indeed, it has been customary to acknowledge that opposition often has played a role in theological and doctrinal development. At the same time, it has been less remarked that the history of the ecumenical movement has been a lesson in not assuming that every vehement conflict on a major theme springs from an underlying contradiction. Lutheran/Catholic conflict over justification is a case in point. In an ecumenical spirit appropriate also for tensions internal to Catholicism three papers explored theological territory between polarized positions on Christian mission.

Mary Ehle went beneath publicized conflict between the communion missiologies of Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and Leonardo Boff to their variant trinitarian principles, though both anchor Church mission in the Trinity and both wield an interpersonal, I-Thou-We, approach. Their conflict over the relative priority of either the universal or local Church springs from diverse understandings of divine and human persons. Ratzinger tends to locate the distinctiveness of the Son in the relation to the Father rather than in a distinct personal property and to treat Jesus's obedience to the Father as the historical expression of that relation. There follows a communion missiology that emphasizes obediential partici-

pation in the universal Church. Boff's contrasting emphasis on the local, eucharistic Church following Jesus' liberating praxis of an option for the poor flows from an understanding of Father, Son and Spirit as a communion of persons whose sacrament is the Church as communion. Ehle proposed that a turn to the communicative understanding of divine and human persons in the communion ecclesiology of Bernd Jochen Hilberath permits balancing the strengths and overcoming a certain one-sidedness in Ratzinger and Boff.

Ralph Del Colle and Thomas Hughson dealt with ecumenical oppositions. Del Colle presented Pentecostalism not so much as an opponent winning converts in the mission field as it is a unique partner for ecumenical dialogue. Baptism in the Holy Spirit characterizes Pentecostalism and has led Pentecostal missiology to emphasize an evangelistic movement that requires an appropriate kind of Christian discipleship. This is not incompatible with the missiology of the Catholic magisterium. In fact, argued Del Colle, there is much common ground, with the exception of Catholic recognition of the Holy Spirit's activity among peoples and cultures prior to the preaching of the gospel. Catholic dialogue with the Pentecostals, consequently, is in a position to take seriously a distinction between Church and movement, to recognize that the charismatic renewal has facilitated Catholic reception of baptism in the Holy Spirit as a sign of the Spirit, and to accept Pentecostal reception of baptism in the Holy Spirit as a sign to the whole Church of the outpouring of the Spirit. This could have the effect of highlighting pneumatological discernment as a principle in ecumenical dialogue, and could encourage other bilateral dialogues to surface their own gifts for communion based on specific kinds of discernment and conversion.

Hughson illustrated the ecumenical potential in Bernard Lonergan's functional specialty of Dialectic by taking up a durable problem in ecumenism, conflict between those "fishing in the neighbor's pond" (proselytism) and those resisting in the name of Christian unity (common witness). Heeding the steps in Dialectic as applied to this conflict results in an unforeseen possibility. This conflict may not spring from a doctrinal contradiction on the nature of the Church, baptism, eschatology, etc., but instead, as Hughson proposed, from diverse practical appropriations of Christian freedom internal to exercise of mission or witness. Evangelical and Pentecostal missionaries, for example, engage in a spontaneous self-transcendence that appropriates the gospel in zeal expressing appreciation for the supreme good that is salvation in Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. Churches committed to ecumenism practice an equally spontaneous self-transcendence that appropriates Christ's prayer and the Spirit's movement for the Church as one communion. Neither side would seem to have appropriated the fullness of Christian freedom into its customary practice of mission. The way forward, consequently, will be renewal that tries to overcome repressed aspects of Christian freedom by those on both sides of the conflict. If this analysis and prognosis are correct, further doctrinal dialogue without attention to practical models of Christian freedom will not resolve the problem of proselytism vs. common witness.

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