CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Vladimir Latinovic and Mark D. Chapman

Change is life and life is change. Our bodies and souls move through time, constantly developing from one state to the next. Even time itself can be defined as change because through the present it transforms the unknown future into the unchangeable past. Our cells mutate and die only so that they are replaced by new ones, just as we through our deaths make way for new generations. Our experience and wisdom also grow or degrade, but they never stand still. Our relationships with our family and friends develop and often take unexpected and sometimes unwanted turns. Change is actually one of the rare constants in our existence; if there is not enough of it, we become tired and bored and we feel the urge to change something so that our lives might become interesting and exciting again. Nothing in this world stands still. Heraclitus grasped this changeability of the world inside us and around us by stating that everything flows (*panta rhei*).

V. Latinovic (✉)
University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

M. D. Chapman (✉)
Ripon College, Cuddesdon, University of Oxford, Cuddesdon, Oxford, UK

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_1

And yet, Christian churches as well as other religions often see change as something essentially negative. They see themselves as based on teachings which are "set in stone". They call their books "sacred" in order emphasize that nothing in them is allowed to be changed; and even if those religions might have been founded by someone who was himself an innovator and who changed the old teaching in order to create a the new one, which is the case both with Christianity and Islam, they nevertheless emphasize how important it is that people do not change this new teaching.[1] The worst word in their vocabulary is reserved for those who try to change the official teachings of the church or religion but who fail to do so. They are called heretics. For those who succeed in changing things, however, another term is used—orthodox. This usually carries a positive connotation, but even where they accept the changes that were brought about, churches desperately try to show that they did not actually change anything: instead, they claim, they have simply found new ways of expressing the old unchangeable truths.

There are many ways that modern psychology could offer an explanation of this phenomenon of rejecting change. Some would connect it with anxiety, because accepting new things requires a degree of courage. Some would say that this rejection of change is unhealthy because it lacks an openness for the new; and some would utter the truism that we need constancy in our lives just as much as we need change.[2] Unfortunately, due to some or all of the above mentioned factors in religious circles, there are often cases where change is rejected. There are some, especially in leadership positions, who are simply too comfortable with the way things are to have any great desire to bring about change. Such inertia is of course one of the worst kinds of reasons not to change. Those who resist such temptations which come with power are in almost every case acknowledged by future generations, when things that were considered as innovations become normal and standard. Here we might simply mention Francis of Assisi, Luther, and Pope John XXIII who, while very different personalities, were all bold visionaries and reformers who were not afraid of bringing change into the life of the church.

[1] For Christianity, see Revelation 22:18. This is especially the case with Islam which, based on the Quran's Surah Al-Ahzab (33:40), claims to be the final revelation and final religion given to the human beings.

[2] Life would be extremely difficult if everything changed constantly. We might suggest that we need a proper balance of continuity and change in order to be happy with our life.

CHAPTER 2

From Rigor to Reconciliation: Cyprian of Carthage on Changing Penitential Practice

David G. Hunter

Cyprian of Carthage, the third-century North African bishop and martyr, was a privileged witness to one of the most dramatic changes in the history of Christianity: the emergence of a penitential system for the forgiveness of previously "unforgiveable" sins. In response to the widespread failure of Christians to remain faithful during the persecution of the Emperor Decius, Cyprian and his fellow North African bishops gradually came to acknowledge that reconciliation might be granted even to those who committed the ultimate sin of apostasy. In this essay, I will examine Cyprian's evolution on the question of penance. The various reasons he offered for allowing changes in penitential practice may provide resources for the contemporary church, especially in its struggle to find adequate pastoral responses to the problem of divorce and remarriage.[1]

[1] For an excellent overview and analysis of Cyprian's controversies, see J. Patout Burns, Cyprian the Bishop (London and New York: Routledge, 2002). The introductions and commentaries of G.W. Clarke to his multi-volume translation of Cyprian's letters in the Ancient Christian Writers series are an unparalleled resource for the study of Cyprian. See note 2 below.

D. G. Hunter (✉)
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_2

Cyprian became bishop of Carthage as a relatively recent convert, barely two years after his baptism.[2] Within a year he had to confront a crisis that was to define his entire episcopate. Late in 249 or early 250, the Roman Emperor Decius issued an edict requiring that sacrifice to the traditional gods be offered throughout the empire.[3] Motivated by a desire to guarantee the continued divine protection of the empire, Decius included the novel requirement that all who sacrificed should get a certificate (*libellus*) signed by local authorities who had witnessed the sacrificial ritual. Penalties for failure to comply varied according to rank and social status: *honestiores* were subject to exile and confiscation of property; *humiliores* were liable to imprisonment and torture. Unlike previous emperors, Decius seemed more concerned to create apostates (and thereby to stimulate traditional worship) than to execute dissidents; as a result, there were few judicial executions, but significant numbers of Christians who suffered penalties of different kinds. The faithful who suffered but survived became known as "confessors"; those who perished were "martyrs." Much larger numbers, however, lapsed in some way, either by actually sacrificing or by obtaining fraudulent certificates.

The persecution of Decius did not last long; by June of 251, the emperor had been killed in battle against the Goths. But an unprecedented crisis remained for church leaders: how to handle the large numbers of Christians—in some places the majority—who had failed to stand firm. In North Africa, the situation was complicated by several factors. Unlike Fabian, the bishop of Rome who suffered immediate martyrdom, Bishop Cyprian believed that he was called to flee and continue to administer the church of Carthage in exile; this decision led some to question the Cyprian's own authority. But a more pressing problem was that some presbyters in Carthage had begun to admit lapsed Christians to eucharistic communion on the strength of letters of recommendation (*libelli pacis*) from the confessors. Earlier Christian tradition had tended to treat apostasy as an "unforgiveable" sin, for which ecclesiastical penance was not available. The new, post-Decian situation, therefore, had raised a twofold

[2] The date is unknown, but Cyprian was bishop by Easter of 249. See Graham W. Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage* (ACW 43; New York: Newman Press, 1984), vol. 1, 16. Cyprian's elevation provoked opposition from some of the more established presbyters, who continued to question his authority and to resist his policies on the lapsed Christians.

[3] According to Clarke (*Letters*, vol. 1, 27–28), the edict applied not only to citizens, but to entire households, including freedmen and slaves.

CHAPTER 3

Who Do You Call a Heretic? Fluid Notions of Orthodoxy and Heresy in Late Antiquity

Vladimir Latinovic

The Orthodox church, to which I belong, in the course of its long existence produced some of the most beautiful and innovative concepts of Christian theology,[1] and yet she somehow manages to uphold the notion that she is a champion of unchangedness and that everything that she does needs to be in total agreement with the tradition and the theology of the "holy fathers". This obsession with continuity and tradition goes so far that in the era in which almost all other churches stepped on the path of modernization,[2] the Orthodox actually thought that they needed to take a step back and remove all the layers of modernity acquired during

[1] This is especially the case for the era of Late Antiquity, in which the East was dominant in theology and which is often considered the golden age of Christian theology.

[2] This in most cases did not help them increase the number of their faithful. The best example is the Anglican Communion, which is always in tune with the spirit of the age, but which has suffered a significant decrease in the number of its faithful in the past few decades. There is a famous quote from the diary of William Ralph Inge, also known as "The Gloomy Dean," connected to his lecture at Sion College in 1911 titled "Co-operation of the Church with the Spirit of the Age". He writes: "[…] if you marry the Spirit of your own generation you will be a widow in the next". See: William Ralph Inge, *Diary of a Dean: St. Paul's 1911–1934* (London: Hutchinson, 1949), 12.

V. Latinovic (✉)
University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_3

centuries, especially the accretions that occurred under the influence of Western scholasticism,[3] by returning to the "theology of the fathers", whatever that is supposed to mean.[4]

In this chapter, I seek to show that in many cases of the development of Christian (and in particular Orthodox) theology there is no such thing as continuity with the tradition and that church often used this continuity as a façade which served only to hide the fact that things had significantly changed.[5] The best way to do this is to show how because of the change of the official doctrine certain persons were condemned for heresy even though they did not change anything in their positions. The only thing that changed was official church theology. Since most condemnations of this type occurred post-mortem even if they had wanted to change something they could not have done so.

As someone who comes from a church that has a rather black and white notion of heresy and orthodoxy, I have always been fascinated with the selection process of who is declared a heretic and who is considered to be orthodox or even a saint, which are often equated. Putting aside all of those considered by the modern Orthodox as heretics, in accordance with Warburton's principle "Orthodoxy is my doxy – heterodoxy is another man's doxy",[6] I would like to focus on some late antique theologians who had the misfortune to be declared heretics, even though they were not, and those who had the luck of remaining orthodox, even though there were valid reasons to consider them heretical, if we were to follow equal and just principles. Finally, as mentioned above, I will consider those who

[3] Florovsky (borrowing from Luther) referred to this influence as to the "Babylonian" or the "Latin Captivity" of Russian theology. See: Georges Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology* (Belmont, MA: Nordland Pub. Co., 1979), 121, 181.

[4] I am referring to the so-called neo-patristic movement of the twentieth century led by Georges Florovsky, Vladimir Lossky, Nicholas Afanasiev, Alexander Schmemann, John Meyendorff, and ultimately John Zizioulas. For the emergence and motives of this theology see: Paul L. Gavrilyuk, *Georges Florovsky and the Russian Religious Renaissance* (Oxford: University Press, 2014). Of course, this is not an isolated phenomenon: there were similar movements in Western theology, such as "Nouvelle Théologie."

[5] The best example for this is the Council of Chalcedon (451), which introduced a political (middle way) solution for the long-standing Alexandrian (miaphysite) and Antiochian (dyophysite) Christological disputes. While introducing this artificial theology the fathers of the council felt need to state in the Creed of the council that they were only "following the holy Fathers" (ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν), which of course was only partly true.

[6] Joseph Priestley et al., *Memoirs of Dr. Joseph Priestley: To the Year 1795, Volume 1* (London: J. Johnson, 1806), 372.

CHAPTER 4

Towards a Theology of Dissent

Judith Gruber

In this contribution, I look more closely into conflicts that accompany change in the church. Are inner-ecclesial controversies to be avoided at all costs, or could there perhaps be a theological significance to disagreement in the church?[1] The Synod of Bishops for the Pan-Amazon Region that took place in October 2019 was perceived by many as a gathering towards change of current church practices, and was, as such, a controversial event. It offers a rich case study to explore the role of conflict in ecclesial theologies and practices.

A Point of Departure: "Everything is connected" (Laudato Si)

The Amazon Synod discussed its two major topics in ways that showed their intimate connection. There was, first, a strong focus on the environmental crisis that finds its roots predominantly in the 'North/West', but

[1] This is one of the central questions that motivated one of Gerard Mannion's major research projects. The working title of his final book was *The Art of Magisterium: A Teaching Church That Learns.*

J. Gruber (✉)
Faculty of Theology, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_4

whose devastating effects are chiefly felt at the peripheries, particularly in the Amazon region. Here, it becomes visible that the looming climate catastrophe is inseparable from questions of social justice. Reckless exploitation poses an acute threat to the survival of Amazonia's indigenous peoples. Here, therefore, the church is massively challenged in its task to realize the gospel message of *buen vivir* for all. Current ecclesial practices, the synod participants agreed, are insufficient; the church has to find new ways to serve the people of Amazonia, and it is also in need of ecological conversion. The synod's two major topics—the ecological-social and the pastoral—thus interlock: "Everything is connected". Evangelization and church reform are not mutually exclusive; rather, only a change of ecclesial practices and structures makes evangelization possible.

If everything is connected, we are confronted with great complexity and cannot hope for simple solutions. Complex problems allow for multiple approaches and generate divergent interpretations. In short, they are prone to trigger disagreement. The 2019 synod also gave rise to dispute that, once again, intensified the conflicts surrounding Francis' pontificate. In response to these divergences, conservative circles have ventilated accusations of heresy and seen the spectre of schism looming over the church. With this interpretation of inner-ecclesial conflict, they argue within an ecclesiological framework that presupposes pre-given unity and a stable tradition of the church, warranted by hierarchical governance. In other words, they discuss ecclesial conflict based on an ecclesiology that a priori denies any legitimacy of conflict in the church. With synodality as a key concept, Francis promotes a different ecclesiology. At stake is a broadening of participation in decision-making that is no longer drawn along clerical lines. Here, unity and consensus in the church are not envisioned as pre-given, but as goals of a dialogical process of patient listening. Synodality consequently makes space for differences and conflict in the church.

These different appraisals of ecclesial conflict call for scrutiny: Which theological status can we attribute to conflict in the church? And is there a way of understanding inner-ecclesial disagreements in ways that do not subject them by harmonizing them into an ideal of unity? In this contribution, I aim to develop a theological understanding of conflict that resists such pacification, in order to pave the way for an ecclesiological framework that allows us to do justice to the complexity of the problems targeted by the Amazon synod.

CHAPTER 5

Theology of Church Reform and Institutional Crisis: Reading Yves Congar in the Twenty-First Century

Massimo Faggioli

Church Reform from Vatican II to Pope Francis

The theological and ecclesial work of countless theologian provided our generation with the most engaging examples of the contribution of systematic reflection to the attempt to reform the Catholic Church, its thinking and institutions. This is an ongoing attempt that finds itself in a situation that is, in many respects, quite different from the twentieth-century paradigms of "reform" in which Catholicism still operates both at the intellectual and institutional level.

Catholicism embodies a strange paradox. Many people still see the Catholic Church as the symbol of immutability, the inability to change and attachment to the status quo. But at the same time, very few Catholics—at least those with a voice in the public square—seem to have been happy with the *status quo*. This paradox is particularly visible today,

M. Faggioli (✉)
Department of Theology and Religious Studies, Villanova University, Villanova, PA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_5

as we do not have the two usual, competing narratives on the current state of Catholicism; that is, a conservative narrative that supports the institutional status quo versus a change-and-reform narrative. Instead, in the context of the epoch-making sex-abuse crisis in the Catholic Church we see both sides attacking the institutional status quo identified with the clerical system, from which Pope Francis distanced himself at the beginning of his pontificate.[1]

On one side, the liberal-progressive, Vatican II narrative calls for the empowerment of the laity and women, decentralization, collegiality and synodality, dialogue and ecumenism, and inclusiveness. On the other side, the counter-reform or the "reform of the reform" narrative points to the dramatic shortage of priests and of vocations in religious orders, to loss of "identity" in Catholic schools, the rise of the "nones" and so forth—all supposedly the fault of a so-called "Catholic lite" that was allegedly the result of the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar period. The tensions that marked the preparation and the celebration of the Bishops' Synod for the Amazon region of October 2019, but also the reception of pope Francis' post-synodal exhortation *Querida Amazonia* (published on February 12, 2020), are one more evidence of this particular Catholic moment.

One reason for this situation is the widening gap between the theology of reform elaborated at the time of Vatican II and certain characteristics of the post-conciliar Church—for the post-conciliar period of the twenty-first century. There is no question that the notion of "Church reform" is one of the key elements to understanding the pontificate of Pope Francis. Antonio Spadaro SJ, and Carlos Maria Galli have edited a large volume of essays that deal with this theme and provide a roadmap for reforms that see in the Franciscan era a precious window of opportunity.[2] But at the same time the idea of "reform" is also one of the theological ideas that has gone through significant transformations since Vatican II.

The most important theological contribution on Church reform in our times came in the period immediately before and after the council from

[1] See F. Ceragioli, "'Il clericalismo è una peste nella Chiesa'. Riflessioni a partire dalla *Evangelii gaudium* e dal magistero complessivo di papa Francesco", *Archivio Teologico Torinese* 24, no. 1 (2018): 147–162; J. Hanvey, "'Sradicare la cultura dell'abuso'. La Lettera di papa Francesco al Popolo di Dio", *Civiltà Cattolica (La)* 169, no. 4 (2018): 271–278.

[2] See *For a Missionary Reform of the Church. The Civiltà Cattolica Seminar*, eds. Antonio Spadaro, SJ, and Carlos Maria Galli. Foreword by Massimo Faggioli (New York/Mahwah NJ: Paulist Press, 2017).

CHAPTER 6

Sisterhood of the Earth: An Emergence of an Ecological Civilization and an Ecozoic Era

Elaine Padilla

The church is not only of the Spirit but also a church of dust. When speaking of its *dustiness*, a commonly held theological understanding is the church as sacrament in the world. This means that an aspect of the nature of the church is to be a sign of the divine presence manifested, though not exclusively, as an audible event of a new creation in the world that is socially and historically palpable.[1] The church as sacrament renders the Logos-Sophia audibly present and the graces of the Spirit-Sophia efficacious through a dialog between word, breath, and world. This trinitarian message can be compared to a tree.[2] The sophianic voice as mother, sister,

[1] See Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations* (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1966), vol. 4, 253–281.

[2] Tertullian, "Against Praxeas," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. III, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 602–603. For a sophianic trinitarian model, see also Elizabeth Johnson, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Religious*

E. Padilla (✉)
Religion and Philosophy, College of Arts and Sciences, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_6

and friend prophetically calls out the church (*ekklesia*) through the roots, the shoots, and the fruit of the earth. If so, what would be the trinitarian cry at the street corners as deforestation, pollution, ecocide, and natural scarcity increase?

So in order for the church to further embody its sacramentality, it would need to change its theological orientation toward the world, particularly by adopting an *organic* mission. Transformation of the church can start by uprooting itself from its androcentricism, reflected in esoteric liturgies and anthropocentric orthopraxes. The church can then ground itself in its earthen soil by listening to the wisdom of the Logos-Sophia and the visceral groanings of the Spirit-Sophia that softly utter the unintelligible words of the other-than-humans (Rom. 8: 22–27). Could their strange tongues be signifying the need for a more *universe*-ally oriented sacramentality?

This humble invitation, if accepted, can provoke a change toward a mission in which liturgy and civil engagements can prophetically embody an eschatological vision of planetary fruitfulness. This type of response is exemplified through communities of Catholic sisters that, for a lack of a better term, have been called "green sisters."[3] Through their eyes, one can look at the church of the twenty-first century with hope for a new earth flourishing in the now (Rev. 21). Upon briefly describing the sacramentality of the church and a development toward an organic ecclesiology, this chapter listens to the message of two green sisters: Sister Gail Worcelo of the Green Mountain Monastery in Greensboro, Vermont, and Sister Dolores Mitch of the Maryknoll Sisters in Monrovia, California.[4] With their wisdom-call in mind, this chapter argues for an ecological mission,

Discourse (New York: A Crossroad Publishing Company, 2001) and Sallie McFague, *Models of God: Theology for an Ecological and Nuclear Earth* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

[3] See Sarah McFarland Taylor, *Green Sisters: A Spiritual Ecology* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2009) and John E. Carroll, *Sustainability and Spirituality* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004).

[4] For information on the Green Mountain Monastery and the community of the Maryknoll Sisters, visit their websites at: http://www.greenmountainmonastery.org and https://www.maryknollsisters.org (accessed February 23, 2020). I want to thank Eugene Shirley, president and CEO of Pando Populus, for his support on making possible the interview with the Maryknoll Sisters. Pando Populus is a nonprofit producer of initiatives and events in the Los Angeles County that aims at fast-tracking the region toward a more ecologically balanced way of life—what Pope Francis calls "integral ecology" and Pando's founding chair John Cobb describes as "ecological civilization." To know more about Pando Populus, visit its website at: https://pandopopulus.com (accessed February 23, 2020).

CHAPTER 7

Developing a Virtue of Eating Well: *Laudato Sí* and Animal Economies

Matthew Eaton

In *Laudato Sí*, Pope Francis calls Catholics and all people of good-will "to move forward in a bold cultural revolution," embodying a "revolution of tenderness" that rejects sovereign powers that perpetrate ecological violence and animal cruelty.[1] The principal powers to resist in this context are the rapacious capitalist industries that annihilate and consume the more-than-human in order to maximize profit. Yet, while Francis recognizes the sinfulness of capitalist greed and condemns anthropogenic ecological and animal violence, the concrete nature of ecologically violent economies and paths toward revolution receive little attention. Francis' revolutionary ethic concerning the more-than-human must be pushed further. Insofar as modern food economies exist via unsustainable and unnecessarily cruel production methods, I argue that responsibility exists to resist and withdraw from such systems insofar as possible, re-imagining what it means to

[1] Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, May 24, 2015), 114 (hereafter LS); *Evangelii Gaudium* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, November 24, 2013), 88.

M. Eaton (✉)
King's College, Wilkes-Barre, PA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_7

"eat well" as a path toward a revolution in global food economies.[2] To eat well necessarily entails a willingness to sacrifice animal sacrifice, which begins to take shape—at least in a Catholic setting—through the re-imagination and re-integration of ascetic, virtuous fasting driven by justice for Earth and our more-than-human neighbors.

Laudato Sí and Animal Economies

Laudato Sí is clear that the more-than-human is inherently valuable, though this assertion remains anthropocentric.[3] In a discussion of animal experimentation and genetic modification, Francis insists "that experimentation on animals is morally acceptable only 'if it remains within reasonable limits [and] contributes to caring for or saving human lives' [106]. The *Catechism* firmly states that human power has limits and that 'it is contrary to human dignity to cause animals to suffer or die needlessly.'"[4] The instrumentalization of animals is thus not condemned if it serves human interests, but neither is it blindly embraced as this would violate human dignity. While this passage ignores the will of the animal—human dignity is at stake here—it does not ignore creaturely value absolutely.[5] Other passages, however, assert the inherent value of non-humans beyond a reductionist humanism. Inherent value is extended to creatures when Frances demands that we not consider any "species merely as potential 'resources' to be exploited, while overlooking the fact that they have value

[2] Jacques Derrida, "'Eating Well,' or the Calculation of the Subject: An interview with Jacques Derrida," in *Who Comes After the Subject?*, edited by E. Cadava, P. Connor and Jean-Luc Nancy (New York: Routledge, 1991), 96–119.

[3] The encyclical asserts—in a section decrying anthropocentrism no less—that "Christian thought sees human beings as possessing a particular dignity above other creatures." LS, 115. A recognition that non-humans have value in the face of a human species that is fundamentally more dignified does not escape metaphysical anthropocentrism as the encyclical would like to claim.

[4] LS, 130.

[5] The will of the animal as the basis for ethics is drawn from Arthur Schopenhauer. See S. Puryear, "Schopenhauer on the Rights of Animals," *European Journal of Philosophy* 25, no. 2 (2017): 250–269; R. Gunderson, "Animal Epistemology and Ethics in Schopenhauerian Metaphysics," *Environmental Ethics* 35, no. 3 (2013): 349–361. Gerard Mannion is one Catholic theologian who recognized the possibility of making such a connection between Schopenhauer and theology. See Gerard Mannion, *Schopenhauer, Religion, and Morality: The Humble Path to Ethics* (London: Routledge, 2017).

CHAPTER 8

Noli Me Tángere: A Church for the Oppressed—Putting the Abused and Vulnerable at the Forefront of Ecclesial Activity and Change

Cristina Lledo Gomez

After decades of silence, across the globe, the voices of generations of people abused as children by Roman Catholic priests and religious are finally being formally recognized at the highest level, through Royal Commissions, grand jury investigations, and by Catholic institutions themselves.[1] While Catholic priests and religious are not the main

[1] See, for example, Tom Jackman, Michelle Boorstein, and Julie Zauzmer, "The Pennsylvania report on clergy sex abuse spawned a wave of probes nationwide. Now what?", *Washington Post,* November 22, 2018, at https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/the-pennsylvania-report-on-clergy-sex-abuse-spawned-investigations-nationwide-now-what/2018/11/22/101dcce8-e467-11e8-8f5f-a55347f48762_story.html?utm_term=.8d7a3cb7777f (accessed February 15, 2020).

C. L. Gomez (✉)
BBI-The Australian Institute of Theological Education, Pennant Hills, NSW, Australia

Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, NSW, Australia

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_8

perpetrators of child abuse (in fact, studies show perpetrators are often anyone well-known to the child, particularly family and family friends),[2] the Church's participation in abuse and/or cover-ups continues to be of high interest to the media and the public, especially in more recent times with the revelations of abuse of nuns by priests and bishops, which Pope Francis has admitted to be true.[3]

In response, the focus of churches has mainly been toward reparative and preventive strategies against the abuse of children. Yet this chapter suggests a broader and more effective approach, that is, an ecclesial focus not only denouncing sexual and physical violence but all forms of violence: psychological, emotional, financial, intellectual, and spiritual, in addition to sexual and physical. Moreover, churches can show real commitment to change by denouncing all forms of oppression, not only against violence but also other forms of oppression, inside and outside of themselves. According to Iris Marion Young's classic five faces of oppression (first published in 1990), the other main forms of oppression are exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, and cultural imperialism.[4] With these differing ways in which people can be abused, intentional care by the church could thus be extended beyond those abused by clergy and religious to all survivors of violence, at-risk persons, and those experiencing multiple forms of oppression.[5] Persons who fall into these categories could include children, domestic violence survivors, people from the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex, or Questioning (LGBTIQ+) community,

[2] "Offenders" in Clayton A. Hartjen and S. Priyadarsini, *The Global Victimization of Children: Problems and Solutions* (New York: Springer, 2012), 198–201. At https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.csu.edu.au/lib/csuau/detail.action?docID=884379 (accessed February 15, 2020). See also, Darkness to Light nonprofit organization, *Child Sexual Abuse Statistics: Perpetrators*, at d2l.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Statistics_2_Perpetrators.pdf (accessed February 15, 2020).

[3] BBC News, *Pope admits clerical abuse of nuns including sexual slavery*, February 6, 2019 at https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-47134033 (accessed February 15, 2020).

[4] Iris Marion Young, "The Five Face of Oppression" in *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011), 39–65.

[5] For a definition of adults at risk, see for example Australian Law Reform Commission, *§14.3 Safeguarding Adults at Risk,* at https://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/risk-adults (accessed February 15, 2020). For a list of indicators of adult abuse, see, for example, Social Care Institute for Excellence, *Protecting Adults at Risk: Good Practice Guide* (2012), at https://www.scie.org.uk/publications/adultsafeguardinglondon/files/sections/recognition-and-indicators-of-adult-abuse.pdf (accessed February 15, 2020).

CHAPTER 9

The Essence of Faith: Prayer as Ritual and Struggle

Mary McClintock Fulkerson

If we were to define prayer, there would probably be a lot of versions. Of course, the first example of prayer that might come to mind would be "The Lord's Prayer," a prayer attributed to Jesus. But Jesus did not offer a definition, just what became a classic example. A rather brief account of prayer and one with deep potential comes from Greg Scheer, who attributes this definition to his pastor: prayer is "the essence of our faith in ritual form."[1] This is to say that Christian faith, the redemptive experience that signifies human beings' connection to God, is lived out in many ways, but definitely through praying.

Prayer has been seen as relational—a fundamental connecting with God—throughout history. Johann Arndt, an evangelical mystic, says "without prayer we cannot find God; prayer is the means by which we seek and find Him." Nineteenth-century theologian, Friedrich Schleiermacher wrote: "To be religious and to pray–that is really one and the same thing."

[1] These historic quotes are all from Greg Sheer, *Essential Worship: A Handbook for Leaders* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2016) p. 24.

M. M. Fulkerson (✉)
Duke University Divinity School, Hillsborough, NC, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_9

As one contemporary scholar puts it, "there can be no doubt at all that prayer is the heart and centre of all religion."[2]

Of course, prayer is not the only form of lived faith, so it helps to also categorize it with the genre of "ritual,"[3] as Sheer points out, namely, in religious practices that are repeated. To be a "*ritual* form" of the "essence of our faith" means that prayer is a *repeated* way to experience and display faith. Thus prayer is not a random, made-up practice, but a somewhat regularized one insofar as its origin and telos is the God of faith. While the centrality of prayer in human life is clear in all these definitions, the potential for diversity is implicit in the definitions, as well. This essay will explore an unusual site of prayer, a homeless shelter, to recognize realities of faith that might help change the church.

These definitions of prayer suggest that there is an importance to prayer that may not always be recognized. To get at its importance, let us first consider some of its limits. Prayer can be significant, as we will discuss, but it can also be limiting. When ritual prayer occurs in church, it can sometimes feel like repetition, as everyone is expected to repeat "The Lord's Prayer" at a particular time in the service, and to be quiet during a number of events, and to sing the correct hymns at the proper time. The feeling may simply be the need to say prayers "correctly" and keep up with the voices of the rest of the congregation. The dominance of "traditional" forms of worship may well restrict openness to new modes of experiencing and communicating faith. The continued use of the image of God as "Father" in the Lord's Prayer, for example, can be problematic for some because of its potential to reaffirm patriarchal religion. Sometimes required, repetitive performances may have little to do with experiencing some deep and disclosive *new insights* into God's contemporary presence, sometimes mediated by new images for God.[4]

Given the limitations of some of the practices of prayer in standard worship, its intended significance is seen when we recognize, as indicated,

[2] Friedrich Heiler offers a fascinating account of the many versions of "Prayer as the Central Phenomenon of Religion," as his Introduction puts it. Friedrich Heiler, *Prayer: A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion* (1932) Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1997, xiii–xxviii, xv.

[3] Ritual is "a formal ceremony or series of acts that is always performed in the same way." Online Definition of Ritual by Merriam-Webster.

[4] The obvious alternative would be God as Mother.

CHAPTER 10

The Holy Spirit Makes the Church: Changing the Church as a Responsive Act

Scott MacDougall

If it is true that church is *semper reformanda*, and surely it is beyond doubt that it is, then the fact that church is a form of Christian community that is always changing must be assumed as a given.[1] What may be more contentious, however, is identifying the agent to whom that change is due. For numerous reasons, change in churches, even when rightly understood as the result of historically contingent events and processes, has often been ascribed to human agency, either implicitly or explicitly. This has sometimes, for example, been on account of scriptural passages such as the Great Commission to go and "make disciples of all the nations" that

[1] I refer to *church* and *churches* rather than *the church* in order to mark what I take to be an important theological distinction between *church* as a name for the analytical category denoting Christian community, *churches* as the set of actual particular forms of Christian communities that exist or have existed, and *the church*, which denotes an abstraction, a universal Christian body that has never existed. In addition, I do not follow the common convention of capitalizing this last concept of *church* because capitalizing it imbues that non-existent and idealized abstraction with an improper, often triumphalist, power that an eschatological outlook on Christian community, as outlined here, helps to correct.

S. MacDougall (✉)
Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, CA, USA

Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_10

the Jesus of Matthew's gospel issues to his apostles (Matt. 28:19) or of the long and (to say the least) ambivalent history of Christian missions stemming from a deep-seated impulse to do precisely that. At other times, it has been fostered by a general tendency to seek ecclesial influence on the social, political, and economic structures of the societies where Christianity has flourished. In each case, talk of the Christian requirement to "build" or "grow" churches, rhetoric that is common at all ecclesial levels, reinforces an imagination of ecclesial change as driven by human action, even if the underlying theology might seek to avoid leaving that misimpression.

Certainly, human beings are actively involved in changing churches, and massively so. To the extent that churches exist precisely as collectivities of human beings, churches change only when and as the people who compose them undergo change of some kind. There is a real and important sense in which we have to say that Christian discipleship requires people to take responsibility for the work required to "build" churches and to demonstrate the wisdom and care needed to "grow" them. Nevertheless, uncareful language about ecclesial change and development featuring ideas that implicitly or explicitly reflect or give rise to an ecclesiological imagination with a starting point rooted in anthropology rather than in pneumatology claims more human causal agency in that sphere than is theologically warranted. People compose churches, but it is the Holy Spirit who makes them.[2] I argue in this brief essay that if, during the course of participating in processes of ecclesial change, we forget that it is ultimately God, not people, who builds, grows, and changes churches, we inappropriately replace divine agency with human agency, thereby profoundly misunderstanding the nature and character of Christian community, which, in turn, impairs the formation and practice of church.

[2] Here and in the title, I am obviously playing on Henri de Lubac's famous dictum that "the eucharist makes the church," but I am also playing on Paul McPartlan's *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1993), for reasons that, I hope to show, Zizioulas himself might approve.

CHAPTER 11

Making the Spiritual World Accessible: Paul VI and Modern Art at the Close of Vatican II

Susie Paulik Babka

In 1932, on the occasion of opening the Vatican Picture Gallery, Pope Pius XI condemned modern art as "unfitting for service in the church because it reverts to the crude forms of the darkest ages."[1] Such a statement reflected the authority of the sixteenth-century Counter-Reformation that tried to secure control over a visually "correct" performance of Catholic teaching in the art objects in church buildings. By the nineteenth century, in what is called "Academicism," religious images had degenerated into a naïve institutionalism and sanitized illustrations for devotional purposes. Academicism meant "art" under clerical control, much like the Neo-Scholastic textbook-style theology that defined the era. Meanwhile, the Impressionist movement in painting sought the regard of nature as sacred in its wildness, pressing these Catholic boundaries, especially in France. But the more widespread modernist movements in art became, the more the clerical Church remained obdurate.

We all are aware of the magnitude of significance regarding Vatican II's engagement with the modern world. But few of us are aware of the

[1] Pius XI, Address, October 27, 1932, *Acta Apostolica Sedis* 24 (1932): 335.

S. P. Babka (✉)
University of San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_11

aesthetic and artistic dimensions of these reforms. Pope Paul VI was that rare cleric who declared the modern artist "a prophet and a poet of today's man, his mentality and modern society [… modern art] shows us that religious values were freely and suitably expressed, we are happy and full of hope."[2] This hope, from one known for his pessimism, reveals a side of Paul VI rarely seen. This chapter explores the significance of modern art as a challenge to authoritarianism, in that hope that art in the Catholic Church will one day no longer be a mere reflection of clerical authority, but rather an expression that serves the incomprehensible God.

What Is "Modern Art"?

In order to understand why the encounter between the Church and Modernism can be framed through its relationship with modern art, it is important to have a sense of what is meant by "modern art." Modern art in popular discourse is largely misunderstood, usually treated as what "my kid could do"—requiring no artistic skill because the appeal to abstraction avoids "reality" and perhaps anything pleasing on the canvas—as well as political messages or disturbing sexuality and an apparent hostility to beauty and technique. The lack of easily accessible interpretation and the disconcerting appearance of much of modern art contribute to this popular sense that "art" of the twentieth century and beyond is an elitist enterprise, perhaps even a fraud.[3]

The term "modern" itself comes from the Latin *modo*, meaning "just now." In 1127, Abbot Suger began reconstruction on the abbey basilica of St-Denis near Paris. His architectural ideas resulted in something never seen before, a "new look" neither classically Greek, nor Roman, and so he termed it an *opus modernum*, "a modern work." Italian theorists in the late Renaissance called it "Gothic," initially as an insult, referring to anything after the fall of Rome, anything that resisted classical style, as crude and "barbaric." The term "modernity," on the other hand, refers to the

[2] *L'Osservatore Romano* (June 24, 1973): 1–2.

[3] Cynthia Freeman, in: *But is it Art? An Introduction to Art Theory*, writes, "Art's language isn't literal […]. You understand its meaning because of your knowledge, and art requires knowledge of context and culture […]. A good interpretation must be grounded in reasons and evidence, and should provide a rich, complex, and illuminating way to comprehend a work of art. Sometimes an interpretation can transform an experience of art from repugnance to appreciation and understanding," (Oxford University Press, 2001): 150.

CHAPTER 12

Women Changing the Church: The Experience of the Council for Australian Catholic Women 2000–2019

Patricia Madigan O.P.

It is no accident, but one of the "signs of the times," that two important ecclesial events which occurred at the end of 2019—a three-week Special Assembly of the Synod of Bishops for the Pan-Amazonian Region which concluded in Rome on the 27 October, and a two-year dialogue on Church life in Germany begun on 1 December by the president of the German Catholic Bishops' Conference and the vice-president of the Central Committee of German Catholics (ZdK)—listed the presence and participation of women in the Church high on their agenda. The Australian church too has experienced its own ecclesial process of listening to women and attempting to strengthen the participation of women through a series of decisions and events which began in the 1970s and will feed into the Plenary Council planned for 2020–2021.

P. Madigan O.P. (✉)
Dominican Sisters, Centre for Interfaith Ministry, Education and Research, Sydney, NSW, Australia

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_12

Women in the Church: The Australian Experience

After the publication of the annual Social Justice Sunday Statement, *Towards a More Whole Church*, by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in 1977 which addressed a range of gender issues in the Church, the Bishops received many responses from which it was clear that issues concerning the role and status of women were a high priority community social justice concern.[1]

Discussion continued for many years until, in 1993, the bishops agreed to look at the possibility of a national survey on the participation of women in the Catholic Church in Australia to be conducted at diocesan level and coordinated nationally. These discussions eventually became fruitful through the hard work and persistence of women such as Sr Anne Lane PBVM, Ms Bernice Moore, and Sr Margaret Hinchey RSM from the Sub-Committee on Women's Issues, Catholic Coalition for Justice and Peace (CCJP), and Ms. Sandie Cornish from the Secretariat of the Bishops' Commission for Justice, Peace, and Development (BCJDP). Some key men at this stage were Bishop William Brennan, Chair of the Australian Catholic Social Justice Council (ASCJC), and Dr Michael Costigan from the BCJDP Secretariat who was also instrumental in enlisting the research expertise of Professor Peter Drake, the first vice-chancellor of the newly formed Australian Catholic University (ACU).[2]

At the same time as a deluge of pronouncements, letters, and statements attempting to reinforce the limitations placed on women in the Church issued from Vatican in the 1990s,[3] the BCJDP wanted to respond to the call by women to be taken more seriously in the Church and to be more fully involved in a variety of aspects of its life, although it recognized that any response would need to be set squarely in the context of the recent church teaching on the Ordination of Women and its disciplinary consequences.

[1] Research Management Group (RMG), *Woman and Man: One in Christ Jesus: Report on the Participation of Women in the Catholic Church in Australia* (Sydney: HarperCollinsReligious, 1999), 1–2 https://women.catholic.org.au/treasures/woman-and-man (accessed February 17, 2020).

[2] Ibid., 2–3.

[3] These included Pope John Paul II's apostolic letter on priestly ordination and women, *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (1994), his 1995 Holy Thursday letter to priests, his Letter to Women (29 June 1995), his remarks on women in the Church on 3 September 1995, and a response by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith concerning the Inadmissibility of Women to Ministerial Priesthood (30 November 1995). Ibid., xi, 5.

CHAPTER 13

The Unity of the Church and Birth Control in an Age of Polarization

Dennis M. Doyle

Catholics have historically maintained a special concern for church unity. Unity is not uniformity, but it does call for people to be bonded together amid differences. Yet we live now in an age of polarization. Polarization has changed the ways in which people relate with each other. I will argue that the present situation calls for all of us to prioritize making changes within ourselves and in how we relate to each other.

In a recent book, Ezra Klein draws upon a wealth of social scientific studies to document the significantly increased polarization in contemporary US society and politics.[1] He shows how in the 1950s strong differences regarding political policy were spread out *within* the two major political parties. Very gradually over many decades even stronger differences have emerged *between* the parties as American voters have sorted themselves out into two distinct political groups. Ideological differences have given way to identitarian differences.[2] For many people in the US today, being a Republican or a Democrat forms not just one element

[1] Ezra Klein, *Why We're Polarized* (New York: Avid Reader Press, 2020).
[2] Ibid., 232.

D. M. Doyle (✉)
University of Dayton, Dayton, OH, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_13

among others of their identity but rather functions as the very basis of it. Klein demonstrates how polarization, in contrast with a healthy diversity, fosters hatred of the other as a core motivation, at times deeper than the ideals one champions. An individual's vote is determined in many cases more by what one is voting against than by what one is voting for. The highest value is placed upon the victory of your side.

Klein draws upon many studies to explain that all human beings are significantly influenced by psychological, social, and other demographic factors in what they accept as knowledge and truth. We are all susceptible to "confirmation bias" and "identity-protection cognition."[3] That such influence exists is nothing new. Klein writes: "What is changing is not our psychologies. What is changing is how closely our psychologies map onto our politics and onto a host of other life choices."[4]

A striking example of the polarization that currently plagues the Catholic Church can be found in two opposing statements, both issued in September 2016, concerning artificial contraception, one by the progressive Wijngaards Institute for Catholic Research, an international group based in the UK, and the other by an ad hoc conservative, international group of Catholic scholars based in Washington, D.C. The Wijngaards Statement was issued at a conference held at the United Nations.[5] The conservative response (hereinafter Response) was released at a news conference at the Catholic University of America.[6]

The authors of the Wijngaards Statement lay out nineteen major points including several sub-points. They claim the main argument underlying the official Catholic ban on artificial contraception is anchored in the belief that every act of intercourse includes procreation as a dimension of

[3] Ibid., 96.

[4] Ibid., 46.

[5] "Academic Report on the Ethical Use of Contraceptives," (previously issued as drafts with various titles). Wijngaards Institute for Catholic Research, posted October 2016, https://www.wijngaardsinstitute.com/statement-on-contraceptives/ (accessed February 11, 2020); see also Jamie Manson, "Catholic Church's Total Ban on Contraception Challenged by Scholars," *National Catholic Reporter,* 21 September 2016, https://www.ncronline.org/blogs/grace-margins/catholic-churchs-total-ban-contraception-challenged-scholars (accessed February 11, 2020).

[6] "Affirmation of the Church's Teaching on the Gift of Sexuality," signed by many Catholic scholars, 21 September 2016, https://trs.catholic.edu/humanae-vitae/index.html (accessed February 11, 2020). See also Carol Zimmermann, "Scholars Reaffirm Catholic Teaching against Artificial Birth Control," *Catholic News Service,* 21 September 2016.

CHAPTER 14

The World Mission of the Christian Church

Roger Haight S.J.

This chapter proposes a theological conception of the mission of the church in the world as we know it today. Important factors have arisen since the mid-twentieth century and changed our thinking. One can list factors in a revolution in Christian consciousness: a new historical and pluralist consciousness that gave rise to the World Council of Churches; a new awareness and positive appreciation of other religions brought on by human mobility, urbanization, and development; a new planetary consciousness of common human solidarity in responsibility for the world; a new evolutionary consciousness and sense of need for a definition of the purpose of the church within history.

These developments have given rise to a new context of our thinking about the world mission of the Christian church and the churches in their contexts. I will turn to the concept of reconciliation as a possible symbol for gathering new thoughts about the mission of the church in history. I do not examine the eschatological role of the church and I leave to the reader to contrast this theology with earlier views. In the mode of an

R. Haight S.J. (✉)
Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_14

outline, what follows will display a bare logic as a stimulus for reconceiving the mission of the church in our contemporary world.

The Origin of the Church

The church gradually emerged out of a Jewish "sectarian" Jesus movement and eventually won its identity as an autonomous religious entity distinct from Judaism.[1] The appropriation of this protracted historical development has been uneasy on both sides: Jews have dropped Jesus as one of their prophets; Christians have neglected Jesus' Judaism and made him a Christian. One thing that all Christians share in common is Jesus of Nazareth interpreted as the Christ. The most basic institution of the church is the Bible because it keeps present to the whole church the closest historical witness to the origin and source of the church.

Ecclesiology as Primarily a Historical Discipline

Systematic treatments of the church must be rooted in historical circumstances. Every institutional form has to be understood in a historical context; evolutionary principles and historical study show that absolute unchanging ecclesiological polities are not possible; if they do not change, they do not last. An evolutionary and historical consciousness prevents a conception of God planning or designing a socio-political form of the church. Historical institutions always emerge out of previous history and are always shifting under the impact of historical forces. Therefore, church institutions are not meant to remain materially identical across history but to preserve the continuity of Christian faith.[2] This idea functions like a meta-principle that calls for elements in the church that provide it with the flexibility to change in order to keep itself in existence and true to its sources.

[1] Is it imaginable that what came to be called Christianity could have remained within the boundaries of Judaism as other movements had? Such purely hypothetical questions often generate discussion that leads to deeper understanding of the historicity of the church.

[2] The word "materially" is inserted in this sentence to note that a formal office may retain the same function (for example, each congregation has a "leader") while the concrete mode of choosing and exercising such a ministry may vary considerably over time or among churches.

CHAPTER 15

Conversion and Change Through the Processes of Mission and Christianization

Paul M. Collins

Change has been part of the reality of the Church since its beginning. Major changes happened as a result of activities which are usually referred to as evangelization or Christianization. Evangelization on the whole is seen as an activity intended by the institution of the Church, while Christianization may be seen as a more piecemeal incorporation of new members within the fold of the Church.[1] Either produces change in practice and belief. Sometimes the institution has actively initiated such change; often change has been recognized reluctantly; and on occasion change happens despite the institution. When change occurs, it begs the question of how far the reality of the Church after change continues to resemble the Church before it happened.

I have chosen three instances which illustrate these processes and the changes which they bring. The first example concerns the admission of the Gentiles into the Church during the first century. The second example

[1] See: Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400–1050* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 3–5, 25.

P. M. Collins (✉)
Church of England, Bournemouth, UK

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_15

concerns the results of the Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons in seventh century England. The final example concerns the outcomes of intentional mission in the present-day Church of England.

Conversion of the Gentiles

It is generally agreed that Jewish expectations for the last days at the time of Jesus and the Apostolic Church included the potential inclusion of the Gentiles in a general salvation which the Jews would bestow upon the world at its end.[2] Such inclusion was premised on Gentile acceptance of the Torah.[3] It seems that the Apostolic Church shared this expectation and understood its mission in the light of this calling to include the Gentiles in God's salvation.[4] However, it is clear from the *Acts of the Apostles* and the letters of St Paul that the process of including the Gentiles was far from straightforward.[5] The incorporation of non-Jews into the Church as a result of both Apostolic mission and broader processes of Christianization raised questions about the character of the body of people who sought to be disciples of Jesus of Nazareth following his death and resurrection. Was that character to be faithful to Jewish customs and laws? Or would it deviate from that inheritance? The Letters of St Paul indicate that despite Apostolic sanction of abandoning the rituals of the Torah, many remained convinced that the character of the disciples of Jesus should remain thoroughly rooted in a Jewish heritage.[6] Divergent beliefs and practices seem to have persisted well into the first century.[7] Gradually Paul's practice became the norm for the Church. This produced theological as well as practical change. The Church embraced Gentile converts by abandoning the practices of the Jews such as male circumcision and the food laws. This meant that it was much easier for Gentiles to become adherents of the new faith.[8] But a potentially dire consequence was that abandoning the ritual law might also mean abandoning the

[2] E.g., Isaiah 2.2–3; Isaiah 11.9–12; Micah 4.1–2.

[3] E.g., Isaiah 56.2–8; and E.P. Sanders, *Paul: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 48, 52, 137–149.

[4] E.g., Galatians 3.8, 14; Romans 15.7–12.

[5] E.g., Acts 15. 1–5; Galatians 2.12; Ephesians 2.11; Colossians 4.11.

[6] Galatians 2.11–14; 1 Thessalonians 2.14–16.

[7] E.g., Titus 1.10.

[8] The practice of circumcision was abhorrent to Greeks and Romans.

CHAPTER 16

Mission as Reception: Reframing Evangelism in the Church of England

Martyn Percy

A few years ago, developmental life of the Church of England crossed an unmarked line. Until recently, the best-selling Report ever produced by the Church of England had been *Faith in the City*.[1] Published in 1985, it engaged seriously with the decay and despair of our inner-city communities. It changed, amongst other things, how the church shaped the training of clergy. It shone a very public spotlight on our Urban Priority Areas (UPA's). It championed the poor. And for focusing on UPA's, the Report earned the opprobrium and scorn of the Tory right-wing press. However, the more serious edge to the Report, and often missed, was that it marked out a particularly distinctive mode of theological reflection. *Faith in the City* represented a kind of theology rooted in the Kingdom of God. One that put the people and the places they lived in before the needs and concerns of the church.

[1] *Faith in the City: The Archbishop of Canterbury's Report on Urban Priority Areas* (London: Church House Publishing, 1985).

M. Percy (✉)
Christ Church, Oxford, UK

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_16

The moment of *Faith in the City,* being the Church of England's best-selling Report, has, however, passed. The biggest-selling Church of England Report is now *Mission-Shaped Church*.[2] For the uninitiated, this showcases forms of congregational life that appeal to homogenous groups and that are largely Evangelical and evangelistic in character, appealing as they do to specific, identifiable, and narrow interest groups (e.g., certain kinds of youth culture, etc.). These new emerging genres of church are usually apolitical in outlook and often tend to be socially, politically, and theologically conservative, as Robert Bellah has observed.[3]

Thus, new forms of "Fresh Expression" promoted by the Church of England are normally careful to avoid anything that could be construed as theologically, politically, or socially divisive. At the same time, these groups inhabit a social and theological construction of reality in which they believe themselves to be risk-takers and edgy. But they are usually anything but this. So, for example, we rarely learn of "Fresh Expressions" for the LGBTQ+ constituency. We rarely find any "Fresh Expressions" that focus on disabilities. Or, for that matter, on serious forms of exclusion from the mainstream of our society. (That "Fresh Expression" for Asylum Seekers would be an interesting kind of ecclesial gathering).

Much of this direction in mission is driven by a reactive response to what appears to be a crisis in evangelism, and it has produced a more intense form of ecclesial polity focused on recruitment and membership as a means of stemming declines in attendance and encouraging numerical growth. The impetus for this began in earnest with Decade of Evangelism. There was little discontent and much optimism when the 1988 Conference passed a resolution approving a Decade of Evangelism. Each Province of the Communion was to develop plans for evangelism that led up the millennium. Most did, including the Church of England.[4]

But the question this poses is profound: is Anglicanism, at least in its English form, a support-based institution, or a member-based organization? Any investment in an overly narrow specifications of membership will have profound consequences for the identity and organizational shape of Anglican ecclesiology, including performative-liturgical arenas such as

[2] G. Cray et al., *Mission-Shaped Church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004).

[3] R. Bellah, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996 – New Edition).

[4] For a critique, see M. Percy, 'Being Honest in the Church' in *Being Honest to God* edited by Adrian Alker (Sheffield: St. Mark's CRC Press, 2013), 41–51.

CHAPTER 17

The "Refugee Crisis" as an Opportunity for Missionary and Pastoral Conversion

Gioacchino Campese

The pastoral constitution of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) *Gaudium et spes* assigned to the Roman Catholic church an essential, urgent and ongoing task: "the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel".[1] There is no doubt today that human mobility is one of those signs that begs and needs to be read from a truly Gospel perspective by all Christian churches. While the regularly mutating phenomena of migration have been a constant of human history since its beginning, it is also clear that, especially in the last decades, they have acquired for different reasons a global political preeminence.[2] The "refugee crisis" in Europe is a significant example of

[1] Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes* 4 (December 7, 1965), http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html (accessed February 11, 2020).

[2] The contemporary classic of migration studies, Stephen Castles et al., *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 6th ed. (London: Red Globe Press, 2020), 10, states that since World War II the "politicization and securitization of migration" is one of the main trends and patterns of global migration.

G. Campese (✉)
Scalabrini International Migration Institute, Pontificia Università Urbaniana, Rome, Italy

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_17

how most recent flows of people have influenced the social, cultural and political climate of the continent, often creating controversy and division, but also movements of solidarity and inclusion both within societies and religious communities.

This chapter will claim that, despite its ambiguity and messiness, the "refugee crisis", as a sign of the present times, represents a providential opportunity to become aware of and to further that "pastoral and missionary conversion" called for by Pope Francis in his programmatic document, the Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (The Joy of the Gospel),[3] which is so sorely needed by all Christian churches. The Argentine pope will be the main conversation partner in this reflection for, among others, two main reasons: firstly, because through his evangelical and straightforward understanding of the meaning of the church's mission he is becoming the catalyst of what has been rightly defined by Gerard Mannion as an "ecclesiological revolution" in the making[4]; secondly, one of the consequences of his missiological and ecclesiological vision is, unsurprisingly, his special attention and sensitivity toward the vulnerable people living in the "peripheries" (EG 20), among whom migrants and refugees stand out. It is only appropriate to underline that Pope Francis' ministry with migrants and refugees does not consist only of numerous public remarks and teachings on this issue,[5] but also includes his passionate personal involvement comprising countless personal visits, meetings and concrete acts of accompaniment and material support toward vulnerable people on the move.[6]

[3] Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium* (November 24, 2013), http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html. (accessed February 11, 2020). Hereafter EG.

[4] Gerard Mannion, "Francis' Ecclesiological Revolution. A New Way of Being Church a New Way of Being Pope," in *Pope Francis and the Future of Catholicism. Evangelii Gaudium and the Papal Agenda*, edited by Gerard Mannion (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 93–122.

[5] The texts by Pope Francis on this subject since the beginning of his papacy in 2013 to the end of 2019 have been collected, made available online and are constantly updated by the Migrants and Refugees Section of the Vatican under the title *Lights on the Ways of Hope*. See https://migrants-refugees.va/resource-center/collection/ (accessed February 11, 2020).

[6] Here we will simply mention Francis' visits to some highly symbolic peripheries of the world indissolubly connected to migrants and refugees such as Lampedusa, Italy (July 8, 2013); Ciudad Juárez, Messico (February 18, 2016); Lesvos, Greece (April 16, 2016) with the Orthodox Patriarch Bartholomew I and the Orthodox Archbishop of Athens Ieronymos.

CHAPTER 18

Blessed Pierre Claverie: Holiness in a World Church

Darren J. Dias

On December 8, 2018, Pierre Claverie and 18 martyred companions were beatified in an open-air liturgy in the brilliant afternoon sun in the coastal city of Oran, Algeria. Claverie was the last of 19 Christians murdered between 1994 and 1996. The declaration of beatification called the martyrs "faithful messengers of the Gospel, humble artisans of peace, remarkable witnesses of Christian charity."[1] Indeed they were. Additionally, however, the beatification has novel significance that reflects a specific historical and cultural situation; namely the postcolonial reality of Algeria. Claverie's life and beatification are emblematic of the emergence of a "world Church," the shift from a colonial to postcolonial paradigm. The appropriation of the postcolonial paradigm by Claverie represents a significant change from a previous era in the Roman Catholic Church's relationship to Muslims, power, truth, and history and as a result its understanding of its mission. Further, in his beatification the Roman Catholic

[1] The beatification is available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yr4dATWxQrk (accessed February 13, 2020).

D. J. Dias (✉)
University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, ON, Canada

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_18

Church sanctions these changed relationships holding up Claverie as an authentic witness to Christian living.

"World Church"

Karl Rahner identifies three epochs in the history of the church.[2] The first, brief epoch was the proclamation of the kerygma in its original Jewish and Semitic context. It ended with the Council of Jerusalem that began the expansion of the church into the Gentile world. This long epoch lasted until the mid-twentieth century. It encompassed the global extension of European mercantile and political interests across the continents through conquest, imperialism, and colonization. During this epoch a single normative culture (western) and religion (Christianity) was "exported" and imposed on colonized peoples.[3]

The third, and current, epoch is the "world Church." The Second Vatican Council (1962–65) marks the Roman Catholic Church's first attempt to understand and actualize itself into a world Church. The Council was global, but not monolithic. It was multi-national, multicultural, and multi-linguistic. An awareness of the pluri-centrality of the church in its localities is evidenced in the displacement of Latin by vernacular languages for liturgy. The actualization of the world Church cannot be attributed to genetic development, but to history and context. For example, the rise of self-determination movements and the end of official colonialism witnessed the emergence of more than 50 independent nations between 1950 and 1980. In this postcolonial context, the world Church was compelled to rethink church-state relationships, its relations with the world's religions, and its mission.

The Algerian Context

Pierre Claverie's life spans the transition from a Western-European church to the emerging world Church, specifically from the Algerian colonial to postcolonial context. The French conquest of Algeria began in 1830 and

[2] Karl Rahner, "Towards A Fundamental Interpretation of Vatican II," *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 716–27.

[3] Rahner, *Towards*, 717.

CHAPTER 19

Changing the Church: An African Theological Reflection

Stan Chu Ilo

The African Church and the Contestations for Tradition and Innovation in the Church Today

Cardinal Sarah's influence in the World Church and in Africa offers a good starting point for exploring the meaning of change in the church and what this means for Africa. In 2015, at a workshop organized by the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM), to articulate Africa's position on the synod on the family, Cardinal Sarah was insistent that Africans should speak with one clear and credible voice at that synod. The Synod on the family brought out all the divisive doctrinal and moral fault lines in contemporary Catholicism.[1] Sarah's desire for the Catholic Church to be a strong and unshakeable bastion of truth in a changing ecclesial, cultural, and historical landscape has drawn a lot of

[1] "Ghana: Speak with One Voice, Cardinal Sarah Tells African Bishops", June 12, 2015 previously at: http://cisanewsafrica.com/ghana-speak-with-one-voice-cardinal-sarah-tells-african-bishops-on-synod/

S. C. Ilo (✉)
DePaul University, Chicago, IL, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_19

admiration and criticism in Africa.[2] His book, *From the Depths of our Hearts: Priesthood, Celibacy and the Crisis of the Catholic Church*, like some of his writings and interviews, has been received with mixed reactions.

Many traditionalists, particularly in the West, see Sarah perhaps as the most visible torchbearer and defender of tradition and orthodoxy against what they fear are the false reforms and changes being made in the Church by Pope Francis. This fear was captured somewhat cryptically by *New York Times* essayist, Ross Douthat, when he wondered: "How does one change an officially unchanging church? How does one alter what is not supposed to be in your power to remake?"[3] What is of concern for many African theologians is that people erroneously identify Sarah's views and writings as representative of a presumed traditionalism of contemporary African Catholicism, as if the conservative views of German Cardinal Müller are representative of the position of the European church on the contested issues in the church today. This so-called African conservatism is often presented as an attachment to a purist notion of doctrines and morality on one hand, and an ahistorical appropriation of images and structures of the church on the other. African Catholics, the thinking goes, wish to preserve the notion of an unchanging church with an unchanging truth. However, this is a very simplistic over-generalization.

Writing in *Presence-Information Religieus*, under the title, "What Interests does Cardinal Sarah Serve?" French theologian, Jocelyn Girard makes some important points about the wider implications of Sarah's theology. These points will be employed to clarify the huge difference between the theological opinion of an influential African Cardinal on the fundamental teachings of the Church on faith, morals, and church traditions; and the faith, morality and theologies of African Catholics and their dynamic actual faith in their response to the demands of the Gospel. According to Girard, when one studies the writings of Cardinal Sarah one would be right in regarding him more as "the most European of all the Cardinals" than as an African theologian. Girard also suggests that Sarah's

[2] Lucie Sarr, "The Image Cardinal Sarah Cuts in Africa", January 29, 2020 at: https://international.la-croix.com/news/the-image-cardinal-robert-sarah-cuts-in-africa/11709?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=e-mail&utm_content=30-01-2020&utm_campaign=newsletter_crx_lci&PMID=ddbec16e7171a2ec541cb21608196675 (accessed February 17, 2020).

[3] Ross Douthat, *To Change the Church: Pope Francis and the Future of Catholicism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2018), 101.

CHAPTER 20

The Revolutionary Power of the Church

Debora Tonelli

Change helps the Church stay young and vital. Sometimes the Church adapts to change initiated by others, sometimes she leads the change, triggering a real revolution. The Vatican II is one fundamental stage of the contemporary Church, showing that she contains in herself the seed of its own regenerations. Theologians must allow the seeds to sprout, welcoming the challenges of the contemporary world, turning them in opportunities.

Sometimes the change is a way to adapt to the contemporary world, and at other times the change requires a true revolution, within and outside the Church. In this last case, she realizes her prophetic vocation, in continuity with her Biblical roots. But what does it mean to talk of "revolution"? The first section will deal with this keyword as a political interpretation of both the Biblical tradition and the Church: biblical hermeneutics, ecclesiology and politics, in fact, converge in many respects. The revolutionary power of the Biblical tradition, the prophetic vocation of the Church in the world, the need to implement the Vatican Council, and the need to put human beings at the center of economic and political choices

D. Tonelli (✉)
Bruno Kessler Foundation, Trento, Italy

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_20

are themes of the contemporary Church and of theology in continuity with their tradition.

My thesis is that the revolutionary power of both is essential to the Biblical tradition and the Church. To remain faithful to it, the Church must take charge of this revolutionary power. Both, Biblical tradition and the Church are alive if they maintain a dialogue with the different cultures of the world and its contemporary challenges, and do not yield to the temptation to fix themselves in a static doctrine or institutional structure.

To explain the meaning of "revolution", I will refer to a recent event: the Ratzinger Prize of 2019. Awarding this prize to Paul Béré expresses the need and desire to overcome historical barriers (of colonialism) to make the Church "universal" in order to realize the Gospel message. To be "universal", the Church and theology cannot be the extension of Europe or of the Roman tradition; they need to be open to living human experience and cultures. The close dialogue between Christian tradition and cultures will enable the revolutionary power of the Church to be put into practice.

Following this path, I will focus on the contribution of African theology and on the need for an inclusive and enculturated theology, that is, the incorporation of elements of African religious reality into the process of interpreting the biblical text. The conclusion will be focused on the change of perspective needed to put human beings at the center of the Church's message, beyond a specific cultural background. A decolonized theology can suggest a good answer to this issue: the human being must again be the common goal rather than any political and economic interests and without the fear of losing the "Christianity's" monopoly.

Changing the Church: Revolutionary Power of the Biblical Tradition

The word "revolution" comes from the Latin *revolutio* meaning "a turn around" and it belongs properly to the political sphere. Discussing this idea, Aristotle refers to the changing of a constitution (1) to another and (2) to a modification of an existing constitution.[1] In the Western tradition, "revolution" belongs to the political context, but by the late fourteenth century, the word was used to refer to the revolving motion of celestial

[1] Aristotle, *Politics*, Book V.

CHAPTER 21

The Implications of Transient Migration and Online Communities for Changing the Church in Asia

Jonathan Y. Tan

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, sociologists are differentiating between "transient migration" as distinct from "permanent migration." Transient migration results from transnational forces that shape recurrent migrations rather than a singular, linear, and unidirectional migration. In a seminal essay entitled "From International Migration to Transnational Diaspora,"[1] John Lie asserts that the classic immigration narrative of a "singular, break from the old country to the new nation" is no longer tenable or viable in view of a world that is becoming increasingly global and transnational.[2] As he explains:

[1] J. Lie, "From International Migration to Transnational Diaspora," *Contemporary Sociology* 24 no. 4 (1995): 303–306.

[2] Lie, "International Migration," 303.

J. Y. Tan (✉)
Religious Studies Department, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*, Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_21

> It is no longer assumed that immigrants make a sharp break from their homelands. Rather pre-immigration networks, cultures, and capital remain salient. The sojourn itself is neither unidirectional nor final. Multiple, circular and return migrations, rather than a single great journey from one sedentary space to another, occur across transnational spaces. People's movements, in other words, follow multifarious trajectories and sustain diverse networks.[3]

More importantly, Lie suggests that transnational and global forces subvert the "unidirectionality of migrant passage; circles, returns, and multiple movements follow the waxing and waning structures of opportunities and networks."[4]

It is in this context of recurrent transnational migrations that Catherine Gomes has coined the terms "transient migration" and "transient mobility" to focus attention on those "transient migrants" who are constantly on the move and not looking to stay in a particular location permanently or for the long term. In an essay that Gomes co-authored with me, she uses the terms "transient migrants," "transient migration," and "transient mobility" to refer to the global and transnational movements of people for work, study, and lifestyle including skilled professionals and students in pursuit of international education.[5]

On the one hand, the concept of transient migrants is not new. Indeed, existing theological scholarship has rightfully focused attention on *unskilled* transient migrants, especially foreign domestic workers, discussing important theological implications and pastoral responses to their lack of agency, ill treatment, and poor working conditions.[6] On the other hand,

[3] Lie, "International Migration," 304.

[4] Lie, "International Migration," 305.

[5] Catherine Gomes and Jonathan Y. Tan, "Christianity as a Culture of Mobility: A Case Study of Asian Transient Migrants in Singapore," *Kritika Kultura* 25 (2015): 215–244, which has been revised and expanded as Catherine Gomes and Jonathan Tan, "Christianity: A Culture of Mobility," in Catherine Gomes, *Transient Mobility and Middle Class Identity: Media and Migration in Australia and Singapore* (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 185–208. The discussion that follows in this section summarizes and discusses the key ideas and conclusions that are taken from our co-authored 2015 and 2017 essays.

[6] See Gemma Tulud Cruz, *An Intercultural Theology of Migration: Pilgrims in the Wilderness* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) and *Toward a Theology of Migration: Social Justice and Religious Experience* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), as and Rhacel Salazar Parreñas, *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

CHAPTER 22

Liturgical Renewal and Ecumenical Progress

John Borelli

We speak of "The Ecumenical Movement" as though we have consensus for its beginning, boundaries, major achievements, and agreed-upon goals and strategies. The Ecumenical Movement is definitely not over, like "The Crusades," nor generally finished through its effects remain significantly for us today, like "The French Revolution." The Ecumenical Movement not only continues; it undergoes transformations. While "restoration," as in recovery of the simplicity of the apostolic church, and "unity," as in organic unity, emerged among nineteenth-century Christian communities as common-sense goals for ending division, from the mid-twentieth century a developing consensus embraced "the restoration of unity," "full ecclesial communion," "reconciled diversity," and "differentiated consensus" as more nuanced realizations for key concepts in the ongoing course of ecumenical progress. One Catholic architect for organized ecumenical efforts, Thomas F. Stransky, CSP, often cited Robert Penn Warren's words in "Wind and Gibbon": "History is not truth. Truth is in the telling." As a ground floor participant in the Second Vatican Council, Stransky lived a

J. Borelli (✉)
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_22

full life of service to unity while telling ecumenical and interreligious tales from his involvement from 1960 onwards.[1]

Pope St. John XXIII wanted his council to be an outreach to other Christians among its aims, as was evident in his public announcement in January 1959: "a means of spiritual renewal, reconciliation of the Church to the modern world, and service to the unity of Christians."[2] These few words provided sufficient motivation for Augustin Bea SJ to organize behind the scenes and persuade Pope John to establish the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Pope John announced the Secretariat and other conciliar preparatory commissions on Pentecost Sunday 1960, but just before that, Cardinal Bea had instructed Msgr. Johannes Willebrands to pay a backchannel visit to Dr. Willem A. Visser 't Hooft, the first General Secretary of the World Council of Churches.[3]

The WCC, established in 1948, represented in 1960 the greatest ecumenical achievement to date, and Bea worked quickly to connect Catholic ecumenical efforts with those of the WCC. Visser 't Hooft and Bea met in Milan the following September.[4] A partnership between the WCC and the Secretariat was born; the Catholic narrative was joined to the dominant ecumenical story; and a Joint Working Group continues to the present.

There are other narratives than this North Atlantic one. Church division long preceded the Reformation. Accounts of the separation of churches in the first millennium developed into our present era with scenarios of attempted efforts at reconciliation in Eastern Europe, the Middle

[1] John Borelli, "Thomas F. Stransky, CSP: A Scriptural Reflection in Memoriam," *Ecumenical Trends* 48, no. 10 (November 2019): 11–15. A sample of histories include: *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948*, edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (Philadelphia, the Westminster Press, 2nd ed. 1968); *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, Volume 2, 1948–1968*, edited by Harold E. Fey (Philadelphia, the Westminster Press, 1970); William G. Rusch, *Ecumenism – A Movement Toward Church Unity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Frederick M. Bliss, S.M., *Catholic and Ecumenical: History and Hope* (Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield, 2nd ed., 2007); and *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices*, edited by Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997).

[2] "Sollemnis Allocutio," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 51 (1959): 68–69; commented on by Thomas F. Stransky, CSP, "The Foundation of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity," in *Vatican II Revisited by Those Who Were There*, ed. Alberic Stacpoole (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1986), 62.

[3] Willebrands reviewed these developments in his Introduction to *Peace among Christians* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), co-authored by Visser 't Hooft and Bea.

[4] Willem Adolf Visser 't Hooft, *Memoirs* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1973; 2nd edition, Geneva: WCC Publications, 1987), 328.

CHAPTER 23

Changing the Catholic Church's Interreligious Relationships: Irish American Pioneers at the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions

Leo D. Lefebure

Planning the Parliament

Because nineteenth-century Popes Gregory XVI and Pius IX warned Catholics against the danger of religious indifferentism and condemned religious liberty and freedom of the press, there was no obvious reason to expect Catholics to accept an invitation to a Parliament of the World's Religions. Nonetheless, in spring 1890 the Presbyterian leader John Henry Barrows, one of the organizers of the World's Parliament of Religions, asked Archbishop Patrick A. Feehan of Chicago, who had been born in County Tipperary, Ireland, in 1829, for support. Barrows wrote to James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore who had been raised in county Mayo, Ireland, inviting Catholic participation, and Gibbons responded cautiously at first. Barrows also wrote to the Secretary of State

L. D. Lefebure (✉)
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_23

of the Holy See, Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, seeking papal approval of the Parliament, but he did not receive a reply from the Vatican.

The American archbishops met in Baltimore in November 1892 to consider whether the Catholic Church in the United States should support the Parliament. Michael Corrigan, the conservative Archbishop of New York City who was the son of immigrants from Ireland, strongly opposed participation; and a number of archbishops objected that this was not wise or prudent. Just when it seemed that the leaders were on the verge of declining the invitation, one elderly archbishop reportedly spoke up with biting irony: "St. Paul must have been a big fool! Why didn't he act like a respectable Catholic? Where did he get off going into the midst of the pagans? Why didn't he stay among his own?"[1] Meanwhile, the archbishops also considered a letter from Bishop John J. Keane, the first rector of the Catholic University of America, who had been born in County Donegal. Even though Keane was not present at the meeting, his letter strongly supported participation and addressed most of the archbishops' concerns:

> The Parliament of Religions is not meant for *discussion,* but for exposition […]. Again it is not in our power to hinder the Parliament from taking place. It is already certain that all the other forms of religion will be ably represented. *Can the Catholic Church afford not to be there?*[2]

In the end, the archbishops approved Catholic participation, directing Cardinal Gibbons to request Keane to organize a delegation of about 20 Catholic speakers; as the plans developed, almost all of these would turn out to have been born or raised in Ireland. The Catholic Church was the only church to approve participation in the Parliament, and it sent the second-largest delegation after the Protestants. Keane and a Catholic Irish-born layman, William J. Onahan, were the key figures shaping the Catholic delegation. They worked closely with Barrows, and Keane later commented that the organizers sought Catholic advice on the topics to be

[1] John J. Keane, Speech to the Third International Scientific Congress of Catholics, Brussels, September, 1894, as given in Victor Charbonnel, *Congrés Universel des Religions en 1900* (Paris: Armand, 1897), 11; James F. Cleary, "Catholic Participation in the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893," *Catholic Historical Review* 55, no. 4 (1970): 585–609, here 591.

[2] Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, Keane to the Most Reverend Board of Archbishops. Washington, November 12, 1892.

CHAPTER 24

Is Interreligious Dialogue Changing the Church? The Significance of the *Document on Human Fraternity*

Roberto Catalano

On February 4, 2019, Pope Francis signed a document destined to mark the history of the Catholic Church and probably of Christianity and, even more, of humanity at large. This document titled *"Human Fraternity for World Peace and Living Together"* represents an absolute novelty in the two-millennia-long history of the Church and this for several reasons. First of all, the papal signature was placed on a document far different from the usual papal official declarations—encyclical letters, apostolic constitutions, exhortations, and letters, *motu-proprio*. Moreover, Abu Dhabi, the venue of this act, is not only far from Vatican City (Rome), but, above all, is part of the Arabian Peninsula, which is identified as home to Islam. Second, the official act was implemented in the course of an International Interreligious Symposium on Peace, organized at the Founder's Memorial of the capital city of the United Arab Emirates. There were hundreds of participants representing not only Christianity and Islam but also other

R. Catalano (✉)
Centre for Interreligious Dialogue, Focolare Movement, Rome, Italy

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_24

religious traditions: Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism, and Judaism. But the most stunning element of the event has to be found in the fact that, for the first time in the history of the Church, a successor of Peter co-signed an official document with a leader of another religion.

The declaration was, in fact, conceived and prepared by the Holy See and al-Azhar, the famous University and Mosque in Cairo (Egypt), which to an extent represents a reference point for Sunni Islam. The Grand Imam Ahmad Al-Tayyib and Pope Francis, by placing their signatures, marked a truly unprecedented event. There is something more to add. The co-signed document was published by the *Libreria Vaticana* in the series, which comprises the official documents of the Holy See considered as the "*magisterium*" of the Catholic Church. In the course of 2019, Pope Francis and other representatives of Roman Curia quoted the document of Abu Dhabi as a text, which has become part of the Church legacy.

All these elements seem to point to the fact that dialogue with other religions is strongly influencing the present and, consequently, the future of the Catholic Church, paving the way to a new age of cooperation and common engagement in issues involving men and women of our times: economic balance and justice, peace, and relationship with nature. Moreover, the Church seems to be committed to seek the alliance of other religions in order to form new generations with these ideals and values. Pope Francis appears fully engaged in increasingly opening up the Church toward all men and women, irrespective of their cultures and religions, faithful to the fact that we all belong to the same human family, as *Nostra Aetate* declared in 1965.

> In our time, when day by day mankind is being drawn closer together, and the ties between different peoples are becoming stronger, the Church examines more closely her relationship with nonChristian religions. … One is the community of all peoples, one their origin, for God made the whole human race to live over the face of the earth. One also is their final goal, God. His providence, His manifestations of goodness, His saving design extend to all men, until that time when the elect will be united in the Holy City, the city ablaze with the glory of God, where the nations will walk in His light.[1]

[1] "Nostra Aetate", at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html (accessed on 31st December 2019).

CHAPTER 25

That's Gonna Leave a Mark: A Saint, a Sultan, and How Friendship Does (or Doesn't) Change the Church

Jason Welle O.F.M.

Given the Gospel dictum, "I no longer call you slaves … I call you friends" (Jn 15:15), the relative absence of friendship as a central ecclesiological category in modern theology must be considered surprising. In one of the most-discussed surveys of approaches to ecclesiology, Avery Dulles's *Models of the Church,* friendship barely enters.[1] More recently, theologians have begun to probe friendship as an ecclesiological theme. In addition to some recent graduate theses,[2] theologians like Steve Summers have

[1] The concept emerges as a foil in one model: the tension between considering the Church primarily as a network of friendly fellowship or as a Mystical Communion with a basis in God. Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974); rev. and exp. ed. (Garden City: Image, 1987).

[2] Richmond Dzekoe, "The Church in Friendship: A Touchstone for Theological Reflection on Ecclesial Communication in a Digital Age" (Ph.D., St. Thomas University, 2017); Anne-Marie Ellithorpe, "Towards a Practical Theology of Friendship" (Ph.D., The University of Queensland, 2018); Jonathan Sammut, *Love of Friendship in the Christian Life* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2019), a revised version of a thesis at the University of Malta.

J. Welle O.F.M. (✉)
The Pontifical Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies, Rome, Italy

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_25

prompted new consideration of the importance of friendship for the Church's self-understanding. Summers understands friendship as "a particular love that can be expressed in a hospitable community,"[3] and argues that a hospitable Church can heal a wounded society through friendship. True friendship is rare, so a Church infused with friendship offers a counter-cultural opportunity as a social good. "Friendship offers the best in human relationality […] a relationship capable of engendering wider social capital."[4]

The assumption that friendship can help heal society is not distinctively Christian; one may note parallels with classical Muslim philosophers on the point.[5] The forthcoming reflections, however, do not concentrate on how the Church affects the world, but on how friendships between Christians and non-Christians change the Church.[6] Much theological work remains to be done regarding interreligious friendship. Some Muslims have recently contested whether a Muslim can befriend a Christian,[7] and the Christian who searches for justification to reject the possibility of interreligious friendship has little trouble finding sources.[8]

[3] Steve Summers, *Friendship: Exploring its Implications for the Church in Postmodernity* (London and New York: T & T Clark/Continuum, 2009), 156.

[4] Summers, *Friendship,* 193.

[5] Both Miskawayh (d. 1030) and al-Tawḥīdī (d. 1023) see the public good that results from stable, reciprocal friendships; this esteem for friendship leads Marc Bergé to describe al-Tawḥīdī as a humanist. Marc Bergé, *Pour un humanisme vécu: Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī* (Damascus: Institut français de Damas, 1979), 318; cf. Nuha A. Alshaar, *Ethics in Islam: Friendship in the Political Thought of al-Tawḥīdī and his Contemporaries* (New York: Routledge, 2015), esp. 47, 159–60, 207, 225.

[6] In this discussion of changing the Church, I intend no engagement with ecclesiological debates about continuity or discontinuity; my point of departure is simply that insofar as individual Christians are members of the body of Christ, the moral and spiritual evolution of those individuals constitutes a change to the Church.

[7] The 2017 controversy in Indonesia surrounding the former governor of Jakarta, a Christian, revolved around this point. More broadly, the Salafi trend of *al-walā' wa al-barā'* likewise seems to pre-empt any friendship between Muslims and Christians. For discussion, see Uriya Shavit, "Can Muslims Befriend Non-Muslims? Debating *al-walā' wa-al-barā'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) in Theory and Practice," *Islam and Muslim-Christian Relations* 25, no. 1 (2014): 67–88.

[8] A quotation from the young Joseph Ratzinger illustrates the tension, though through the language of brotherhood rather than friendship. "In contrast to the Stoics and the Enlightenment, *Christianity affirms the existence of the two different zones [of ethical behaviour] and calls only fellow believers 'brothers'.*" *Christian Brotherhood* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1966), 81.

CHAPTER 26

Three's Company in Interfaith Dialogue: A Protestant Modus for Engagement with Those from Other Faiths

Nicolas G. Mumejian

Missionary, ecumenist, theologian, and social ethicist are but a few of the many hats Lesslie Newbigin wore throughout his life. Born in Britain in 1909, Newbigin spent 40 years in South India as a missionary.[1] It is during this time that he would establish himself as a preeminent ecumenist.[2] Newbigin views dialogue as an exchange of livelihood which entails personal interaction. In *The Open Secret* he discusses the manner in which dialogue becomes more than words; dialogue, he suggests, is the development of relationships that necessitates both conversations about each other's faith convictions and opportunities to work together for a

[1] Geoffrey Wainwright, *Lesslie Newbigin: a Theological Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), v.

[2] For further and more detailed biographical information I recommend Geoffrey Wainwright's book that is cited above. Due to the constraints of this paper I will not expound upon the details of his life that are not immediately pertinent this paper.

N. G. Mumejian (✉)
Hartford Seminary, Hartford, CT, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_26

variety of common causes.[3] In such an encounter with one another, trust is developed in ways that mere conversation lacks. Dialogue then is not evangelism but the pre-text to evangelism. I will endeavor to flush out the unique qualities of dialogue that makes it different from evangelism in the proselytizing sense.

The first question is this: why should Christians engage interreligious dialogue with the religious other? Is the witness of the Church through individuals and the corporate body not enough? Newbigin claims:

> Anyone who knows Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior must desire ardently that others should share that knowledge and must rejoice when the number of those who do is multiplied. Where this desire and this rejoicing are absent, we must ask whether something is not wrong at the very center of the church's life.[4]

Part of the Church's witness that declares Jesus as Lord and Savior entails the necessary role of dialogue. Lack of dialogue then inflates suspicion of the Church's focus and calls into question the individual's integrity as a follower of Christ.[5] Dialogue is action and, Newbigin writes, discipleship in practice is

> […] a matter of action, and not only thought. Therefore, I think that the most fruitful kind of interfaith dialogue is one in which people of different faiths or ideologies who share a common situation and are seeking to meet ordinary human needs, are enabled to share the insights which their different beliefs give them for contemporary action. It is in this situation of active discipleship, where we cannot take refuge in established formulations of doctrine but have to probe new and unexplored territory, that we learn what it means to trust Jesus as the way, the truth and the life and as one who can lead us into truth in its fullness.[6]

[3] Lesslie Newbigin, *The Open Secret: an Introduction to the Theory of Mission* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1995), chapter 10, part 1.

[4] Newbigin, *The Open Secret*, 127.

[5] In his book *Household of God* Newbigin relates the sin of the individuals as being then the sin of the Church. For Newbigin the dichotomy between individual Christian and community of Christians is blurred to the point that to refer to one is to refer to both.

[6] Lesslie Newbigin (ed. Geoffrey Wainwright), *Signs Amid the Rubble: The Purposes of God in Human History* (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 2003), 77. See also Wainwright, *Lesslie Newbigin: A theological Life*, 232.

CHAPTER 27

Reforming Anti-Judaism in a Church Called to Communion

Mary Doak

Ecclesia reformata, semper reformanda—the church reformed, always reforming: This phrase aptly expresses a task but also a hope, especially for those of us who have been nurtured and inspired, but also frustrated and even bitterly disappointed by our church. Much internal reform is obviously necessary if the church is to be the sign and instrument of unity-in-diversity that it is called to be. Ecclesial reform is urgently needed for the sake of a church that seems to have nothing to offer the disaffected younger generation but yet more of the same rancorous divisions so prevalent in society. Ecclesial reform is also crucial for the sake of the fragmented world to which the church is sent. We can only imagine what a healing force the church might be if it really lived the sacramental, loving, communion that embraces rather than rejects difference. Perhaps what Howard Thurman argued in the midst of the racial segregation of twentieth-century America remains true today: if the church truly

M. Doak (✉)
University of San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_27

exemplified a love in which everyone was accepted as a precious brother or sister, would not people flock to the church to learn its secret of how to live together in love and peace?[1]

Fearful of losing a distinct ecclesial identity, advocates of ecclesial neo-exclusivism seek a church that preserves its difference by criticizing rather than engaging with the world.[2] Apparently unaware of the irony of their approach, they would have the church emulate the tribal polarization of the world rather than the loving communion of the Holy Trinity that the church is called to embody in history.

This neo-exclusivism has fostered acrimonious divisions within churches battling over how to strengthen their distinct identity, while also impeding the ecumenism that seeks to heal divisions between Christian churches. An evident lack of Christian unity is such a serious obstacle to the church's mission to be a sign of unity-in-diversity that overcoming the divisiveness of neo-exclusivism must be a major focus of the church's reforming energy.[3] However, neo-exclusivism is also distracting the church from its responsibility to seek communion with non-Christians and, of particular concern here, from the project of overcoming the anti-Judaism deeply embedded in the Christian tradition. A church preoccupied with defending its own identity and traditions is not disposed to continue critiquing and revising those traditions, especially when that process requires dialogue with Jews or others outside the church. Yet communion with non-Christians is integral to the church's mission: if the church is to be a sign and instrument of unity-in-diversity, then the church must not only manifest unity within the church but also demonstrate a capacity for harmony with those outside of the church, and especially with the church's primary other—the Jews.

It is tempting to believe that the official church statements that have repudiated supersessionism and have revoked the deicide charge have brought an end to the long and tragic history of Christian contempt for

[1] Howard Thurman, Walter Earl Fluker, and Catherine Tumbler, *A Strange Freedom: The Best of Howard Thurman on Religious Experience and Public Life* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998), esp. 254–55.

[2] Gerard Mannion, *Ecclesiology and Postmodernity: Questions for the Church in Our Time* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007), esp. 43–74.

[3] I further explore this common view of the church's mission in my article, "The Unity and Disunity of Our Hope," in *Hope in the Ecumenical Future,* edited by Mark D. Chapman (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 13–26.

CHAPTER 28

Overcoming "The Church as Counter-sign of the Kingdom"

Paul Avis

It is almost universally agreed by New Testament scholars that the coming of the kingdom or reign of God was the very core of Jesus' proclamation.[1] "After John [the Baptist] had been handed over, Jesus came into Galilee proclaiming the gospel of God and saying, 'The time has been fulfilled and the reign (*basileia*) of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel'" (Mark. 1.14–15). The imminence of the kingdom was the "good news" ("gospel"). The theme of the nearness of the reign of God is pivotal for Jesus' destiny from beginning to end.

As early Christian theology evolved, Jesus came to be seen as the personal embodiment of the kingdom, the kingdom itself (*autobasileia*, as Origen put it). The one who proclaimed the kingdom was proclaimed by the church as the content of the kingdom. As Bultmann puts it, "*The*

[1] "'The centrality of the kingdom of God (*basileiatoutheou*) in Jesus' preaching is one of the least disputable, or disputed, facts about Jesus": James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered, Christianity in the Making, Volume 1* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 383.

P. Avis (✉)
Durham University, Durham, UK

University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_28

proclaimer became the proclaimed."[2] From then onward the church could speak of the kingdom of Christ, as well as of God (1 Cor. 15. 24–25; 2 Peter 1.11; Rev. 20.6). The relationship or connection between the kingdom of God and the church has been argued about in the history of theology. Augustine of Hippo identified the two, while Protestant theology has tended to oppose them. In modern ecumenical theology the church is seen as the sign, instrument, and foretaste of the kingdom—serving the kingdom but staying in dialectical tension with it. The church spearheads the kingdom in the world, but is not identical with it. The church is judged against the kingdom. But what happens when the church obscures the kingdom of God and of Christ, the reign of love, justice and freedom, and becomes a *counter-sign of the kingdom*?

With regard to the failings of the church, we should distinguish between ordinary human moral frailty and intentional, premeditated human wickedness. To be a Christian is to know weakness as well as strength. The sign of a sanctified life is an overpowering sense of how far we still have to travel into the holiness of God. Perhaps the first sign of sainthood is self-abasement; the saints are moved by an overpowering sense of unworthiness. That is the condition for receiving grace. God's power is made perfect in human weakness (2 Cor. 12.9–10). Christian moral weakness, Christian sinfulness or "falling short", are unavoidable (Rom. 3.23; 7.14–25). We are steeped in sinfulness even as we are being transformed by the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 3.18). However, the serious misdemeanours and crimes of the church corporately, such as those being uncovered in the current global sexual abuse scandal, are in another league altogether. Not only do they harm and ruin countless human lives, but they can also obliterate the kingdom of God and of Christ in the perception of many who are not directly affected. Where does that leave our doctrine of the church?

Because the church is identified with the body of Christ, crucified and risen, its weakness as well as its strength is apparent. Just as Christ's risen body bore the marks of crucifixion (John 20.20, etc.), so the church bears all the marks of human imperfection and fallibility, even of sin (which

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, 2 vols (London, SCM Press, 1952), vol. 1, 33; italics original. Further on the theme of Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom, the eschatological background and the implications for ecclesiology, see Paul Avis, *Jesus and the Church: The Foundation of the Church in the New Testament and Modern Theology* (London and New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020).

CHAPTER 29

To Live According to the Form of the Holy Gospel: Francis of Assisi's Embodied Challenge to the Institutional Church

Craig A. Phillips

It is common in contemporary North American society to hear explicit rejection of the "institutional church," or "organized religion." Sexual misconduct scandals involving clergy and lay staff, accompanied in some places by the continuing shelter and protection of known sexual abusers across denominations, along with occasional financial fraud and misuse of church funds, have led many to conclude that the institutional church cannot be trusted to govern itself in a manner that fosters public trust, and in a manner consistent with the Gospel message the church seeks to proclaim.

In addition, the organized juridical structure of the church is often seen to be at odds with the personal needs of people formed by the values of a highly individualistic culture. As a result, the church often does not offer sufficient resources to help individuals find coherence between their daily life and their religious practices. This essay will explore what the contemporary church can learn from Francis of Assisi and the ancient

C. A. Phillips (✉)
Virginia Theological Seminary, Arlington, VA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_29

monastic traditions of the church so that by focusing less on itself as an institution, it might offer concrete resources to help contemporary Christians find continuity between who they are and what they do.

The first part of the essay examines how Francis of Assisi (1181/1182–1226) challenged the juridical structures of the institutional church of his day in two ways: by his decision "to live according to the form of the Holy Gospel," thus deferring the establishment of a monastic rule to govern his life, and by his decision to live without property. In his political theory, Giorgio Agamben sheds light on these two decisions of Francis. Agamben's unique interpretation of Francis allows for the identification of resources to change the church that might otherwise remain hidden were we to focus solely on a critique of the juridical structures of monastic communities or of the larger church itself.

The concluding section of the essay examines what the Most Rev. Michael Curry, the Presiding Bishop and Primate of the Episcopal Church, is doing to re-brand the church as the "Episcopal branch of the Jesus Movement" and how the "Way of Love, Rule of Life" that he and other leaders of the church have developed and propagated, resonates with Francis's way of changing the church through the example of Francis' life lived according to the pattern of Jesus Christ.

In 1206, as Francis of Assisi was praying before the Byzantine crucifix that hung in the dilapidated church of St. Damiano, he heard the divine voice say to him, "Francis, rebuild my church, which as you can see is going to ruins." At first, Francis took this call literally, focusing on gathering stones and mortar to repair the physical church. As time went on, he realized that the reform of the church involved more than material repairs. Hearing a reading from the Gospel of Matthew in which Jesus tells his followers to "take no gold, or silver, or copper in your belts, no bag for your journey, or two tunics, or sandals, or a staff [….]" (Mt 10:9), Francis, a layperson, resolved to live henceforth without property, as a beggar, wearing a simple cloak and cord.

In his study of Christian monastic traditions, Giorgio Agamben identifies two distinct ways that Francis sought to live outside the juridical structures of the church: the first was his attempt to pattern his life in accordance with the example of Jesus without formalized monastic rules and the second was his explicit refusal to own property. Agamben turns to Christian monasticism for his contemporary political philosophy so that he begins to "construct a form-of-life" […] that is, a life, "linked so closely to its form

CHAPTER 30

Authority and Change: The Role of Authority in the Anglican Communion and the Lutheran World Federation

Miriam Haar

This article explores the relationship between change and authority and discusses the role of authority when churches and global ecclesial communions experience change. Recent developments regarding human sexuality in two Christian World Communions, the Anglican Communion (AC) and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), serve as case studies. Although similar challenges have occurred in other global ecclesial communions such as the World Methodist Council, the AC and the LWF have been selected because in both communions these challenges have stirred debates about the understanding and practice of authority when trying to hold together the global communion. In both communions, the member churches are autonomous and there is no "magisterium". Both communions have member churches that have implemented decisions and introduced legislation that have brought about change: change regarding same-sex partnerships and regarding the ordination of homosexual pastors

M. Haar (✉)
Institute for Ecumenical Studies and Research, Bensheim, Mannheim, Germany

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_30

and priests and the consecration of bishops.[1] Thus, both have member churches which ordain homosexual people and conduct blessings or marriages for people living in same-sex unions and, at the same time, both communions have member churches opposed to this.

When churches and global ecclesial communions are faced with changes including over complex and divisive issues, questions related to authority arise: Who has the authority to allow change or to hinder these developments? How do churches which are members of *one* global communion react when change happens in churches which are members of the same communion?

Recent Developments in the Anglican Communion

The AC is a global communion with about 85 million members in 46 different churches in more than 165 countries. All are in communion, or in a reciprocal relationship, with the See of Canterbury and recognize the Archbishop of Canterbury as the Communion's spiritual head. There is no central authority in the AC. All the provinces are autonomous and free to make their own decisions in their own ways guided by recommendations from the four "Instruments of Communion" which are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Primates' Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC).

In the wake of the 13th Lambeth Conference in 1998, there was heated disagreement between churches of the AC over the issue of biblical warrant for ordaining homosexual clergy and blessing same-sex unions. In its resolution on "Human Sexuality",[2] the Lambeth Conference states that "in view of the teaching of Scripture, [it] upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage".[3] Although the bishops at Lambeth recognize that there are members of the Church who "experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation"[4] and "assure them that they are loved by God and that all baptized, believing and

[1] I have chosen to speak of "homosexuality", and not to use the more inclusive "LGBTQ+" terminology, because the two world communions still use the former terminology and very few member churches use the LGBTQ+ terminology.

[2] Resolution I.10 "Human Sexuality" at: https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/76650/1998.pdf (accessed January 8, 2020).

[3] Ibid., I.10 b.

[4] Ibid., I.10 c.

CHAPTER 31

"Stop, Stop and Listen": Changing the Church by Listening to Its Life

Andrew Pierce

Irish poet Austin Clarke deposits a bucket of ice-cold nature over the ecclesial grace of the monk, Patric, as the blackbird of Derrycairn sings:

> Stop, stop and listen for the bough top
> Is whistling and the sun is brighter
> Than God's own shadow in the cup now![1]

How might the official ecclesiological self-understanding of the Anglican Communion benefit from heeding a call to stop and listen?

Recently, Anglicans have begun to use a distinctive language to describe themselves—both to themselves and to their ecumenical partners. The Anglican Communion, it is claimed, is one communion with four instruments of communion. But, no matter how often some Anglicans repeat this mantra, its persuasive power seems limited: It is a very new way in which to express "Anglicanity", and its connection to what went before is

[1] "The Blackbird of Derrycairn", in Austin Clarke*: Selected Poems*, edited by Hugh Maxton (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 1991), 40.

A. Pierce (✉)
Irish School of Ecumenics, School of Religion, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_31

unclear; theologically it is remarkably underdressed; and, despite its appearances in Anglican Communion publications, it seems to have garnered little traction across the churches of the Communion. Since reception is a live ecumenical issue, Anglicans might benefit from the blackbird's edict to shut up and listen to what is actually going on, and not continue to prescribe what some think ought to be happening. Changing the Church should mean something other than enforcing a fiction.

The Thematizing of Dispersed Authority

Anglicanism has undergone—to use the terminology of William L. Sachs—a dramatic "transformation" in its self-understanding from "state church to global communion."[2] The current characteristic usage of "Anglican Communion" dates only from the nineteenth century. Before that, anachronistic Anglicans would have claimed a unity in their heritage of the state-sponsored reforms of the English church under Tudors and Stuarts, and on the expanding role played by that church during the development of British colonies overseas. Connections and confusions between catholicity and colonialism are not unique to Anglicanism. The decoupling of the colonizer and colonized has been, and remains, a deeply fraught process with many aspects—including the theological. The expansion of a distinctive and developing theological identity, from the Church of England to at least some of the ends of the earth, leaves in its wake a need to make ecclesiological sense of the resulting "transformation."

Attempts to curtail the risk of ecclesiological anarchy are nicely symbolized by the first Lambeth Conference in 1867. Prodded into action by the church overseas, a reluctant Archbishop of Canterbury invited "all" 144 bishops of the Communion. Not all bishops saw this as wise—only half of those invited attended, the Archbishop of York famously opted out, and the Dean of Westminster refused to host the final service of the Conference in Westminster Abbey. The Conference tried to balance the evident need of Canadian Anglicans to take counsel more widely, with the extreme caution on the part of Anglican leadership in naming what—ecclesiologically speaking—was actually happening.

Despite initial nervousness, Anglicans have grown more comfortable with having their bishops meet every 10 years or so, and with these

[2] William L. Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

CHAPTER 32

How Should the Church Teach? A Mode of Learning and Teaching for Our Times

Peter C. Phan

The purpose of this chapter is to develop further my own understanding of the magisterium.[1] Given limited space, there is no need to provide an overview of the Catholic Church's teaching on the nature of episcopal magisterium (the prophetic function of the Church), its subjects (who can teach), its proper subject matter (what can be taught), and its modes

[1] For my past reflections on the magisterium, see Peter C. Phan, "From Magisterium to Magisteria: Recent Theologies of the Learning and Teaching Functions of the Church," *Theological Studies*, 80, no. 2 (2019): 393–413; *The Joy of Religious Pluralism: A Personal Journey* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2017), 21–49; "Teaching as Learning: An Asian View," *Concilium*, no. 2 (2012): 75–87; "The Church in Asian Perspective," in *The Routledge Companion to the Christian Church*, edited by Gerard Mannion and Lewis S. Mudge (New York and London: Routledge, 2008), 275–290; "A New Way of Being Church in Asia: Lessons for the American Catholic Church," in *Inculturation and the Church in North America*, edited by Frank Kennedy (New York: Crossroad, 2006), 145–62; "A New Way of Being Church: Perspectives from Asia," in *Governance, Accountability, and the Future of the Catholic Church*, edited by Francis Oakley and Bruce Russett (New York: Continuum, 2004), 178–90.

P. C. Phan (✉)
Department of Theology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_32

(infallible and authoritative but non-infallible).[2] Instead, I will highlight certain aspects of the traditional theology of the magisterium that in my judgment should be reconsidered and modified so that the Church's teaching function can be exercised in a fruitful and credible way. I will conclude by showing how Pope Francis has inaugurated a new way of papal teaching.

Teaching Function of the Hierarchy or the Prophetic Role of the Whole Church?

The first widespread ambiguity to be dispelled is the notion of "magisterium" itself. Etymologically, it means the teaching role or the act of teaching itself of a teacher (*magister*). That one of the most important parts of Jesus' ministry is teaching and that he was called a "teacher" or "rabbi" by his contemporaries is beyond doubt. Furthermore, there is also no doubt that after his resurrection Jesus commissioned his disciples to "teach" all nations to obey and observe everything he had commanded them (Matt. 28:20).

What is theologically problematic is the process whereby this teaching function, which the whole Church, symbolized in Matthew as the "eleven disciples," and not just the apostles, is commissioned to perform, is gradually restricted to mean exclusively the teaching role and the teachings themselves of the apostles and of their presumed successors, that is, the bishops, or the episcopal or hierarchical magisterium. Eventually a distinction was made between the "teaching Church" (*ecclesia docens*) and the "learning Church" (*ecclesia discens*), the former composed of the pope and bishops, and the latter of the laity, who are reduced to being "students" or learners of their "teachers," namely the pope and bishops. As a result, *magisterium* comes to refer exclusively to the teaching function of the pope and the bishops. To underscore this point, English usage retains the Latin term "magisterium" untranslated and adds the definite article *the* to "Magisterium," with M capitalized. Thus, the phrase "*the* Magisterium of

[2] For a comprehensive exposition on the magisterium, see Francis Sullivan, *Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), Michael A. Fahey, "Magisterium," in *The Routledge Companion to the Christian Church*, edited by Gerard Mannion and Lewis S. Mudge (New York and London: Routledge, 2008), 524–535; and the many works by Richard Gaillardetz, especially *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997).

CHAPTER 33

Towards a Re-reading of the Dogmas of Vatican I

Peter Neuner

The Philosophical and Spiritual Climate

It was 150 years ago that the Catholic Church was moved by the First Vatican Council (1869–1870).[1] Its documents and especially the papal dogmas can be understood only in the context of the history of the nineteenth century. This century began with the French revolution, whose ideals of *liberté, egalité, and fraternité* were rapidly suppressed by the blood frenzy of the mob. The September massacres of 1792, when 1200 captives, among them 300 priests, were murdered in the dungeons of Paris, along with the parliament's decision to abolish Christianity (1793), were heavy challenges for the church. The French military occupied the Papal States; in 1799 the mortally ill Pope Pius VI was dragged across the

[1] On this, see some recent historical investigations: Manfred Weitlauff, *Das Erste Vatikanum (1869/70) wurde ihnen zum Schicksal* (2 vols.) (München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2018); Bernward Schmidt, *Kleine Geschichte des Ersten Vatikanischen Konzils* (Freiburg: Herder, 2019). See also: Peter Neuner, *Der lange Schatten des I. Vatikanums* (Freiburg: Herder, 2019).

P. Neuner (✉)
Ludwig Maximilians University of Munich, Munich, Germany

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_33

Alpes to Grenoble and Valence, where his death ended this macabre spectacle. Moreover, the philosophical climate changed. In the second part of the nineteenth century, tendencies prevailed which were critical of religion, and history unsettled the trust in miracles and divinely ordained authorities.

It is not surprising that the Popes condemned these events. However, they also rejected the theoretical concepts that, according to their view of history, made them possible. They were convinced that the ideas of modern times were the root of all these catastrophes. They supported a neoscholastic approach, which seemed to be untouched by the changes of history.[2] They regarded Martin Luther as responsible for all the catastrophes of modernity.[3] His rebellion against the God-ordained authorities, the Pope, and the Emperor caused the breakdown of society and unity of the Church. The false ideas of the fatal monk of Wittenberg, according to the official catholic view of history, had the consequence that everybody became their own teacher, priest, and pope. Luther's principles of freedom and autonomy led to destruction and chaos. Catholic authorities were convinced that there was only one remedy for religion and even for society: the return to the medieval order of authority and obedience.[4]

The individual character of the popes brought an additional step. Thus, Pope Gregory XVI condemned everything that was in contact with modernity and liberalism, especially what he denounced as indifferentism: "From this most rotten source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity, that liberty of conscience must be claimed and defended for anyone".[5] His successor, Pope Pius IX declared in his encyclical letter *Quanta cura* (1864) the conviction that the liberty of conscience is the right of everybody and that civil law has to protect it as sheer foolishness. The Syllabus of Errors, an attachment to this encyclical, condemned the statement: "The Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile and adapt himself to progress, liberalism and the modern civilization".[6]

[2] See Heinrich M. Schmidinger, "Neuscholastik", in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* edited by Joachim Ritter and Karlfried Gründer (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984), volume 6, 769.

[3] See Neuner, *Der lange Schatten*, 18.

[4] Hermann Josef Pottmeyer, *Der Glaube vor dem Anspruch der Wissenschaft* (Freiburg Herder, 1968).

[5] Encyclical, *Mirari vos*, Denzinger, no 2730.

[6] *Syllabus Errorum*, Denzinger, no 2980.

CHAPTER 34

Ecclesial Reform and Human Cultures

Sandra Mazzolini

In the Western tradition, "few ideas have enjoyed a longer, more complex, and, in many instances, more disruptive history than reform. Expressed by a number of terms, of which the most direct and obvious is the Latin *reformatio*, it has traditionally been defined as *mutatio in melius*."[1] Etymologically speaking, *reform* is not a creation *ex nihilo* (in fact, it presupposes a previous original form). It is not a generic change and development, "that come about in a gradual fashion without deliberate decision making to effect the final result,"[2] because it "entails a self-consciously undertaken effort within an institution to effect change. It is thus different from changes that come about because of decisions taken by others."[3] The

[1] John O'Malley, "'The Hermeneutic of Reform.' A Historical Analysis," *Theological Studies* 73 (2012): 517–546, 518. Even if the idea of *mutatio in melius* can be expressed by other terms, nonetheless *reform* "remains the most basic and most frequently invoked in almost every sphere of human activity to improve the status quo" (517).

[2] Ibid., 517. See also John O'Malley, "Developments, Reforms, and Two Great Reformations: Towards a Historical Assessment of Vatican II," *Theological Studies* 44 (1983): 374–378.

[3] O'Malley, "The Hermeneutic of Reform:'" 517.

S. Mazzolini (✉)
Pontifical Urbanian University, Rome, Italy

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_34

concept of reform refers, firstly, to the relationship between the past and the present, opening up to the future; secondly, to the historical and cultural context[4]; and thirdly, to specific criteria which determine forms and results, as well as the reasons and purposes of reform.

Originally directed towards each individual Christian, the concept of reform "early began to be applied also to the church as an organized social body and was thus launched on its impressive ecclesiastical trajectory."[5] In the course of time, the theme of ecclesial reform has been crucial but, at the same time, it has been a very thorny one. Today, this theme of reform also recurs in the magisterium of Pope Francis, who refers it to the ecclesiological model of the church which goes forth,[6] simultaneously stressing the very nature of ecclesial renewal, the missionary identity of the church, and the principle of pastoral conversion.[7] Within this framework, the relationship between ecclesial reform and human cultures is extremely relevant.

The Second Vatican Council set about discussing the issue of the relationship of the church to human cultures, recognizing, on the one hand, cultural plurality[8] and, on the other, that this multifaceted dialogical relationship enriches both the church and human cultures.[9] After the Council, there have been very many different discussions of this issue and its related questions, such as those of inculturation, evangelization of cultures, and

[4] Without a precise reference to the historical context, reform could be explained only by further abstractions, degenerating "into a platitude or even a mask for an ideology" (O'Malley, "'The Hermeneutic of Reform'," 521). See also John O'Malley, "Reform, Historical Consciousness, and Vatican II's Aggiornamento," *Theological Studies* 32 (1971): 589–601; O'Malley, "Developments, Reforms," 404.

[5] O'Malley, "'The Hermeneutic of Reform'," 518.

[6] See EG 20. 24. This ecclesiological figure summarizes some main perspective of Council Vatican II, as well as aspects of Latin-American and Argentinian theology. See, for example, Juan Carlos Scannone, *La teologia del popolo. Radici teologiche di papa Francesco* (Brescia: Queriniana 2019).

[7] See Sandra Mazzolini, "'An ecclesial renewal which cannot be deferred' (EG 27–33). Ecclesial Renewal and the Renewal of Ecclesial Structures," in *Pope Francis and the Future of Catholicism. Evangelii Gaudium and the Papal Agenda*, ed. Gerard Mannion (New York: Cambridge University Press 2017), 77–83.

[8] This acknowledgment firstly entails the clarification of the concept of culture (see GS 53), and, secondly, the understanding of cultural diversity from the viewpoint of the divine plan of creation and salvation.

[9] See, for example, LG 13; GS 44–45. 58; AG 22.

CHAPTER 35

Ecclesiology in Extremis

Dale T. Irvin

Johannes Christiaan "Hans" Hoekendijk was a mid-twentieth century Dutch Reformed leader of the ecumenical movement who was passionate about the need for changes in our ecclesiological thinking.[1] Hoekendijk identified his primary area of work as being in mission studies. Mission for him meant change, which came about through the church's encounter with the world beyond itself. The church had become too settled in its own time and place. But the church as he understood it from the perspective of the New Testament and the message of Jesus had no fixed place as either the beginning or end of what God is doing in the world: "Consequently it cannot be firmly established but will always remain the *paroikia* [sojourner], a temporary settlement which can never become a

[1] For a fuller introduction to Hoekendijk and his background, see D. T. Irvin, "For the Sake of the World: Stephen B. Bevans and Johannes C. Hoekendijk in Dialogue," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 44, no. 1 (January 2020): 20–32, first published online April 9, 2019, at https://doi.org/10.1177/2396939319839291

D. T. Irvin (✉)
New School of Biblical Theology, Orlando, FL, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_35

permanent home".[2] This was for him the heart of being apostolic: being sent into the world both to transform and to be transformed.[3] Hoekendijk is most often remembered along these lines for his participation in the project carried out by the Department on Studies in Evangelism of the World Council of Churches that culminated in the 1967 publication of *The Church for Others and the Church for the World*, and in a collection of his own essays titled *The Church Inside Out* that was first published the previous year in 1966.[4]

Toward the end of the latter volume, Hoekendijk noted that various churches allow intercommunion in what are considered abnormal situations. The traditional language for such practices was for situations considered to be "in extreme" (in extremis). Such abnormal situations, Hoekendijk argued, include a "missionary situation," an "emergency situation," and situations where "we have passed the point of no return in our lives and have arrived on the threshold of death" (the traditional understanding of in extremis in Roman Catholic theology).[5] In such situations otherwise immutable ecclesiastical rules such as those that govern who can

[2] J. C. Hoekendijk, "The Church in Missionary Thinking," *International Review of Missions* 41, no. 3 (1952): 334.

[3] See a fuller discussion of Hoekendijk's concept of apostolicity and mission in John G. Flett, *Apostolicity: The Ecumenical Question in World Christian Perspective* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2016), 187–210.

[4] *The Church for Others and the Church for the World: A Quest for Structures for Missionary Congregations: Final Report of the Western European Working Group and North America Working Group of the Depeartment on Studies in Evangelism* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1967); and Johannes C. Hoekendijk, *The Church Inside Out* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966).

[5] Among the more recent official documents in Roman Catholic theology guiding pastoral practices regarding in extremis are the instructions "On Admitting Other Christians to Eucharistic Communion" (*In Quibus Rerum Circumstantiis*) published by the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity on June 1, 1972 (Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1975], 554–559; the 1983 Code of Canon Law, paragraph 844, (online at http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_INDEX.HTM, (accessed December 1, 2019); the "Ecumenical Directory" of 1993 (online at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_25031993_principles-and-norms-on-ecumenism_en.html); and the "Guidelines for the Reception of Communion" issued by the US Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1996 (online at http://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/the-mass/order-of-mass/liturgy-of-the-eucharist/guidelines-for-the-reception-of-communion.cfm (accessed December 1, 2019)). See also Jeffrey T. Vanderwilt, *Communion with Non-Catholic Christians: Risks, Challenges, and Opportunities* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), esp. 39–48.

CHAPTER 36

Ecclesial Extroversion: On the Reform in the Current Pontificate

Sandra Arenas

Slowly and gradually the Roman Catholic Church is taking responsibility for what is appropriately called an institutional failure,[1] a failure that urges it to move from its own axis outward, in a process of significant extroversion; a failure that has pushed to the edge the trust and credibility of its internal structures, especially of its ministries and, thus, touches not only the legal, but also the sacramental, liturgical, and more genuinely spiritual. Taking responsibility for it places the church in a broad plan of necessary reforms.

To undertake this plan, it is essential to look at the reasons that make reform necessary. Our emphasis will be on the progressive loss of trust and credibility, which, although is due to several causes—analyzable from multiple angles—all seem to converge. For the purpose of this work, the angle of analysis will be the vital context of its author, namely a Roman Catholic and Chilean lay theologian. This peculiar place will provide local

[1] C. Schickendantz, "Fracaso institucional de un modelo teológico-cultural de Iglesia Factores sistémicos en la crisis de los abusos," *Teología y Vida* 60, no. 1 (2019): 9–39.

S. Arenas (✉)
Universidad Católica de Temuco, Temuco, Chile

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_36

indicators, with key theological reflections in the context of ecclesial reform. The epistemological assumption is that local churches inform the global church in institutional design as well as in its charismatic vitality.

Initially, data will be provided (1) on the degree of engagement and institutional trust of the Latin American and Chilean Catholic parishioners in recent years; (2) then we will succinctly examine Pope Francis' responses relating to the reasonableness of the loss of credibility in the church, within the margins of his ecclesial reform plan and finally (3), I will make a theological evaluation.

The Data

The Roman Catholic Church has been progressively losing credibility in Chile. This has been reflected in various measurements of public opinion for several years now. According to the National Bicentennial Survey of the Pontifical Catholic University (UC)/GfK Adimark (2016), social trust in the church dropped from 44% in 2006 to 24% in 2016.[2] A recent study confirms this perception: CADEM, in mid-August 2018, indicated that 80% of its respondents acknowledged having little/no trust in the institution; 70% of them declared themselves Catholics.[3] Thus, the aforementioned deterioration does not correspond only to persons outside the institution, but also *to a significant group within it*. What is this crisis? The CADEM survey assesses certain attributes of the church, the results questioned the church's solidarity (53%), adaptation to new times (66%), knowledge and concern for human needs (58%), fieldwork (60%), closeness (67%), humility (73%), and honesty and transparency (83%).[4]

This last survey, in August 2018, showed that, among the elite groups, the bishops have lost the most trust between 1988 and 2018, down from 58% to 18%. That value was measured with respect to presbyters only in

[2] Use the following link to access the surveys conducted by the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile and Adimark, https://encuestabicentenario.uc.cl/resultados/. To consult the result of the measurements of religious behavior in Chile in 2015–2016 see file:///C:/Users/Admin/Desktop/Encuesta-bicentenario-2016-Religio%CC%81n.pdf [accessed January 15, 2020].

[3] To view the CADEM website, see https://www.cadem.cl/sobre-cadem/. To access the complete CADEM August 2018, Study N° 238 survey, see https://www.cadem.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Track-PP-Jul-Sem1-N238-VF.pdf [accessed January 15, 2020].

[4] Ibidem.

CHAPTER 37

Synodality as a Key Component of the Pontificate of Pope Francis: The Difficult Way from Theory to Practice

Peter De Mey

From his very first exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (2013) Pope Francis was convinced that all levels of ecclesial life should be involved in the missionary endeavor (EG 27–33). It was especially needed to pay more attention to "the identity and mission of the laity in the Church" since they constitute "the vast majority of the people of God" (EG 102). In the speech he gave on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the institution of the Synod of Bishops, on November 18, 2015, Pope Francis used the term "synodality" to refer to the common responsibility of all the members of the people of God for the life of the Church.[1] On March 2, 2018, the International Theological Commission (ITC) published an extensive study on *Synodality in the Life and Mission of the Church*.[2] As with all

[1] This ceremony was one of the highlights of the second synod on the family. See http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2015/october/documents/papa-francesco_20151017_50-anniversario-sinodo.html (accessed February 27, 2020).

[2] http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_cti_20180302_sinodalita_en.html (accessed February 27, 2020).

P. De Mey (✉)
KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_37

documents from Rome its theoretical and practical values have to be critically investigated. First, however, it will be argued that synodality is deeply rooted in the ecclesiology of Vatican II.

The ITC and Pope Francis on the Conciliar Basis of Synodality

Right from its beginning, the ITC document situates synodality "in the teaching of Vatican II" (§ 6). In his recent *Letter to the Pilgrim People of God in Germany,* Pope Francis explains that synodality forms part of the "reception and further development" of Vatican II.[3] The ITC takes the conciliar basis of synodality to be "the ecclesiology of the People of God" for it "stresses the common dignity and mission of all the baptized, in exercising the variety and ordered richness of their charisms, their vocations and their ministries" (§ 6). In my view, the theology of synodality can better even be linked with the pattern, which the Council fathers used to describe the mission of the people of God as a whole and of the different categories within the people of God, that is, their taking part in the threefold office of Christ. Indeed, if one takes the mention of the messianic people in LG 9 as a brief hint to their sharing in the kingly office, then one can argue that LG 9–12 characterizes the Church as a whole as a priestly, prophetic and royal people. This is followed by descriptions of the specific way bishops (LG 25–27), priests (LG 28), and laity (LG 34–36) have their share in the *tria munera Christi.*

A key line in the attempt of the document to present the new theology of synodality as a faithful act of reception of Vatican II is found in § 9:

> In conformity with the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* Pope Francis remarks in particular that synodality "offers us the most appropriate framework for understanding the hierarchical ministry itself" and that, based on the

[3] *Schreiben von Papst Franziskus an das pilgernde Volk Gottes in Deutschland*, § 9. This letter was published on the symbolic date of June 29, 2019 in response to the joint plan of the German bishops' conference and the Central Committee of German Catholics to engage in a synodal process. See http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/de/letters/2019/documents/papa-francesco_20190629_lettera-fedeligermania.html (accessed February 27, 2020).

CHAPTER 38

Changing the Church Through Synodality

Brian P. Flanagan

One of the main aspects of Pope Francis's "radical ecclesiology of openness, inclusivity, and dialogue"[1] that is beginning to take shape in the Catholic Church, is the revival of the Second Vatican Council's hopes for a synodal church. Most prominently in the frequency and the new atmosphere of the meetings of the synod of bishops, Pope has set the church on a course to re-embrace synodality as the foundational principle of collective discernment and decision-making. This chapter surveys a particular contribution to that renewed, radical ecclesiology, a document from the International Theological Commission (ITC) that outlines the theology and practice of synodality in a way that reflects the priorities of Francis's ecclesiology.[2] Francis has pushed the Catholic Church towards "the path of synodality which God expects of the Church of the third millennium,"[3]

[1] Gerard Mannion, "Francis's Ecclesiological Revolution: A New Way of Being Church, a New Way of Being Pope." In Gerard Mannion, ed. *Pope Francis and the Future of Catholicism*: Evangelii Gaudium *and the Papal Agenda* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2017), 94.

[2] International Theological Commission, "Synodality in the Life and Mission of the Church," March 2, 2018.

[3] Pope Francis, "Address," Ceremony Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Institution of the Synod of Bishops, 17 October 2015.

B. P. Flanagan (✉)
Marymount University, Arlington, VA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_38

and while the ITC document is only one step forward in that path, an appropriation of the gift of synodality at all levels of the church will allow it to share the good news more authentically in the face of a democratic world, more ecumenically in relation to churches with longer histories of synodal structures, and more faithfully in expression of the vocation of all of the baptized. The further embrace of synodality, on the basis of this document, has the potential to lead to a wide renewal of synodal practices throughout the Catholic Church.

While the practices of synodality go back to the earliest days the church, the word itself is a more recent neologism.[4] In many ways, to be "synodal," that is, to involve Christians' call to "walk a path together" (from the Greek words "σύν", "with", and "ὁδός", "path"), is characteristic of the history of the pilgrim church. Since modern studies of synodality go back decades,[5] the ITC document harvests the fruits of that research as well as Pope Francis's recent priorities. It outlines the sources of synodality in scripture and tradition, a theology of synodality for today's church, its structures and institutions as they currently exist, and the need for a conversion to a spirituality and fuller practice of synodality for the life of the church since, as it repeats at least three times, synodality is the "*modus vivendi et operandi* of the Church."[6]

Like many other treatments of synodality, the ITC document roots its idea of synodality in both scriptural warrants and the continuing history of the church, particularly the shared forms of decision-making of the first millennium of Christianity. While drawing upon multiple biblical

[4] ITC, "Synodality," § 6.

[5] Among many sources, see especially Giordano Frosini, *Una Chiesa di Tutti: Sinodalità, partecipazione, e corresponsabilità* (Bologna: Edizione Dehoniane Bologna, 2014); International Congress of Canon Law, *La synodalité: la participation au gouvernement dans l'Église: actes du VIIe Congrès international de droit canonique, Paris, Unesco, 21–28 septembre 1990*, 2 vol. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1992); Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, "Synodality and Primacy during the First Millennium: Toward a Common Understanding in Service to the Unity of the Church," *Origins* 46/21 (Oct. 20, 2016) 328–31; Alberto Melloni and Silvia Scatena, eds., *Synod and Synodality: Theology, History, Canon Law and Ecumenism in New Contact* (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005); Gilles Routhier, "La synodalité dans l'Église locale," *Scripta theologica* 48 (2016): 687–706; Ormond Rush, "Inverting the Pyramid: The *Sensus Fidelium* in a Synodal Church," *Theological Studies* 78 (2017) 299–325; Antonio Spadaro and Carlos Galli, "La sinodalità nella vita e nella missione della Chiesa," *La Civiltà Cattolica* 169/II, no. 4039 (2018) 55–70.

[6] ITC, "Synodality," § 6, § 43, and § 70.

CHAPTER 39

Local Synodality: An Unnoticed Change

Radu Bordeianu

A significant change occurred in the first three centuries of the Church: the unique eucharistic assembly led by the bishop in the diocese transitioned into the Liturgy presided over by the priest in the parish. And yet, modern Orthodox ecclesiology tends to attribute no ecclesiological significance to the parish and continues to speak about synodality exclusively in episcopal terms. As Schmemann contends, "the process which transformed the original 'episcopal' structure of the local church into what we know today as parish […] although it represents one of the most radical changes that ever took place in the Church, remained, strange as it may seem, virtually unnoticed by ecclesiologists and canonists."[1] Based on this change in the life of the Church, I propose a theological change, namely shifting away from universal episcopal synodality[2] and focusing on

[1] Alexander Schmemann, "Towards a Theology of Councils," *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (1962): 177.

[2] While the 2016 Synod of Crete should have been an impetus for universal synodality, it in fact moderated Orthodox claims that synodality is its ecumenical charism, or even that it exists at all at the universal level, four Patriarchates having withdrawn shortly before the Council. Crete also radically challenged the Orthodox vision of Christian unity. Orthodox representatives to ecumenical dialogues claim that the ideal model of unity involves gathering

R. Bordeianu (✉)
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_39

synodality in the parish, diocese, and autocephalous Orthodox Church with emphasis on lay involvement.

The term "synod" refers primarily to a gathering of bishops who exercise their ministry together. It comes from the Greek words *syn* (with) and *odos* (way), and so suggests "walking together along the same path." Its etymology implies both that the Church remains pilgrim as it advances towards the Kingdom of God and that one cannot travel along this path in isolation. In a larger sense, "synodality" and its synonym, "conciliarity" refer not only to the episcopate, but to all the baptized members of the Church, as they exercise their responsibilities together.

Synodality is rooted in the communal character of the earlier ministry of Jesus Christ, who called the twelve to symbolize the entirety of Israel, and not just a select group to the exclusion of Jesus' other followers. These roots bore fruit most notably at the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem described in Acts 15: "Paul and Barnabas and some of the others were appointed [by the community in Antioch] to go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and the elders."[3] These delegates consulted along the way with other communities (Acts 15:3), and when they arrived in Jerusalem, "the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider this matter."[4] After Peter, Paul, and Barnabas spoke, James took the role of mouthpiece for the Council. Moreover, "the apostles and the elders, with the whole church"[5] chose *omothumadon*—"with one accord" (NKJV) or "unanimously" (NRSV)[6]—representatives to disseminate the decision of the Council, which was inspired by the Holy Spirit ("it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us").[7] This Apostolic Council became the (perhaps idealized) template for future councils, with emphasis on churches designating representatives, a process of consultation, plurality of voices represented at the council, inspiration by the Holy Spirit, unanimity (or maybe consensus), a conciliar decision, and its dissemination. Clearly, the

in the same synod and receiving Communion together. Unfortunately, this ideal of unity is often imposed as a condition for Orthodox-Catholic unity, when in fact its practical realization in world-wide Orthodox life is lacking.

[3] Acts 15:2.

[4] Acts 15:6.

[5] Acts 15:22.

[6] Acts 15:25. The distinction between unanimity and consensus will have to be discussed on a different occasion.

[7] Acts 15:28.

CHAPTER 40

Problems at the Periphery: A Productive Confusion in "The Speech That Got Pope Francis Elected."

Paul Lakeland

> *Evangelizing presupposes a desire in the Church to come out of herself. The Church is called to come out of herself and to go to the peripheries, not only geographically, but also the existential peripheries: the mystery of sin, of pain, of injustice, of ignorance and indifference to religion, of intellectual currents, and of all misery.* [Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio, Address to the College of Cardinals, 2013]

Among the many slogans with which Pope Francis has promoted his vision for the church, none is more likely to be quoted than his call for Christians, whom he has designated "missionary disciples," to go to the periphery. This phrase is to his plan to remake evangelization, what "the smell of the sheep" is to rethinking episcopacy, or "the field hospital" image is for ecclesiology. Indeed, so striking is the image of the periphery that it has already occasioned a number of appreciative studies of its

P. Lakeland (✉)
Fairfield's Center for Catholic Studies, Fairfield, CT, USA

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_40

impact.[1] All of them are careful to indicate that the notion of the periphery may be understood geographically, socioeconomically, psychologically, and existentially. Those at the margins may be so because they are in remote areas of the world, because they are poor and so rarely come to the attention of the centers of global Catholicism, because they are culturally or socially alienated from all things Catholic or Christian, or because they meet one or more of these criteria. The primary role of the church is to proclaim the good news, reaching out beyond the comfort zone of the local community of faith to those who are at one or other periphery, somehow on the margins, even perhaps marginalized.

Caroline Woo has pointed out that Pope Francis's first public use of the term "periphery" occurred in his address to the College of Cardinals in the days leading up to the conclave which chose him.[2] Many have suggested that it was this speech that in fact led to his election. Though its text has never been officially published, it was eventually released with his approval, using the handwritten notes he had given to Cardinal Jaime Ortega of Havana, Cuba. The four points that Bergoglio made recur throughout the subsequent years. Beginning by arguing that the Church should "take leave of itself and go to the peripheries," he added that he meant this in not only the geographical sense "but also the existential sense, manifested in the mystery of sin, pain, injustice and ignorance, among others," reported Cardinal Ortega. Bergoglio then went on to warn against a "self-referential" church whose thinking is a kind of "theological narcissism," and that such a "worldly" church ends up "living in itself, of itself, for itself." Finally, the cardinal soon to be elected pope said he expected the new pontiff to be "a man who, from the contemplation of

[1] Andrea Riccardi, *To the Margins: Pope Francis and the Mission of the Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2018); Pasquale Ferrara, "The Concept of Periphery in Pope Francis' Discourse: A Religious Alternative to Globalization?" *Movement Politics and Policy for Unity* at: http://www.mppu.org/en/archive/point-of-view/910-the-concept-of-periphery-in-pope-francis-discourse-a-religious-alternative-to-globalization.html (accessed February 17, 2020) Richard R. Gaillardetz, "The Francis Moment: A New Kairos for Catholic Ecclesiology." Presidential address, *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, 69 (2014) at: https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ctsa/article/view/5509 (accessed February 17, 2020); T. Bilocura, "Pope Francis, Christian Mission, and the Church of St. Francis," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 37, no. 3, (2013) at https://doi.org/10.1177%2F239693931303700309 (accessed February 17, 2020).

[2] "Periphery," in *A Pope Francis Lexicon*, edited by Joshua J. McElwee and Cindy Wooden (Collegeville, Minn., Liturgical, 2018), 142.

CHAPTER 41

Milestones for the Next Council: Conciliar Experiences and Global Synodality

Luc Forestier

Before formulating his conclusion, in the last sentences of his forceful little book about the last three councils of the Roman Catholic Church, John O'Malley proffered a caveat and a prediction: "Will there be another ecumenical council? If tradition has any force in the Catholic church, the answer has to be a resounding affirmative. But, as the above considerations make clear, serious questions about its location, its membership, about how it might handle the large number of bishops and other potential participants, and about the precise form it might take hang in the air. Stay tuned."[1] While the exact meaning of the word "ecumenical" may of course be ambiguous, O'Malley's main assertion challenges ecclesiologists. How can we imagine the future "ecumenical" council, that is, the next worldwide meeting of church leaders in order to outline changes in the life of the churches, both on pastoral and doctrinal levels?

[1] John O'Malley, *When Bishops Meet. An Essay Comparing Trent, Vatican I, and Vatican II* (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Belknap Press, 2019), 209.

L. Forestier (✉)
Catholic University of Paris, Paris, France

M. D. Chapman, V. Latinovic (eds.), *Changing the Church*,
Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53425-7_41

In 2005, under Benedict XVI's pontificate, the principal conviction of Gilles Routhier about this issue was a historical one: "To put it bluntly, thinking about the holding of a council in the present situation puts us in such a situation of invention that recourse to history, which John XXIII, who had studied the history of councils, liked to call 'mistress of wisdom', seems necessary today to make our imaginations more fruitful."[2] In his contribution, Routhier went back to the first centuries of Christianity, looking for criteria that would enable us to imagine new forms of conciliarity for different families of churches.

Yet the history of the 1925 anniversary of the first ecumenical council of Nicaea (325) may help us to discover a concrete step toward this imagination of new conciliar institutions which the churches need today, in order to go further in the mission they receive from God.

1925, A Separated Anniversary

In the history of the Ecumenical Movement, the first meeting of *Life and Work* in Stockholm (1925) is always praised as a decisive step toward the constitution of the World Council of Churches in 1949. For example, the prominent French Protestant leader Wilfrid Monod (1867–1943) spoke about his participation in this meeting as the "the holiest and most victorious joy" of his whole life.[3] Yet, from the Catholic side, the impressions were mixed as is revealed in the long article in *Les Études*, a journal edited by the Jesuits since 1856. The absence of doctrinal agreement was severely denounced: despite a vague religiosity, "it is untrue that the 600 members of the Conference were united by the same faith in the same Christ"[4] since, sixteen centuries after the Council of Nicaea, they wanted to remain completely silent about any doctrinal issues concerning the divinity of Christ.[5]

[2] Gilles Routhier, "Le rêve d'un nouveau concile," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 93, no. 2 (2005): 247–65, here 265.

[3] Laurent Gagnebin, "Wilfred Monod et l'œcuménisme," *Autres Temps. Les cahiers du christianisme social* 23 (1989): 50–53, here 51.

[4] Paul Dudon, "La conférence chrétienne de Stockholm (19–30 août 1925)," *Études*, 185 (1925): 652.

[5] In a book written when he was young, Charles Journet (1891–1975) stated that Protestants only promoted "a humanism coloured by evangelism". Quoted by Daniel Moulinet, "Réactions catholiques face aux tentatives d'union des Églises au début du xx^{e} siècle," *Histoire et missions chrétiennes* 13 (2010): 137–54, here 151.