Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2001

The Magisterium and Theologians in the Writings of Avery Robert Dulles

Darius W. Jankiewicz

Andrews University, darius@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jankiewicz, Darius W., "The Magisterium and Theologians in the Writings of Avery Robert Dulles" (2001). *Dissertations*. 69.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/69>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/69>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS IN THE
WRITINGS OF AVERY ROBERT DULLES

A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Dariusz W. Jankiewicz

July 2001

UMI Number: 3019342

UMI Microform 3019342

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS IN THE
WRITINGS OF AVERY ROBERT DULLES

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Dariusz W. Jankiewicz

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Faculty Adviser,
Raoul Dederen
Professor of Theology, Emeritus

J. H. Denis Fortin
Associate Professor of Theology

George R. Knight
Professor of Church History

Miroslav M. Kiš
Professor of Ethics

John T. Ford, csc
Professor of Theology
The Catholic University of America

Director, Ph.D./Th.D. Program
Randall W. Younker

Dean, SDA Theological Seminary
John K. McVay

Date approved

ABSTRACT

**THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS IN THE
WRITINGS OF AVERY ROBERT DULLES**

by

Dariusz W. Jankiewicz

Faculty Adviser: Raoul Dederen

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

**Title: THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS IN THE WRITINGS
OF AVERY ROBERT DULLES**

Name of researcher: Dariusz W. Jankiewicz

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Raoul Dederen, Dr. es Sc. Morales (Ph.D.)

Date completed: July 2001

This study explores Avery Robert Dulles's views regarding the nature of doctrinal authority in the Roman Catholic Church, and particularly the relationship between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians, with special focus on the apparent disparity between his early post-Vatican II views and his recent views.

To attain this goal, Dulles's convictions were considered in the context of his doctrine of the Church, and, whenever relevant, from the perspective of his overall theological system, without neglecting the presuppositions undergirding his ideas and the methodologies used to support them. To highlight contrasting positions, three periods are studied consecutively: the earliest writings, i.e., those published before the end of the Second Vatican Council; the post-Vatican II publications, with particular emphasis on the seventies; and, finally, his most recent writings, with specific emphasis on the nineties.

A brief introduction, delineating the objectives, method, and limitations of the study, is followed by an historical survey of developments in regard to doctrinal authority in the Church, with special emphasis upon the respective roles of the episcopate and theologians. The survey demonstrated that the Christian Church has struggled with the issue of doctrinal authority from its inception. This struggle intensified following the Second Vatican Council.

Chapters 2 and 3 contrast Dulles's early and recent thinking concerning the relationship between the magisterium and theologians. The early Dulles refuted the official view that revelation was mediated by a specially commissioned class of individuals, who alone were to be regarded as authoritative in the Church, and that the role of theologians was to reflect upon and defend authoritative statements. The recent Dulles believes that the remedy to the widespread damage wrought by post-Vatican II Catholic theology includes acceptance of the authority of the magisterium in its current form by Roman Catholic theologians and the admission of their dependence on authoritative Catholic sources.

The final chapter summarizes Dulles's views and suggests the reasons for his shift.

To Edyta-
-who knows the ways of the Wise

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
1. THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	10
Introduction	10
A History of the Relationship Between the Magisterium and Theologians	11
The Primitive Church	11
The Early Church to the End of the Middle Ages	14
From Trent to the Mid-Twentieth Century.....	20
The First Vatican Council	23
The Modernist Crisis.....	25
World War I to the Second Vatican Council.....	29
The Second Vatican Council	32
The Post-Conciliar Years	37
Avery Dulles: The Man and the Context	41
The American Roman Catholic Church	42
The Society of Jesus and Its Post-Vatican II Transformation	44
Avery Dulles's Academic Career	47
2. THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS: PRE-VATICAN II AND EARLY POST-VATICAN II VIEWS	50
Introduction	50
Catholic Ecclesiology in the Twentieth Century.....	50
Revelation.....	51
Ecclesiology.....	52
The Pre-Vatican II Ecclesiology of Avery Dulles.....	53
Rejection of Liberalism and a Conversion Experience.....	53
The Nature of Revelation	55
The Nature of the Church.....	56
Teaching Authority in the Church	57

Avery Dulles and the Second Vatican Council	59
Towards the Second Vatican Council	59
The Second Vatican Council	60
Hermeneutics of Discontinuity	61
A Closed Society versus an Open Society	62
Dulles's Critique of Neo-Scholasticism	64
Avery Dulles's Post-Vatican II Ecclesiology	67
The Nature of Revelation	67
Beyond the Neo-Scholastic Conception of Revelation	68
The Concept of Revelation	69
The Nature of the Church	71
The Church as the Pilgrim People of God	72
The Church as Sacrament	74
The Church as a Community of Disciples	79
The Nature of Doctrinal Authority	81
Christianity: A Religion of Authority	81
The Nature of True Authority	83
The Structure of Authority: A Pluralistic Theory	84
The Historicity of the Magisterium	86
The New Testament	88
The Patristic Era	88
The Middle Ages	89
From the Counter-Reformation to the Second Vatican Council	89
The Second Vatican Council and the 'Ius Divinum' Issue	90
Avery Dulles's Proposal of Two Magisteria	93
Hierarchical and Theological Magisteria	93
The Need for Two Magisteria	95
The Hierarchical Magisterium	98
The Task of the Hierarchical Magisterium	98
The Bishops and the 'Sensus Fidelium'	100
The Theological Magisterium	103
A Historical and Theological Rationale	104
The Historical Precedence	104
The Ambivalence of Apostolic Succession	105
Regarding the 'Charisma Veritatis Certum'	108
About the Canonical Mission	109
Qualifications for Membership	110
The Nature of Theological Enterprise	112
Hierarchical-Scholastic Theology	112
Kerygmatic-Biblical Theology	113
Secular-Dialogic Theology	113
The Task of the Theological Magisterium	115
Formative Function	115
Corrective Function	117

On the Working Relationship Between the Two Magisteria	119
Three Basic Approaches.....	120
The Principles of a Dialectical Relationship	121
The Responsibilities of the Bishops	121
The Responsibilities of Theologians	123
Avery Dulles's Early Ecumenical Perspective.....	124
Conclusion.....	128
 3. THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANs:	
RECENT VIEW, THE NINETIES ON.....	131
Introduction	131
The Disputed Legacy of the Second Vatican Council.....	134
Avery Dulles and the Hermeneutics of Continuity.....	138
The Faces of American Catholicism.....	139
Traditionalism	140
Liberalism	140
Dulles as a Traditionalist	142
Avery Dulles's Ecclesiology from the Late Eighties Onward	143
The Nature of Revelation	143
The Nature of Propositional Revelation	144
Revelation in Dulles's Recent Writings	146
The Nature of the Church.....	152
The Models' Method: A Re-evaluation.....	153
The Church as the Body of Christ.....	155
An Ecclesiology from Above.....	156
The Nature of Ecclesiastical Authority	159
The Task of the Church	162
The Nature and Task of the Doctrinal Magisterium.....	164
The Nature and Structure of the Roman Catholic Magisterium.....	164
Apostolic Succession and Charisms of the Episcopal Office...	165
Papal Primacy and Collegiality.....	167
The Task of the Magisterium.....	170
The Transmission and Preservation of the Deposit of Faith.....	170
Hierarchical Mediation.....	171
Doctrinal Teaching	172
The Preservation of Unity Through Jurisdiction.....	177
Theologians in the Church	178
The State of Post-Vatican II Theology.....	179
Constitutive Characteristics of Catholic Theology	181
Catholicity and Catholicism.....	182
The Evangelical Dimension of Theology	183
Basic Principles of Catholic Theology	185
Respect for Reason.....	185
Missionary Universalism.....	185
Ecclesial Context.....	186

Differentiated Unity	187
Continuity with the Past	187
The Sense of the Faithful and the Consensus Principle	188
Fidelity to the Magisterium	189
'Ex Corde Ecclesiae' and Canonical Mission.....	190
The Issues of Dissent.....	193
Dulles's View on the Future of Catholic Theology	195
University Theology.....	195
Seminary Theology	196
On the Dialogue Between the Magisterium and Theologians.....	198
From Polemics to Loyalty	200
Critique of the Contemporary Notion of Dialogue.....	201
Avery Dulles's Ecumenical Perspective	203
Conclusion.....	206
 5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	 209
Introduction	209
A Summary of Findings: A Study in Contrast	210
The Magisterium and Doctrinal Authority in the Church	210
Early View	210
Recent View.....	213
The 'Sensus Fidelium'	215
Early View: Revelation and Ecclesiology	216
Early View on the 'Sensus Fidelium'	217
Recent View: Revelation and Ecclesiology.....	218
Recent View on the 'Sensus Fidelium'	221
The Role of Theologians	222
Dulles's Recent Attitude Toward Vatican II.....	224
Appreciation and Criticisms.....	230
Attempting to Understand Dulles's Shift.....	236
The Breakdown of Religious Life: The Unforeseen	
Effects of Vatican II	237
Secularism and Relativism	241
The Issue of Dissent.....	244
A Final Word.....	248
 SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	 249

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AER</i>	<i>The American Ecclesiastical Review</i>
<i>CC</i>	<i>Christian Century</i>
<i>CE</i>	<i>The Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
<i>CM</i>	<i>The Catholic Mind</i>
<i>CS</i>	<i>Chicago Studies</i>
<i>CTSA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America</i>
<i>DFT</i>	<i>Dictionary of Fundamental Theology</i>
<i>DR</i>	<i>Downside Review</i>
<i>FCSQ</i>	<i>Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly</i>
<i>FH</i>	<i>From the Housetops</i>
<i>FT</i>	<i>First Things</i>
<i>HPR</i>	<i>Homiletic and Pastoral Review</i>
<i>HQ</i>	<i>The Hartford Quarterly</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JES</i>	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
<i>LIC</i>	<i>Long Island Catholic</i>
<i>LL</i>	<i>The Living Light</i>
<i>LS</i>	<i>Loiuvain Studies</i>
<i>NCE</i>	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
<i>NCR</i>	<i>National Catholic Reporter</i>
<i>NCREg</i>	<i>National Catholic Register</i>
<i>NOR</i>	<i>New Oxford Review</i>
<i>NYT</i>	<i>New York Times</i>

<i>OC</i>	<i>One in Christ</i>
<i>PR</i>	<i>Pro Ecclesia</i>
<i>PT</i>	<i>Philosophy and Theology</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Spirituality Today</i>
<i>TD</i>	<i>Theology Digest</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TT</i>	<i>Theology Today</i>
<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In completing this dissertation I would like to express my gratitude to a number of persons who in one way or another contributed to the completion of my work. First of all, I would like to thank my parents, Elizabeth and Jan Jankiewicz, for their enduring support of this endeavor. I wish to express my gratitude to my committee members: Dr. Raoul Dederen (chairman), Dr. George Knight, and Dr. Denis Fortin. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Dederen. His expertise and endless hours of work on my manuscripts made the success of this project possible. I will always remember him as a person with a big heart, for whom my spiritual and intellectual growth was of utmost importance.

Without the willing help of the library staff, my work would have been much more frustrating. I would like to especially thank Sandra White, who spent many hours searching for books and articles in libraries all over the world. Also, I would like to express my thanks to Judy Nelson, Terry Robertson, Josip Horonic, Marilyn Gane, and Sharon Straw for their continuing and courteous assistance. I am also grateful to Bonnie Proctor for her constant helpfulness, despite a busy schedule. Special thanks to Mabel Bowen, the Ph.D./Th.D. secretary at the Seminary, for going above and beyond the call of duty. Her support and encouragement were invaluable. David and Carol Tasker, fellow doctoral students, also deserve special mention for encouraging me in difficult moments.

I am also grateful to the South Pacific Division, and Dr. Barry Oliver in particular, for the financial support that made this project possible.

My deepest gratitude goes to my wife, Edyta. Without her constant support and encouragement this project would not have begun and would never have been completed. The many hours she spent correcting and polishing my English grammar, as well as running the household and caring for our two little girls, Caitlin and Ashley, are an invaluable contribution to this work.

Finally, I give thanks to the Lord, who gave me daily strength to accomplish what often seemed impossible.

INTRODUCTION

The Contemporary Crisis of Authority within the Roman Catholic Church

In the last several hundred years the history of Western culture has been marked by persistent confrontations between modern thought and the beliefs and teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. From the sixteenth century on, Roman Catholicism began to move in a direction opposed to the popular culture of an increasingly secularized society.¹ While society as a whole, influenced by the liberal spirit first of the Renaissance and then of the Age of Reason, was becoming self-critical, democratic, and more pluralistic, the Roman Catholic Church responded to the challenge by becoming increasingly oligarchic and authoritarian.² This confrontation culminated in the modernist crisis with the Church declaring open war on modern thought³ which offered society an “opportunity to penetrate, to assert [its] views and to disseminate them in the atmosphere of mutual respect.”⁴ Eventually, Catholic distrust of modernity and its reassertion of autocratic institutionalism

¹Langdon Gilkey, *Catholicism Confronts Modernity* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974), 36.

²Roger Aubert, *The Church in a Secularized Society*, The Christian Centuries Series (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 5:58-60. The definition of papal infallibility during the Vatican I Council (1869-1870) was essentially the Church’s response to the challenges and insecurities of the rampant liberalism of the 19th century.

³Protestantism, according to Gilkey, avoided such a dramatic showdown with modernity. Rather than confronting it, it “has in one way or another, both successfully and unsuccessfully, sought for two hundred years or more to deal with, absorb, and reinterpret the culture of modernity.” Gilkey, 34-5.

⁴Aubert, 50, 52.

resulted in a gradual erosion of the authority that the Roman Catholic Church had been seeking to preserve. This process has shown no sign of subsiding even in recent years.¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that the issue of authority in and of the Church was one of the issues debated at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965).² The main items on the Council's agenda proposed a "massive reaffirmation of all the theological, moral, economic, political, and cultural positions adopted by the popes of the modern era."³ The drafts of the conciliar documents presented to the bishops during the first session of the Council and prepared under the scrutiny of the conservative elements of the Roman Curia, reflected this agenda.⁴ In the name of *aggiornamento*, they were subsequently rejected by the majority of the Council fathers.⁵ This rejection, as well as Pope John XXIII's insistence that the Council concentrate on pastoral rather than dogmatic issues, signaled the willingness of the assembled Roman Catholic leadership to face and respond to the challenges of modern culture and to review the issue of teaching authority in the Church.⁶

¹One of the latest signs of the ongoing struggle within the Roman Catholic Church is an apostolic letter entitled *Ad tuendam fidem* [To Defend the Faith] released by Pope John Paul II on June 30, 1998, and published in English in *Origins* 28 (1998): 113-16. For a commentary see Francis A. Sullivan, "A New Obstacle to Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue," *America*, August 1, 1998, 6-7, and James H. Provost, "Safeguarding the Faith," *America*, August 1, 1998, 8-12.

²Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Ecclesial and Cultural Roles of Theology," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society (CTSA)* 40 (1985): 22; Giuseppe Alberigo, "The Announcement of the Council from the Security of the Fortress to the Lure of the Quest," in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995), 1:14.

³Komonchak, 22.

⁴Henri de Lubac, a prominent Catholic theologian, commented that the texts were controlled by "the rules of a strict and shallow scholasticism, concerned almost exclusively with defense and lacking in discernment, tending to condemn all that did not fit perfectly with its own perspective." *A Theologian Speaks* (Los Angeles: Twin Circle Publishing, 1985), 7.

⁵Giuseppe Alberigo, "The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies (JES)* 19 (1982): 138; Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)," in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995), 356.

⁶Gary MacEoin, *What Happened at Rome?* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), 17.

This dramatic shift was clearly reflected in the new drafts provided for the examination of the gathered bishops, this time put together with the help of a select group of Roman Catholic theologians, many of whom had been under suspicion in pre-conciliar times.¹ The new drafts spoke to the contemporary problems facing the Church, and the thorny issue of authority was often brought to the fore of discussions. Although the documents of the Council, and more particularly the constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*, did not challenge papal primacy as defined by *Pastor aeternus* of the First Vatican Council (1869-1870),² they “appreciably corrected the hierarchical and authoritarian perspective of modern Catholicism.”³

Many believers, particularly theologians, welcomed these developments, perceiving them as the beginning of a new era of freedom in which the bishops could not “claim for themselves the totality of the teaching power.”⁴ The post-conciliar years, however, evidenced the Church unable to deal effectively with the innovative changes suggested by Vatican II. Ten years after the Council, Langdon Gilkey pointed out that Vatican II was really the first time that Catholicism

tried to absorb the effects of this whole vast modern development from the Enlightenment to the present in a short period between 1963 and 1973! Thus all the spiritual, social, and technological forces that have structured and transformed the modern history of the West have suddenly, and without much preparation, impinged forcefully on her life, and they have had to be comprehended, reinterpreted, and dealt with by Catholicism in one frantic decade.⁵

¹The writings of theologians such as Yves Congar, Karl Rahner, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Henri de Lubac, Marie Dominique Chenu, and John Courtney Murray influenced the authors of the Vatican II Council documents. Herbert Vorgrimler, “Karl Rahner: The Theologian’s Contribution,” in *Vatican II Revisited*, ed. Alberic Stacpoole (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986), 33-4.

²*Lumen gentium* 3.18, 22, 23, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 37-8, 43-4; See also the *Nota Explicativa Praevia* which was appended to *Lumen gentium* (98-101).

³Alberigo, “The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II,” 141.

⁴Avery Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma* (New York: Doubleday, 1971), 97.

⁵Gilkey, 35.

The years since the Council have been marked by constant conflict between the centralized power of the Roman magisterium¹ and theologians.² As Peter Hebblethwaite suggested, the problem may have originated with the documents of Vatican II themselves, which, he contended, were ambiguous about Church authority. While they allowed for new expressions of doctrinal authority, as well as a new role for the faithful in formulating the doctrinal stance of the Church, they nevertheless reasserted the formulations of *Pastor aeternus* regarding papal prerogatives.³ This ambiguity resulted in confusion as the documents of the Council were interpreted in diverse ways, depending on the point of reference of the interpreter. What theologians “stressed in their readings of Vatican II was not always what pastors stressed in theirs. . . . Misunderstanding and collision were therefore, in the end, unavoidable.”⁴

Despite the problems that the Roman Catholic Church has faced in the aftermath of the Second Vatican Council, these decades have been particularly productive for the development of Catholic theology, especially in the areas of biblical studies and ecclesiology. Numerous theologians, sensing an increase in theological freedom, spread their wings, taking Catholic theology to new speculative heights.

¹In 1993, William H. Shannon complained that, despite the proclamations of the Vatican II Council, a “high” centralist ecclesiology permeates the recently published (in French) *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. See his “The Catechism of the Catholic Church,” *America*, June 5, 1993, 7; cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1994). See also Edward Schillebeeckx, *Church: The Human Story of God* (New York: Crossroads, 1991), 208-09, who finds fault with the renewed efforts toward the centralization of the Church in the post-Vatican years.

²One of the most articulate expressions of the dissatisfaction of theologians with the current situation in the Church is a book co-edited by Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler, eds., *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* (San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1986).

³Peter Hebblethwaite, *The Runaway Church: Post-Conciliar Growth or Decline* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 103-04; Charles R. Morris, *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church* (New York: Random House, 1997), 333.

⁴Hebblethwaite, 104; Avery Dulles, “Papal Authority in Roman Catholicism,” in *A Pope for All Christians*, ed. Peter J. McCord (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 55.

Avery Robert Dulles

Avery Robert Dulles, a conservative Catholic theologian, has attained a position of considerable eminence within Roman Catholicism. He is one of the most prolific American authors of the post-Vatican II period¹ and has taken a most active part in the dialogue between the magisterium and theologians.

The issue of doctrinal authority within the Church, and consequently the relationship between the magisterium and theologians, became prominent in Dulles's writings soon after the Second Vatican Council. His pre-Vatican II writings reflect a manualist approach to the issue, characteristic of the Neo-Scholastic Roman Catholic theology of the first half of the twentieth century. In those years Dulles viewed the Catholic Church as a *societas perfecta*, a countercultural fortress where teaching authority flowed from the pope to the rest of the Church.²

Dulles's early post-Vatican II views were characterized by a progressive rendering of the Council's teachings, which, he believed, allowed for "new styles of teaching authority."³ The Council's depiction of the Church as the "People of God," as well as its emphasis on the *sensus fidelium* (the sense of the faithful), encouraged him to advise that theologians be no longer simply agents of the magisterium, playing merely an apologetic role and defending "what has already become official teaching," but that they should also have an active role in teaching doctrine.⁴

¹See pp. 46-9 below for a more detailed description of Dulles's academic career.

²See Avery Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946), 97-104.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 97; idem, *A Church to Believe In* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1982), 145. Patrick W. Carey places Dulles with other progressive Catholic theologians who joined David Tracy, another noted Roman Catholic scholar, "in accepting and celebrating reform, revision, and pluralism within unity as fundamental Catholic values." *The Roman Catholics* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993), 144.

⁴Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 98.

More recently, however, it appears that Dulles has chosen to distance himself from his earlier views on these issues. He now advocates the view that the hierarchical magisterium is the only teaching office of the Church, and that theologians are to submit to and be guided by it.¹

Statement and Justification of Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore Dulles's views regarding the nature of doctrinal authority in the Church, and particularly, the relationship between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians in the Roman Catholic Church.

Dulles's work has been selected for several reasons. First, the question of the relationship between the magisterium and theologians continues to be a major struggle within the Roman Catholic Church. Although the early post-Vatican II enthusiasm may have subsided, mainly because of the current re-centralization of the Church, the problem has by no means disappeared.²

Second, Avery Dulles is undoubtedly one of the most prominent American ecclesialogists of the post-Vatican II era. A gifted and prolific writer, he currently holds the Laurence J. McGinley Chair in Religion and Society at Fordham University. Since the vast majority of his writings [some 400 hundred articles and 20 books], in one way or another, deal with major ecclesiological themes within the Roman Catholic communion, it seems most relevant to research his work for the purpose of understanding the problem of the relationship between the magisterium and theologians.

¹Avery Dulles, *The Craft of Theology* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1992), 166-67.

²See the noted lecture given by Archbishop John R. Quinn at Oxford University on June 29, 1996, entitled "The Exercise of the Primacy," as well as the responses of several theologians, published in a volume edited by Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, *The Exercise of the Primacy* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998); Küng and Swidler, eds., *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* George A. Kelly, "A Battle the Vatican Cannot Afford to Lose," *Inside the Vatican*, May 1999, 29-34. For a discussion regarding the current issues facing the Church, see pp. 37-41 below.

Finally, despite careful research, I found no in-depth research work focusing specifically on the topic of this dissertation project, i.e., the relationship between the magisterium and theologians. A study by John F. Russell, completed in 1978, compares Dulles's writings with those of Gabriel Moran on the issue of revelation.¹ In 1989, Joseph Egan wrote a comparative dissertation dealing with fundamental theology, where he evaluated the writings of several scholars, including Avery Dulles.² Finally, in 1997, Michael R. Inman attempted to assess the validity of constructing a theology on the basis of existential principles. In this context he deals with the existentialism of John Macquarrie and appraises contemporary Catholic and Protestant ecclesiologists in the light of existentialist principles. His chosen authors were Avery Dulles and Donald Bloesch.³ To my knowledge, only two dissertations to date have been devoted exclusively to Dulles's views, neither of which addresses the apparent shift in his ecclesiology. The first, written in 1989, deals mostly with ecumenical issues.⁴ The second, completed in 2000, explores Dulles's views on doctrinal development.⁵

Limitations

To achieve the purpose of this dissertation, it will be necessary to set forth Dulles's ecclesiology without losing sight of his understanding of the doctrine of revelation.

¹John F. Russell, "The Development of Theology of Revelation in the United States in the Decade after *Dei Verbum*: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Theological Writings of Avery Dulles, S.J. and Gabriel Moran, F.S.C." (S.T.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1978).

²Joseph Egan, "The Nature of Fundamental Theology: A Critical Study of the Works of Avery Dulles, Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, Gerald O'Collins and David Tracy" (S.T.D. dissertation, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1989).

³Michael R. Inman, "The Existentialism of John Macquarrie: Its Implications for Modern Theology and Ecclesiology" (Ph.D. dissertation, Duquesne University, 1997).

⁴Anne-Marie Rose Kirmse, "The Church and the Churches— A Study of Ecclesiological and Ecumenical Developments in the Writings of Avery Dulles, S.J." (Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1989).

⁵Richard Herman Warneck, "Avery Dulles's Advocacy of Reformulation of Dogma and Doctrinal Development" (Ph.D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, 2000).

The exposition of Avery Dulles's ecclesiology and epistemology will be based on an examination of the numerous published works directly relevant to this dissertation. Some unpublished materials, as well as information obtained during a personal interview on March 5, 2001, have also been considered. Some difficulties arise from the fact that Dulles continues to publish. I have researched his books and articles through to mid-2000, the last major work being *The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II*, published in 1999.¹ To highlight contrasting positions, three periods are studied consecutively: the earliest writings, i.e., those published before the end of the Second Vatican Council; the post-Vatican II publications, with particular emphasis on the seventies; and, finally, his most recent writings, with specific emphasis on the nineties.

It is not my purpose to posit value judgment as to the orthodoxy of Dulles's theological views, nor to evaluate his positions, by comparing them with official Roman Catholic teachings, as presented for instance in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and *The Code of Canon Law*, or the views of other theologians. While such comparisons may occur, they are made for the purpose of highlighting the main features of Dulles's own position. His views alone remain the main focus of my research and concern.

Other limitations concern the use of primary sources. One should not expect a coverage of the entire scope of Dulles's theology. Particular effort has been exerted to concentrate on issues directly related to the problem of the relationship between the magisterium and theologians in the Roman Catholic Church. The reader, therefore, should not expect a detailed discussion on related issues such as the relationship between the papacy and the episcopate, the problem of infallibility, the issue of doctrinal development, theological norms and methods, or Dulles's involvement in ecumenical matters. Likewise, an in-depth treatment of his views on revelation would require separate research. Only those aspects of revelation that are immediately relevant to this dissertation have been retained.

¹Avery Dulles, *The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999).

Finally, this dissertation does not purport to provide a rigorous exegesis and explanation of relevant biblical, patristic, or magisterial sources. Instead, I intend to explore how Dulles's starting point and theological assumptions influenced his understanding of the biblical and ecclesiastical documents pertaining to this study.

CHAPTER 1

MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIANS: A HISTORICAL
PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Few issues are more enduring in the Christian Church than the problem of doctrinal authority. Questions such as Who decides what is true teaching? What is the nature of the official teaching authority? have been the source of controversy from the inception of Christianity. While the problem of doctrinal authority shows up in every Christian confession,¹ it is particularly evident within the Roman Catholic communion with its doctrinal magisterium.

The issue of doctrinal authority within the Roman Catholic Church and more particularly the relationship between the magisterium and theologians is the subject of this dissertation. The nature of this relationship has been variously interpreted during different periods of Christian history. In spite of many attempts to establish guidelines for the relationship between these two orders, issues such as the membership of the authoritative magisterium, as well as the doctrinal authority of theological teachers and what part they play in defining the doctrinal stance of the Church, have never been satisfactorily or definitely resolved. As a result, friction and hostility have often developed between these two bodies, at times leading to major rifts. In the wake of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) the problem has become especially acute, prompting Yves Congar² to observe

¹Jürgen Moltmann notes that “the question of teaching authority arises in every church, including the Protestant and Orthodox churches, and . . . divides many churches from each other.” Jürgen Moltmann, foreword to *Who Has the Say in the Church?* ed. Jürgen Moltmann and Hans Küng (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), vii.

²Yves Congar (1904-1995) is rightly considered by many as “the most important theologian of the structure of the church in this century,” and his influence is “still very

that “the Catholic Church no longer presents a monolithic unity.”¹ A brief exposition of the historical development of this relationship should provide a fitting background that should help in understanding Avery Dulles’s stance on this issue.

A History of the Relationship Between the Magisterium and Theologians

It is difficult to discuss the relationship between the magisterium and theologians in the earliest history of the Christian Church since these designations are the product of later historical developments. The extant New Testament writings do not provide much information as they never formally addressed this specific question. One may construe, however, general ideas regarding the doctrinal leadership in the New Testament Church.

The Primitive Church

Throughout the New Testament, Paul’s writings most prominently deal with doctrinal leadership in the primitive Church. The apostle addresses this issue in most of his writings, but it is generally accepted that the *locus classicus* is found in 1 Cor 12-14.² In

Paul’s understanding, the Christian Church is a community of believers who are subject to much in force today.” In the years leading to the Second Vatican Council, Congar broke new ground in Catholic ecclesiology, specifically in the area of the nature and role of the episcopal magisterium and laity. Thomas F. O’Meara, “Ecumenist of Our Times: Yves Congar,” *Mid-Stream* 27 (1988): 70, 71, 76. In 1970, Michael Winter noted that “of all the theologians alive today, none has influenced the Church’s thinking as much as Fr Congar.” “Masters in Israel: VI. Yves Congar,” *Clergy Review* 55 (1970): 281.

¹Yves Congar, “Trials and Promises of Ecumenism,” in *Voices of Unity*, ed. Ans J. van der Bent (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981), 24. Elsewhere, Congar notes that “the period since the [Second Vatican] Council has been marked by argument, the breaking up of what had represented Catholic unity up to and including Pius XII.” Yves Congar, “A Brief History of the Forms of the Magisterium,” in *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 327.

²Reference to this epistle will suffice for the purpose of this dissertation. Scholars such as Ernst Käsemann and Eduard Schweizer persuasively argue that because of the plenitude of information in Paul’s letter, the organization of the Church of Corinth could serve as a model of the New Testament church. For a discussion on Church order in Corinth, see Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SMC Press, 1964), 63-94, and Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (London: SMC Press, 1961), 89-104.

Christ. In order to facilitate the proclamation of the gospel and the propagation of the Christian faith, Christ promised to remain with his followers through the presence of the Holy Spirit.¹ This presence is manifested through a variety of charismatic gifts, the purpose of which is to build up the Church.² Paul likens this community to a “body” in which different members have various functions or charisms and which work together for the benefit of the community. It would seem that in 1 Cor 12:28 Paul divides his list of spiritual gifts into two parts. The first part, in which he clearly mentions the individual functions of apostles, prophets, and teachers, is followed by a seemingly random list of gifts.³ While commentators disagree on the importance of Paul’s sequence, particularly regarding the first three gifts,⁴ there seems to be general agreement that these three stand apart from the others. The individuals fulfilling each of these three functions seem to be charged with doctrinal leadership in the early Church.⁵

¹Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the First Three Centuries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), 56.

²According to Käsemann, the concept of *charisma* is of primary importance to Paul: it informs his entire ecclesiology. It was Paul who first used the term and introduced it into theological vocabulary. For issues related to the concept of *charisma* and its development within Paul’s theology, see Käsemann, 64 passim.

³“God has appointed first of all apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, also those having gifts of healing, those able to help others, those with gifts of administration, and those speaking in different tongues” (NIV).

⁴Some, like Campenhausen, hold that placing the gift of apostleship at the beginning of the list “undoubtedly carries the additional sense of an objective precedence.” Campenhausen, 61. Marlon Soards, on the other hand, sounds a note of caution, claiming that the way in which the Greek ordinals are formulated does not indicate Paul’s intentions. Ranking the gifts according to their importance, he believes, would militate against Paul’s intentions to correct the Corinthian problem of ranking gifts and making comparisons. Marlon L. Soards, *1 Corinthians*, New International Biblical Commentary (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 266. Similarly, Richard McBrien notes that “there were also prophets and teachers whose authority was very much like that of the Apostles.” Richard McBrien, *Catholicism* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1981), 800. Furthermore, the different gifts listed in the various Pauline writings often do not agree. Compare 1 Cor 12: 28 with Rom 12:6-8 and Eph 4:11; cf. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 618.

⁵Campenhausen, 61; Fee, 619; C. K. Barrett suggests that “this threefold ministry [is] . . . the primary Christian ministry.” See his *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968), 295; cf. James Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 273.

In the New Testament, the designation “apostle” was first applied to the Twelve, i.e., the closest associates of Christ who received a specific commission from him. The apostles were commissioned to preach the gospel and nurture new Christian congregations. Apostleship, however, was not restricted to the Twelve and was claimed by others as well.¹ It is thought that the prophets were those members who exercised the gift of prophecy described at length in 1 Cor 14. Their work seems to have been primarily directed towards the edification of the local community.² Unfortunately, on the basis of the New Testament, not much can be said about the teachers. Their sphere of influence, like that of the prophets, seems to have been restricted to the local scene and was probably reminiscent of the role of rabbis and scribes in the synagogues.³ According to Myles Bourke, their *charism* was closely related to that of apostleship, since the message preached by the apostles was “the basis of their teaching.”⁴ While some individuals such as Paul may have been endowed with more than one gift, these three *charisms* generally applied to different individuals, who were to perform different functions in the early Church. Apart

¹As McBrien points out, the “Twelve” belonged to this group but not all apostles were members of the “Twelve.” McBrien, 799. The apostles who were not part of the Twelve included Paul (1 Cor 9:1), Barnabas (Acts 14:14), Apollos (1 Cor 4:6, 9) and Silvanus and Timothy (1 Thess 1:1; 2:6); cf. E. F. Harrison, “Apostle, Apostleship,” *EDT* (1984), 70-2. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the various theories regarding the nature and membership of the apostolate in the New Testament. For a careful discussion, see Dunn, 271-75; Edward Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ* (New York: Crossroads Publishing, 1981), 5-9; Barrett, 293-95; and Hans Küng, *The Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), 344-54.

²Myles M. Bourke, “Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly (CBQ)* 30 (1968): 499-500. Bourke notes that the prophetic ministry was associated with the reception of divine revelation (*ibid.*); cf. Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*, 10. For a discussion on New Testament prophets, see Gerhard Friedrich, “Prophets and Prophecies in the New Testament,” *TDNT* (1968), 6:828-61. For the reasons why prophets ceased to play an important role in the early church, see James L. Ash, “The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church,” *Theological Studies (TS)* 37 (1976): 227-52.

³It is reported that the church in Antioch was led by prophets and teachers (Acts 13:1); cf. Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*, 10.

⁴Bourke, 500; Barrett, 295; McBrien, 821-22. For an attempt to discern the role of teachers in the New Testament, see McKenzie, *Authority in the Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), 78-83.

from clearly setting forth the authority of the apostles,¹ the New Testament provides little information regarding the nature of the relationship between the individuals performing these three functions.

While in the Pastoral Epistles the elders-bishops were called to teach and instruct the Christian community,² scholars such as John McKenzie argue that there is no evidence that teachers who were not bishops could not exercise the teaching gift in their own right, without being regarded as representatives of the local leaders.³

The Early Church to the End of the Middle Ages

Teachers seem to have played an important role in the early post-apostolic age. While 1 Clement (c. 96) concentrated on the importance of the episcopal office,⁴ the *Didachē* (c. 80-100)⁵ emphasized the role of teachers, apparently placing them on an equal

¹Cf. 1 Cor 14:37-8; 1 Thess 4:8; 2 Thess 3:14.

²1 Tim 3:2; 4:11; 2 Tim 2:24.

³McKenzie, 83. McKenzie draws a clear distinction between proclamation and teaching. While the gift of teaching could operate independently from episcopal oversight, it was effective in the Church only if it was based on the "sound doctrine" of the Old Testament, which was the basis of New Testament teaching (ibid.). Similarly, Bourke notes that in the Pastorals there is a distinction between the charisms possessed by different individuals. Bourke, 505-06.

⁴For the text of 1 Clement, see Maxwell Staniford, trans., *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Robert Baldick and Betty Radice (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1972), 17-57. This letter is considered to be the first actual document dealing with the importance of the office of the bishop in the early Church. It was written in the name of the Roman congregation to admonish the Corinthians who were experiencing internal problems. Charles Gore, *The Church and the Ministry* (London: Longmans, Green, 1907), 173; cf. Kenan B. Osborne, *Priesthood, A History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 93.

⁵For the text of the *Didachē* refer to Cyril C. Richardson, ed., *Early Christian Fathers*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), 171-79. The *Didachē* is an important document of Christian antiquity and has been considered the first Christian catechism. Since the discovery of the *Didachē*, in 1875, its authorship and date have been debated. Most scholars place it at the end of the first century. The importance of this early document lies in the fact that it gives insight into the early Church ministry and, according to some, parallels much of the New Testament data. See Philip Carrington, *The Early Christian Church*, vol. 1, *The First Christian Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 483. For a commentary on the *Didachē*, see ibid., 491-501.

footing with bishops and prophets. The churches were exhorted to welcome itinerant teachers, who came to teach them “all we have been saying,” and to “welcome [them] . . . as the Lord.”¹ Edward Schillebeeckx holds, however, that in the *Didachē* we find the first hints that the ministry of teachers and prophets could have been conjoined with that of the episcopal office.²

In a surprisingly short period of time, the prophets and teachers lost their privileged position and by the second century the office of *episcopos* appears to have replaced their ministry. As early as in the writings of Ignatius³ one sees a strong emphasis on the authority of the bishops. Ignatius exhorted believers to regard the bishop as the Lord himself, asserting that by being subject to their bishop they were subject to God.⁴ In the second century, in response to Gnosticism, Irenaeus suggested that only bishops in an unbroken chain of succession with the apostles should be considered teachers in the

¹The *Didachē*, 11; Carrington, 484.

²Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*, 22-4. The author of the *Didachē* urges local church members to “elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are credit to the Lord. . . . For their ministry to you is identical with that of the prophets and teachers.” The *Didachē*, 15. Such developments could have been the result of the rapid spread of false teachings and an effort to protect the unity of faith. The concern for truth is especially evident in the *Didachē*, 11. Schillebeeckx adds that the appointment of bishops to every congregation was necessitated by the need to celebrate the Eucharist every time the early Christians met. This ministry seemed to have been hitherto fulfilled by the teachers and prophets. He writes: “Thus the *episcopoi* and their helpers are here at the service of the prophets (and teachers) who (continue to) preside at this liturgy; these newcomers share in the liturgical leadership or in the ministry of these prophets and teachers.” Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*, 23 (emphasis his).

³Ignatius was known to be a bishop of Antioch in Syria. Unfortunately, little else is known about this historical figure, since most biographical information is found only in his letters. Ignatius’s letters, written during the reign of the emperor Trajan, c. 110 A. D., outline a system of episcopal structure that eventually became the standard pattern throughout most of the Christian world. Staniford, 63; Paul Valiere, “Tradition,” *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (1987), 15:7. Carrington provides an in-depth analysis of the Ignatian epistles (445-58).

⁴Ignatius, *Ephesians* 6; *Magnesians* 3; *Trallians* 2, in Staniford, 77, 87-8, 95; cf. Yves Congar, “The Historical Development of Authority in the Church: Points for Christian Reflection,” in *Problems of Authority*, ed. John M. Todd (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964), 124.

Church, as the apostles had passed the teaching *charism* on to their successors.¹ Thus, the Pauline conception of ministry, which included prophets, teachers, and other charismatic ministries, was gradually replaced by the elevation of the office of bishop.²

By the beginning of the third century A. D., the role of the bishop as the sole leader and teacher in the local congregation seems to have been consolidated, defined, and universally accepted throughout the Roman world.³ There were, to be sure, some notable exceptions. In Alexandria, for example, the “scholar, the doctor, the lecture-room” constituted the primary doctrinal authority in the Church. Clement (d. 215), the principal theologian of the Alexandrian school, refused to surrender the rights of theologians, whose primary task he saw as defending sound doctrine. Neither did he appeal to the historic episcopate as the guarantor of truth.⁴ The Alexandrian situation, however, was not

¹For an overview of the development of the doctrine of apostolic succession before and after Irenaeus, and its main proponents, see Arnold Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953). Also Jules Lebreton, *The History of the Primitive Church*, vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), 661, and George A. Jackson, *The Fathers of the Third Century* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881), 26. As J. B. Lightfoot rightly observes, Irenaeus was not the first to use the argument of apostolic succession. The concept was already present in the writings of Hegesippus, early in the second century, and Tertulian, a younger contemporary of Irenaeus. It was Irenaeus, however, who developed it theologically. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), 239; cf. Dom Gregory Dix, “The Ministry in the Early Church,” in *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*, ed. Kenneth E. Kirk (New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1947), 201.

²Hans Lietzmann notes that the elevation of the authority of the episcopal office was engendered by the fact that “it was recognized that in difficult times—and a state of war now existed against gnosticism—the concentration of power in the hands of a single person offered the surest guarantee of good leadership; the policy of the Church was shaped accordingly.” Hans Lietzmann, *The Founding of the Church Universal* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1950), 58.

³Bernard Cooke, *Ministry to Word and Sacraments* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 61.

⁴R. B. Tollinton, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*, vol. 2 (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), 228-29. In the later history of the Alexandrian school, this conception of theological freedom led to serious conflicts between certain theologians, most notably Origen (182-251), and the bishops. For a history of Origen’s conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities, see Robert B. Eno, “Authority and Conflict,” *Église et théologie* 7 (1976): 49-54. See also W. Tefler, *The Office of a Bishop* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962), 150-54.

common. In most areas of the Christian Church, the episcopacy asserted its authority over theologians.

It is widely recognized that the authority of the episcopal office was furthered through the work of Cyprian (d. 258).¹ He taught that the bishop, in addition to his governing duties, was the chief theologian of the Church, whose main task was to explain as well as to defend the deposit of faith against heresy and theological extravagances.² As it happened, many prominent theologians of the patristic era, such as the Cappadocian Fathers,³ Athanasius (c. 296-373), and John Chrysostom (c. 347-407), were bishops who taught the faith and reflected on its implications.⁴ Thus, in the words of Yves Congar, from these early centuries, “theologians [were] most often bishops and important bishops [were] theologians.”⁵

During the early Middle Ages, theology was still primarily taught by bishops. These years, however, witnessed a notable development of monasteries. Such monasteries usually operated under the direct supervision of the episcopal see in whose territory they were located. Conflicts occasionally flared when monasteries, attempting to assert their

¹Cyprian’s theology of the episcopate arose within the context of difficult historical circumstances. Severe persecutions and schismatic movements threatened the well-being of the Church. Cyprian’s teaching evolved around two central issues: (1) the question of church discipline, and (2) the unity of the church. For an overview of Cyprian’s life, ministry, and teachings see Peter Hinchcliff, *Cyprian of Carthage and the Unity of the Christian Church* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1974). For details on Cyprian’s teaching regarding the episcopate, see *ibid.*, 100-07.

²Tefler, 148; Tollinton, 229. Tollinton notes that scholars who were not bishops gradually “surrendered [their] rights to the Bishop, and when the Bishop was also a scholar, all went well. When he was not, the surrender, though inevitable, had its dangerous consequences” (*ibid.*).

³The Cappadocian fathers, Basil the Great (c. 329-379), Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 325-389), and Gregory of Nyssa (c. 330-395), were instrumental in the defeat of Arianism at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.

⁴Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology* (London: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 84-5.

⁵Congar, “A Brief History of the Forms of the Magisterium,” 317.

independence, rose against the supervising bishops.¹ Later on, the influence of monasteries as centers of theological activity allowed for the development of cathedral schools, which eventually evolved into universities where theology was taught as a distinctive discipline.² Almost from its inception, the university struggled for greater independence from Church authorities.³ “Knowledge,” Congar notes, “like the Word, possesses a sort of autonomy. It moves toward detachment from Power.”⁴ With time,

¹L. H. Lawrence notes that the early Middle Ages were “littered with lawsuits pursued both locally and at the papal Curia between bishops and self-assertive monasteries.” L. H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (New York: Longman House, 1984), 119. For a comprehensive history of the development and influence of monasticism, see also David Knowles, *Christian Monasticism* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

²The seats of the oldest universities were Paris, Salerno, Bologna, and Oxford. Paris and Oxford were considered to have the best theological faculties and for many years Western theology centered around these two institutions. Charles H. Haskins, *The Rise of Universities* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923), 28-9.

Yves Congar suggested that the success of the university in the Middle Ages may be attributed to the “astonishing period of creativity” spawned by such factors as better living conditions for much of the European people, greater mobility and increase in population. The Crusades contributed to greater knowledge of the world and more fertile imaginations. In addition, “the sense of the individual was developing and being affirmed.” In such a climate, Congar concludes, it was inevitable that schools, which were mushrooming all over Europe, were becoming “institutions in which a new kind of theological reflection was to appear. This new mode of theological reflection, clearly different from that which prevailed in the monasteries, employed a rational method directed toward analysis, definition, construction and systematization.” Yves Congar, “Theologians and the Magisterium in the West,” *Chicago Studies* (CS) 17 (1978): 213-14. See also Lowrie J. Daly, *The Medieval University, 1200-1400* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), 17-8. On the birth and growth of universities, see H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), and A. L. Gabriel, *Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Medieval University* (Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1969). On the transition from monastic and cathedral schools to universities, see Daly, 5-8.

³At the time, notes A. B. Corban, universities were not regarded as independent institutions but rather as “natural ecclesiastical appendages. . . . As such, they were to be integrated into the existing ecclesiastical structure and subjected to a permanent ecclesiastical governance. This dependent and static role cast for the universities was one wholly at odds with the ideas and aspirations of the guilds of masters and associated scholars.” A. B. Corban, *The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization* (London: Methuen and Company, 1975), 76.

⁴Congar, “Theologians and the Magisterium in the West,” 214. Thomas Aquinas, whose teachings at one time attracted ecclesiastical condemnation, attempted to define the role of theologians in the Church. He suggested a double teaching office: pastoral (*magisterium cathedrae pastoralis* or *pontificalis*) and academic (*magisterium cathedrae magistralis*). Congar, “A Brief History of the Forms of Magisterium,” 318. As Congar

medieval teachers became known as *magistri*¹ and wielded so much influence and authority that their teaching often successfully competed with that of the pope and bishops. At times, scholars assumed the role of authoritative teachers and made decisions that called for assent on behalf of the believers.² Such rivalry inevitably led to conflicts.³

Confronted with numerous internal and external threats to papal authority Boniface VIII (1294-1303), in 1302, issued *Unam Sanctam*, a bull intended to assert the temporal powers of the bishop of the Roman see and to emphasize the unity of the Church under the rule of the Roman pontiff.⁴ Since the Lord had placed Peter in a position of leadership, all

points out, however, the term *magisterium* signified something different in the thirteenth century than it does at present. He states: "In the Fathers, in the Middle Ages and up until the 1820's and 1830's, *magisterium* means simply the situation, the function or the activity of someone who is in the position of a *magister*, that is, of authority in a particular area. . . . The activity could be that of teaching. In this case, *magisterium* shared materially in the modern sense of "magisterium," but before the nineteenth century it never meant precisely what we call "*the magisterium*," i.e., the teaching office and authority of the Church held by the episcopate (ibid., 318-19, italics his). See also Yves Congar, "A Semantic History of the Term 'Magisterium'," in *The Magisterium and Morality, Readings in Moral Theology*, ed. Charles Curran and Richard McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 297-313. Both pastoral and academic forms of teaching involved authority. The former had its basis in *charism* and signified the power to teach and govern. The theologians' authority, on the other hand, was based on knowledge and teaching ability. Francis A. Sullivan, *Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 24. For a concise description and analysis of Aquinas's struggle with ecclesiastical authorities, see Walter Principe, "Bishops, Theologians, and Philosophers in Conflict at the Universities of Paris and Oxford: The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277," *CTSA* 40 (1985): 114-26.

¹The title *magister*, Congar notes, was also applied to the episcopal order. Congar, "Theologians and the Magisterium in the West," 214.

²Ibid., 221; idem, "A Brief History of the Forms of the Magisterium," 319.

³F. Funck-Brentano documents one such conflict, which occurred at the end of the twelfth century. The bishop of Paris ordered that all teachers of theology at the University of Paris swear an oath of obedience. The teachers objected claiming that teaching licenses were given or refused without consideration of their views. F. Funck-Brentano, *The Middle Ages* (London: William Heinemann, 1922), 201. Congar describes several conflicts in "Theologians and the Magisterium in the West," 219-21.

⁴For a succinct description of the circumstances surrounding the issuance of the bull, see J. Derek Holmes and Bernard W. Bickers, *A Short History of the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 100-02, and T. S. R. Boase, *Boniface VIII* (London: Constable and Company, 1933), 316-19.

Christians were to be committed and subject to “Peter and his successors.”¹ Although *Unam Sanctam* did not specifically address the issue of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over universities, it set the stage for dealing with the growing influence of theological faculties.² Nevertheless, university theologians continued to consider themselves “as authoritative in theology as the Pope although conceding to Christ’s Vicar equal status with [themselves] as ‘the two lights of the world’.”³ While relations between theologians and bishops continued to be uneasy, there were remarkable examples of cooperation between the two bodies during the late Middle Ages.⁴

From Trent to the Mid-Twentieth Century

Collaboration between bishops and theologians was particularly evident during the Council of Trent (1545-1563), which convened to deal with one of the most significant crises encountered by the Roman Catholic Church, i.e., the Reformation. The bishops felt that without the help of “learned theologians” they would be unable to provide an effective *antidotum* to the Protestant malady. Hubert Jedin, in his monumental *The Council of Trent*, reports that even though they did not have a decisive voice, theologians were

¹Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*, in *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, comp. H. E. Denzinger (St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957), 468-69. See also George H. Tavard, “The Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII,” in *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1974), 106-07.

²The papal legate Benedict Caetani, soon to become pope Boniface VIII, exhibited his attitude to the Paris theological faculty and their aspirations towards independence, stating: “You sit in chairs . . . and think that Christ is ruled by your reasonings. . . . They think their foolish cogitations all important, but to the Church is committed the care of all the world.” Boase, 22; cf. Barbara W. Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous 14th Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 22.

³Tuchman, 22.

⁴Avery Dulles notes that Clement V ordered that the decrees of the Council of Vienne (1311-1312) were not to be declared official until they had gained the approval of university theological faculties. Furthermore, at several councils in the high Middle Ages, including Constance (1414-1417) and Basle (1431-1449), theologians who were not bishops were allowed a deliberative vote. Avery Dulles, *The Resilient Church* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1977), 105.

important “participants” at the Council.¹ Virtually all decrees of the Council were drafted by and/or referred for further clarification to the theologians. Only then were they voted upon by the bishops. As a result of such collaboration, the Roman Catholic Church was able to present a unified response to the threat of Protestantism.² Paradoxically, while the results of the Council testified to the fruitfulness of such a close cooperation, the Council resulted in a greater centralization of the Church, as well as in an increased emphasis upon the authority of the pope.³

The period between Trent and the First Vatican Council was chiefly defined by the Catholic response to the Protestant Reformation. In response to the continued challenge of Protestantism, Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), one of the most important theologians of this era, developed an ecclesiology that focused upon the visible, hierarchical church, with the papacy at its apex. He saw the papacy as the final authority in all theological conflicts.⁴

¹Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, vol. 2 (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961), 483. Jedin states that, at times during the Council, there were as many bishops as theologians, thus showing that the ecclesiastical leaders “were in earnest in their search for a solution of the problems in the sphere of dogma and Church reform for which they had been convened” (ibid., 484). For Jedin’s description of these examples of close collaboration between bishops and theologians, see ibid., 15, 59, 133, 153, 173, 179, 249, 493.

²Jedin, 15; F. S. Piggin, “Trent, Council of,” *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology (EDT)* (1984), 1110.

³Justo L. González notes that at the beginning of the Council the authority of the pope was an important issue questioned by many Catholics. During the course of the Council, however, the papacy emerged as a major unifying and authoritative force. At the request of the gathered Fathers, Pius IV ratified the Council decrees and published a bull, decreeing that no one was allowed to publish commentaries or other interpretations of the Council without the expressed approval of the Holy See. Thus, the pope was “made at once the source of the council’s authority and its final interpreter. The conciliar movement of the late Middle Ages had come to an end. The modern Roman Catholic Church was born.” Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought*, 3 vols. (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1987), 3:247. Christopher O’Donnell suggests, however, that without such centralization the reforms intended by the Council might not have come about. Christopher O’Donnell, *Ecclesia: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 451.

⁴Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 207; J. Van Engen, “Bellarmine, Robert,” *EDT* (1984), 132. For an in-depth study of the life and work of Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, see James Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine, Saint and Scholar* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1961).

Although Bellarmine's views did not meet with universal acceptance, they provided the foundation for the development of the Ultramontane movement, which engulfed the nineteenth-century Roman Catholic Church and led to the elevation of papal power to unprecedented heights in the period leading up to and during the First Vatican Council (1869-1870).¹

While Ultramontanism was chiefly concerned with combating the independence of national Churches, it also resulted in stricter ecclesiastical control of theological trends. Pius IX (1846-1878), who "gave the [Ultramontane] movement every encouragement,"² sought to quench any theological trend that undermined the theology of the Roman School. In 1864, he published the *Syllabus Errorum*, a set of eighty theses which condemned all modern philosophical trends that posed a challenge to ecclesiastical authority.³ Gabriel Daly notes that the effects of this proclamation "were felt more painfully within than outside the church."⁴ Several centers where nineteenth-century Catholic theology was flourishing

¹Concerned with safeguarding papal authority, Ultramontanists utilized extreme methods in propagating papal prerogatives. Roger Aubert writes: "Their legitimate desire to counteract teaching which minimized the pope's prerogatives led them to propagate a simplistic ecclesiology in which, for example, the Church was presented as 'the society of the faithful governed by the pope', to the seeming neglect of the bishops' divinely appointed and equally essential role, or which declared that the teaching function of the bishops was limited to the transmission to the faithful of teaching handed down by the Holy See." Aubert, 59. For a history of Catholicism in France, the primary center of nineteenth-century anti-Ultramontanism, see John McManners, *Church and Society in Eighteenth Century France*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); cf. Austin Gough, *Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

²Aubert, 5. Aubert states that Pius IX did not discourage the Ultramontane devotion to the papacy, which, at times, "verged on 'idolatry of papacy'," and referred to the pope as "God's deputy among men," or "the Word Incarnate still dwelling among us" (ibid.).

³For the text of the *Syllabus* in English, see Pius IX, *Syllabus Errorum*, in *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, comp. H. E. Denzinger (St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957), 435-42. For Latin text, see W. E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1875), 109-29.

⁴Gabriel Daly, "Theological and Philosophical Modernism," in *Catholicism Contending with Modernity*, ed. Darrell Jodock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 95.

were placed on notice for adhering to ideas condemned by the *Syllabus*.¹ Its publication made it clear that only theology strictly adhering to the principles of Neo-Thomism, an ideology favored by Rome, had the right to exist.²

The First Vatican Council

The growing influence of various secular philosophical and political trends, as well as theological liberalism, paved the way for the First Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility,³ which stated that when the Pope spoke *ex cathedra*,⁴ his authority was analogous to that of absolute sovereignty in civil matters.⁵ A parallel development saw the teachings of the magisterium placed at the same level as traditional sources of revelation,

¹Aubert cites several conflicts between the ecclesiastical authorities and the theologians at prominent centers of nineteenth-century Catholic theology, such as Paris, Munich, and Tübingen. The publications of theologians suspected of sympathizing with modern ideas, attempting to accommodate official Church teaching with modernity, or resisting the advances of Ultramontanism, were placed on the Index. See Aubert, 59-61, 167-71.

²Gabriel Daly, 95.

³C. T. McIntire, "Vatican Council I (1869-1870)," *EDT* (1984), 1134-135; cf. August B. Hasler, *How the Pope Became Infallible: Pius IX and the Politics of Persuasion* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1981), 39-41.

⁴"Cathedra" refers to the episcopal chair or throne. The phrase *ex cathedra*, "from the chair," refers to those pronouncements by the pope as teacher and pastor of the Church. It is traditionally accepted within Roman Catholicism that when the Pope makes *ex cathedra* pronouncements, he speaks as the supreme apostolic authority, with the assistance promised to him by Christ through Peter. A doctrine thus defined is to be held as a matter of faith by the universal Church. Thus, papal definitions cannot be changed or reversed. O'Donnell, 214.

⁵Michael D. Place, "From Solicitude to Magisterium," *CS* 17 (1978): 235. For a history of the First Vatican Council, and the way in which papal infallibility was defined, see Hasler, *How the Pope Became Infallible*. Hasler notes that much of the theological groundwork that led to the definition of infallibility was provided by Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821). Due to the lack of biblical or historical support, Rome was slow to accept Maistre's ideas. During the reign of Gregory XVI (1831-1846), however, Maistre's teachings became increasingly popular among Ultramontanists. Hasler attributes the change to the growing threat of liberalism and the political situation in Europe (*ibid.*, 41-3); cf. Joseph Marie de Maistre, *The Pope, Considered in His Relations with the Church, Temporal Sovereignities, Separated Churches, and the Cause of Civilization* (New York: H. Fertig, 1975).

i.e., the Scriptures and tradition.¹ In fact, as Congar remarks, the undue juridicization of papal authority in the nineteenth century resulted in the virtual identification of tradition with the magisterium.² These developments, coupled with a preoccupation with papal authority, led to the elevation of the papal office as the supreme magisterium of the Church, which, while not separated from the episcopal body, was considered to possess a special *charism* of teaching. This represented a culmination of centuries of juridicization and institutionalization of the teaching office. In a noticeable departure from the New Testament categories, the Church in the time of Pius IX recognized true teaching *charism* only in members of the episcopal order.

This understanding of the ecclesiastical magisterium resulted in the view that Catholic theologians had a subordinate and apologetic function. Their role was to explain, amplify, and defend the teachings of the episcopal magisterium. When called upon they could offer advice. "But theologians, according to this theory, are not teachers in the Church. They are not members of the magisterium. The true teachers, the bishops, receive their competence not by learning but by being incorporated into the episcopal order," writes Avery Dulles.³ Intra-ecclesial reactions to these developments varied. Most Catholics, some with notable hesitance, eventually accepted the decrees of the Council.⁴ There were,

¹Place, 235-36.

²Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 181. This tendency was clearly exemplified in Pius IX's famous statement: "I am the tradition." Hasler, 91.

³Avery Dulles, "The Theologian and the Magisterium," *CTSA* 31 (1976): 239. Pius IX told theologians that their most noble task was "de montrer de quelle façon la doctrine se trouve dans les sources de la révélation, au sens même où l'Église l'a définie." Pius IX, quoted in Joseph Hoffmann, "Théologie et magistère, un 'modèle' issu de Vatican I," in *Les théologiens et l'Église*, ed. Charles Pietri (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1980), 97.

⁴Margaret O'Gara, *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988), xiii-xviii; cf. Hasler, 189-228.

however, groups of theologians and bishops who were unable to reconcile themselves with the Council's teachings.¹

The Modernist Crisis

The Modernist crisis² provided further justification to affirm the official policy regarding Catholic theologians. Although not explicitly an ecclesiological clash, Modernism had powerful repercussions upon the relationship between the magisterium and theologians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In their writings, Roman Catholic Modernist authors criticized the centralization of Church government and the widespread influence of the Curia. Church discipline over the clergy was also questioned. Most significantly, however, Catholic Modernists struggled to work and publish without being censored by the Church. In the words of Lester Kurtz, Catholic Modernism was a movement that attempted "to free Catholic thought from the alleged straitjacket of late nineteenth-century scholastic intellectualism."³ Although it began to exert its influence upon Catholic thinking in the early nineteenth century, it was not until

¹The most significant post-Conciliar development was the rise of a Catholic splinter group, designated as "Old Catholics," which was active mainly in German-speaking countries. The members of the group believed that the Roman Church had departed from the true Catholic faith, and, therefore, rejected the doctrines of papal infallibility and universal jurisdiction. For a history of the Old Catholic movement, as well as its subsequent development, see Karl Pruter, *A History of the Old Catholic Church* (Scottsdale, AZ: St. Willibrord's Press, 1973); Victor Konzernius, *Katholizismus ohne Rom: Die Altkatholische Kirchengemeinschaft* (Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, 1969); Raoul Dederen, *Un réformateur catholique au XIXe siècle: Eugène Michaud (1839-1917)* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1963), and A. M. E. Scarth, *The Story of the Old Catholic and Kindred Movements* (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1883).

²At the risk of oversimplification, Modernism may be described as an attempt to reinterpret Christian doctrine in terms of nineteenth-century scientific thought. Catholic Modernism tended to question the objective value of traditional beliefs, and to regard some dogmas of the Church as symbolic rather than literal. The leaders of this group included Alfred Loisy (1857-1940), George Tyrrell (1861-1909), and Friedrich von Hügel (1852-1925). For an incisive analysis of the Modernist crisis, as well as its subsequent developments and implications, see Marvin R. O'Connell, *Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1994).

³Lester R. Kurtz, *The Politics of Heresy: The Modernist Crisis in Roman Catholicism* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), 10.

later in the century that Modernism became a serious challenge for the Church. In the popular integralist literature, the movement was often described as a threat to all that the Church stood for. Its proponents were denounced as involved in a deliberate campaign to destroy it. Influenced by such sentiments, Church officials initiated an extensive crusade to root out the “Modernist heresy.” This was done by consistent identification of Catholicism with Scholasticism and continual insistence on papal authority. The groundwork for this was prepared by Leo XIII’s (1878-1903) encyclical, *Aeterni patris* (1879),¹ which firmly established Neo-Scholastic² theology as the chief theological system of the Church.³ Kurtz notes that the pope’s action initiated “what many called a ‘reign of terror’ within the church for a number of years.”⁴

The teachings of Vatican I, in tandem with *Aeterni patris*, influenced the way in which the Catholic magisterium came to understand and exercise its authority. Yves Congar states that, until modern times, the papacy had “rarely exercised the active magisterium of dogmatic definition and constant formulation of Catholic doctrine in the way it has been exercised since the pontificate of Gregory XVI [1831-1846] and especially since that of Pius IX [1846-1878].”⁵ Modernist teachings and their influence upon

¹Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, ed. John J. Wynne (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), 34-57.

²Neo-Scholasticism designates a nineteenth- to twentieth-century movement that emphasized the teachings of the Scholastic masters, Thomas Aquinas in particular, for use in theology and philosophy. *OSV’s Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1991 ed., s.v. “Neo-Scholasticism.”

³Daly, “Theological and Philosophical Modernism,” 101. Daly notes that the rise of Neo-Scholasticism was, to a large extent, the result of fear and incomprehension. He observes that “the nineteenth century had witnessed a skillfully organized Catholic retreat from the jungle of post-Enlightenment ideas to the *hortus conclusus* of an artificially constructed theology.” Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 189; cf. Kurtz, 38-41.

⁴Kurtz, 10, 33-4. To be fair, Kurtz continues, Vatican officials did not oppose all forms of intellectualism, but only those that seemingly undermined the authority of the hierarchy (*ibid.*, 10).

⁵Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 178. Before the modern era, Congar states, doctrinal disputes were resolved by the assemblies of bishops and “launched, developed

twentieth-century Catholic scholars became a powerful catalyst for increased juridicization of the papal and episcopal offices. Through a series of developments, the Roman Curia became increasingly involved in the process of defining Church doctrine and vigilant of every theological trend that threatened its position of authority.¹ With Pope Leo's encouragement, the proponents of Neo-Scholasticism quickly moved to replace those theologians whose views were suspect.²

The establishment of Neo-Scholasticism was accompanied by Leo XIII's denouncement of a "heresy" termed "Americanism." Americanists held that, since there were clear differences between European and American Catholics, the Catholic Church in the United States should adapt to the American culture. In an 1899 apostolic letter, *Testem benevolentiae*, Leo condemned the "Americanist" tendencies of the Church in the United States. He was especially concerned with the trend to allow modern theories and methods to impact the teachings of the Church, as well as the belief that individuals could act assuredly and independently, based on their natural abilities, in a way that would limit the power of the Church.³

The popes following Leo XIII were no less eager to root out all forms of modern heresy from Catholic teachings. During the pontificate of Pius X (1903-1914), there were further attempts by Catholic scholars to adopt modern methodologies in studying Church teachings and interpreting established doctrines. This, in turn, led to conflict between the freedom of inquiry and the obedience that the ecclesiastical authorities had come to expect. Pius X, a pope for whom "narrow dedication to evangelization, clerical discipline, and and concluded by immediate reference to Scripture and to a series of patristic, conciliar or canonical texts, in short a kind of magisterium of tradition itself" (ibid.).

¹Jodock, "Introduction I: The Modernist Crisis," 6.

²Raymond Corrigan, *The Church and the Nineteenth Century* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1938), 74.

³For a detailed study on Americanism, see Thomas T. McAvoy, *The Americanist Heresy in Roman Catholicism, 1895-1900* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963).

unquestioning adherence to doctrinal teaching” were guiding principles,¹ responded to such challenges with his well-known 1907 encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis*.² Written in a harsh and judgmental tone, the encyclical alleged the existence of a conspiracy to subvert the authority of the Roman Catholic Church.³ It was followed by the decree *Lamentabili* (1907), which, in essence, was a new “syllabus of errors,” condemning sixty-five propositions which allegedly undermined Catholic teachings,⁴ and, in 1910, by the notorious anti-modernist oath,⁵ which demanded submission of all ordained clergy and theologians to the teachings of *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi*.⁶

Such measures resulted in the strict control of all clerics and theologians working within the Roman Catholic Church. In the remaining years of Pius X, the term

“modernist” remained as a convenient label for any theological initiatives in the Roman Catholic Church which appeared to deviate from the neo-scholastic norm,

¹O’Connell, 267.

²For the text of the encyclical, see Pius X, *Pascendi dominici gregis*, in *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, comp. H. E. Denzinger (St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957), 514-41. For George Tyrrell’s response to it, see A. Leslie Lilley, ed., *The Programme of Modernism* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1908), 1-148.

³O’Connell, 340-48. The first paragraph of the encyclical announces its intent: “The office committed to us of feeding the flock of the Lord has especially this duty assigned to it by Christ, to guard with the greatest vigilance the deposit of the faith delivered to the saints, rejecting the profane novelties of words and the oppositions proposed by knowledge falsely so-called.” Pius X continues by denouncing crucial tendencies, which, according to him, permeate Modernist writings: agnosticism, immanentism, evolutionism, and democratism (ibid.); cf. Darrell Jodock, “Introduction I: the Modernist Crisis,” in *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*, ed. Darrell Jodock (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 6.

⁴Kurtz, 153.

⁵The oath appears in Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 235-36. This demand was rescinded in the years immediately prior to the Second Vatican Council.

⁶Alec R. Vidler notes that in spite of predictions of resistance, the requirement was accepted throughout the Roman Catholic world without much opposition. Only in Germany were university professors exempted from taking the oath, so as not to be “humiliated before their Protestant colleagues and to have their position as scholars hampered and restricted by the extravagant demands of the papacy.” *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1934), 203.

especially in matters of dogma, biblical criticism, and Church polity. Integralism, the frame of mind most inimical to change in the Church, achieved a position of control over Catholic theology and Church practice which was given juridical expression in the *Codex juris canonici* (1917) and executive expression in the sweeping powers exercised by the Roman dicasteries.¹

Theology, thus, was prevented from exercising the creative and critical functions some had been longing for. Its role was confined to explaining and defending the accepted positions of the Church. Theologians and their work were often censored, and deviation from accepted teachings was frequently remedied, resulting in setbacks for the development of Catholic scholarship. Many Catholic theologians slowed down their activity for fear of reprisals.²

World War I to the Second Vatican Council

Things took a different turn in the aftermath of World War I. The period between World War I and the Second Vatican Council was marked by a gradual easing of the intra-ecclesial tensions brought about by the Modernist crisis. While the popes of the interwar period continued to curb those theological advances which, in their perception, undermined the authority of the magisterium, Catholic theology, especially ecclesiology, experienced an unprecedented renewal.³ The focus was on rediscovering the Church as the mystical body of Christ and setting forth “to do greater justice to the theme of the Church as continuing

¹Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 218.

²Alec R. Vidler, *20th Century Defenders of Faith* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), 36-7; cf. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 214-17; McBrien, 645; Jodock, 3-8.

³McBrien describes the period between the two World Wars as “one of unusual progress on several major fronts, each of which would reach a fuller flowering at the Second Vatican Council.” These include the growth of the liturgical movement, biblical scholarship, the social action movement, the developing lay apostolate, the influence of the ecumenical movement, the missionary movement and, finally, theological renewal. Regarding the latter, McBrien notes that it was inspired by renewed respect for Thomistic theology, but “not uncritically wedded to this system.” Because of the influence of the aforementioned movements, the new theological approach was “more biblically, historically, pastorally, socially, and ecumenically oriented.” McBrien, 646-47.

the redemptive incarnation of the Son of God, mediating his divine life to mankind.”¹ Pius XII’s encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943), a leading document that dealt with the renewal of biblical studies,² encouraged scholars to pursue, within accepted limitations, their research and to utilize modern critical methods without the threat of condemnation. “It was the most important milestone in the history of Catholic scriptural scholarship,” which had been repressed since the time of Pius IX.³

The doctrine of the magisterium, however, was not significantly altered during this time. Its juridical dimension, which had dominated the understanding of doctrinal authority in the Church since the Council of Trent, continued to find expression in official documents. In fact, as Aubert notes, the last decade of Pius XII’s pontificate was marked by an increased “stiffening of attitude,” which was Rome’s reaction to the “renovatory enthusiasm” stimulated by the Pope’s own encyclical.⁴ Some scholars had begun to apply the recommendations of *Divino afflante Spiritu* to areas of traditional Catholic teaching, rather than just to scriptural studies. The official theology of the Roman School found

¹The new emphasis upon the mystical body of Christ found its official expression in Pius XII’s encyclical, *Mystici corporis* (1943). For a summary of these developments, see Aubert, 613-15.

Although the concept of the Church as the body of Christ was present in biblical and patristic sources, it was popularized by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) and used to defend the authority of the papacy against the theology of the Reformation. Through the use of this image Pius XII indicated his desire to return to the biblical and patristic foundations of the Church. His argumentation, however, reflected a heritage of centuries of institutional ecclesiology. The result was that *Mystici Corporis* proclaimed a static and monolithic view of the Church. See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, in *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, ed. Gerald C. Treacy (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), 7-51.

²Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*, in *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, 64-87.

³Michael J. Walsh, “Pius XII,” in *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 22. Walsh notes that this action prepared the way for theologians, whose work became foundational in preparations for the Second Vatican Council. He writes: “Though the Constitution on Revelation at Vatican II has often been regarded as the major landmark in Catholic biblical studies, the real turning point had occurred with *Divino afflante Spiritu* two decades earlier (ibid., 22).

⁴Aubert, 622.

itself challenged in such areas as the development and nature of dogma, the nature of revelation and the validity of Neo-Thomistic theology. In addition, the institutional and juridical dimensions of the Church were juxtaposed with a more biblical and patristic ecclesiology which focused on the wholeness of the Church as the people of God. These trends were characterized as *nouvelle théologie*, and those who espoused such views were watched and at times censored.¹

Humani generis (1950) was Pius XII's response to these new developments.² Étienne Fouilloux notes that the encyclical "was meant to put a brake on the desires for openness that had survived the condemnation of modernism almost a half-century before."³ Its purpose was to reject the tenets of the new theology, which was regarded as linked to Modernism, and to reaffirm traditional Catholic doctrines.⁴ The encyclical called all Catholics to accept even non-infallible teachings emanating from the Roman see with reverent submission. It reproached theologians for departing from Thomistic theology and, most important, in our case, affirmed that the task of theologians was to explain and defend the teachings of the magisterium by showing their compatibility with Scripture and

¹The scholars whose views fell under suspicion included Yves Congar (1904-1995), Karl Rahner (1904-1984), Henri de Lubac (1896-1991), Hans Urs von Balthasar (1905-1988), Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895-1990), Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), and John Courtney Murray (1904-1967).

Peter Hebblethwaite notes that while these theologians, who broadly represented the "new theology," did not agree on every issue, they nevertheless represented a general direction which he described as follows: "From the essentialist to the existentialist; from the juridical to the personalist; from the a-historical to the historical; from the exclusive to the inclusive; from deductive theology to inductive anthropology; from defensiveness to dialogue. None of these slogans," Hebblethwaite continues, "provided a precise criterion; but all indicated a direction, and dozens of minor theological works proclaimed the new trends." Hebblethwaite, *The Runaway Church*, 103; cf. Richard A. McCormick, "Notes on Moral Theology," *Theological Studies* (TS) 29 (1968): 715.

²Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, 171-86.

³Étienne Fouilloux, "The Antepreparatory Phase: the Slow Emergence from Inertia (January, 1959-October, 1962)," in *History of Vatican II*, vol. 1, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 71.

⁴Walsh, 22-3; Aubert, 622-23. Aubert notes that while *Humani generis* in many ways resembled Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi dominici*, it was a much less restrictive and more balanced document.

tradition. The teachings of the magisterium “must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians,” explained the document, implying that once an official decision had been made regarding a controverted point, the matter was no longer open for discussion. Finally, the encyclical insisted that established dogmatic definitions were unchangeable, as they were faithful expressions of biblical teachings and therefore valid at all times. Anyone who taught otherwise was treading on dangerous ground.¹ The end result of Pius XII’s encyclical was that many theologians lost their positions or found their writings censored.²

The Second Vatican Council

The Second Vatican Council is often considered a primary example of cooperation between the magisterium and theologians. While the relationship between these two bodies was not the subject of conciliar debates, the conciliar documents are widely regarded as the fruit of positive collaboration between the two groups.³ The Council fathers were served by more than four hundred *periti* (experts), who “made a constant, effective, disinterested

¹Pius XII, *Humani generis*, 171-86.

²While the publication of *Humani generis* made progressive theologians more cautious, the work of renewal was not halted in spite of increased vigilance of ecclesiastical authorities. Aubert comments that the Roman see introduced an “insidious policy of forcing works judged to be unsettling to be withdrawn from circulation and of depriving of their teaching office theologians regarded at Rome as ‘out of step’.” Fr Congar, Fr Chenu, Fr de Lubac, along with others who had been the teachers of a generation, fell victim, happily only for a while, to this ‘witch-hunt’.” Aubert, 622.

³The report of a Catholic Theological Society of America committee dealing with the issue of the relationship between the magisterium and theologians stresses that the Council documents “would not have been what they are” if not for the work of theologians in the years prior to and during the Council, when they served as *periti*. Leo J. O’Donovan, Sara Butler, Peter F. Chirico, Joseph A. Komonchak, Richard A. McCormick, and James H. Provost, “CTSA Committee Report on Cooperation Between Theologians and the Church’s Teaching Authority,” *CTSA* 35 (1980): 327. The procedures according to which Council experts were appointed are outlined by Klaus Wittstadt, “On the Eve of the Second Vatican Council (July 1-October 10, 1962),” in *History of Vatican II*, 1:448-62. On the role of theologians during the conciliar deliberations, see also Karl Heinz Neufeld, “In the Service of the Council: Bishops and Theologians at the Second Vatican Council,” in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, vol. 1, ed. René Latourelle (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 74-105.

and unobtrusive contribution to the Council.”¹ It was a rare opportunity for the bishops to come to know and understand the work of Catholic theologians.² The cooperation between bishops and theologians was further encouraged by John XXIII’s *motu proprio* *Appropinquante concilio* (1962), which allowed theologians appointed by the pope to take part in the Council, although it limited their role to an advisory one. While not allowed to express their views during the discussions in the Council Hall, they were particularly influential in conciliar committees as drafters, revisers, and correctors of various conciliar documents.³

The first list of *periti*, published in 1962, consisted of theologians closely associated with the Roman Curia and whose views reflected a predominantly traditional mind-set.⁴ As the Council progressed, however, it became clear that Pope John’s challenge, which called for a “rejuvenation” of the Church, required the participation of theologians who possessed “an alert sense of the spiritual situation of the period and of the Church’s potential within this context, courage and insight in developing new perspectives and in formulating concepts in a comprehensible fashion, the gift of discernment, and the strength to withstand the seduction of certain tendencies.”⁵ Thus, theologians who, during the pontificate of Pius XII, had been accused of adhering to the *nouvelle théologie* and subjected to ecclesiastical supervision and even censure, were gradually invited to take part

¹Neufeld, 77, citing a chronicler of the Council, G. Caprile (no original source given).

²Mario von Galli, *The Council and the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), 130.

³Neufeld, 78-9. In fact, as von Galli reports, sometimes theologians became so influential that many Council fathers found it threatening. In reality, he states, “the theologians were the ‘Council’s cooks’. They did not choose the topics, but they had decisive influence on the bishops’ opinions and the actual work of the commissions was in their hands.” Von Galli, 130.

⁴Wittstadt, 449-50.

⁵Neufeld, 80.

in the Council.¹ They were able to influence the outcome of the Council by introducing ideas that had developed outside of Roman Catholic theology.² There is general scholarly agreement that the Council's success in producing quality declarations and constitutions may, in a large measure, be attributed to the quality of the theologians' work and their collaboration with the bishops.³ The influence of these experts was one of the main reasons why the Council, without abandoning the traditional juridical and hierarchical ecclesiology, supplemented it with other models of authority.⁴

Lumen gentium, promulgated on November 11, 1964, is considered by many as one of the most important documents issued by the Council.⁵ The constitution's main contribution is its emphasis upon a biblical understanding of the Christian community's organization, as compared with the juridical and hierarchical model prevalent in traditional Catholic ecclesiology. Drawing upon a rich biblical and patristic imagery, *Lumen gentium*

¹Wittstadt, 450.

²This was especially evident in the case of the dogmatic constitution on revelation, *Dei Verbum*, promulgated on November 18, 1965. The constitution was informed by the best modern biblical scholarship, both Protestant and Catholic. See *Dei Verbum*, in Walter Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II: In a New and Definitive Translation with Commentaries and Notes by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 111-32. See also Christopher Butler's commentary on the constitution, as well as an assessment of its importance in his *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), 43-53.

³Wittstadt, 451-62; T. Howland Sanks, "Co-operation, Co-optation, Condemnation: Theologians and the Magisterium 1870-1978," *CS* 17 (1978): 261; Neufeld, 82-8; Jon Nilson, "The Rights and Responsibilities of Theologians: A Theological Perspective," in *Readings in Moral Theology: Dissent in the Church*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 13-4.

⁴T. Howland Sanks observes that while the Council did not abandon Neo-Scholastic ecclesiology, "the models of the socio-political structure of the church and of the forms of authority in it did shift somewhat. They shifted in the sense that more than one model is present in the documents, not that one model has replaced another. The juridical, hierarchical model . . . is still present, though it is not as dominant as the others." T. Howland Sanks, *Authority in the Church: A Study in Changing Paradigms* (Missoula, MT: Scholars' Press, 1974), 162.

⁵*Lumen gentium*, in Abbott, 14-106. See also Jorge Medina Estevez's commentary, "The Constitution on the Church: *Lumen Gentium*," in *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), 101-22.

describes the Church as the “pilgrim people of God,” in which all believers participate in Christ’s threefold mission as prophet, priest, and king. This view provided the foundation for a new relational understanding of the Church, which could nevertheless be harmonized with the juridical and hierarchical elements of the ecclesial reality. In harmony with the concept of the “people of God,” *Lumen gentium* emphasized the *sensus fidelium*, or “the sense of the faithful.” This “sense,” a gift of the Holy Spirit, was granted to the whole Church, allowing all the faithful, from bishops to laity, to have a role in establishing faith and morals.¹ Thus, the Council emphasized a collegial mode of power-sharing, where ecclesiastical authority is viewed in terms of service rather than dominance.² In addition, the “pilgrim” status of the “people of God” suggested that the Church was in need of continual reformation and renewal, a process in which all believers were invited to participate.³ “The basis for this was the communal sense of responsibility involved in the People of God model of a covenant theology as opposed to the more individualistic orientation of the juridical model or the Head-Body relationship of the Mystical body paradigm.”⁴

¹The constitution states: “The body of the faithful as a whole, anointed as they are by the Holy Spirit (cf. Jn 2:20, 27), cannot err in matters of belief. Thanks to a supernatural sense of the faith, which characterizes the People as a whole, it manifests this unerring quality when, ‘from the bishops down to the last members of the laity,’ it shows universal agreement in matters of faith and morals. For, by this sense of faith which is aroused and sustained by the Spirit of truth, God’s people accepts not the word of men but the very Word of God.” *Lumen gentium* 12, in Abbott, 29.

²Nilson, 12. Avery Dulles states that “the People of God image . . . was adopted in part because it harmonized with the general trend toward democratization in Western society since the eighteenth century.” Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1974), 31; cf. Bernard Cooke, “The Church: Catholic and Ecumenical,” *Theology Today* (TT) 36 (1979): 358-59, and Richard A. McCormick, “Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 29 (1968): 715.

³*Lumen gentium* 8, in Abbott, 24; cf. Karl Rahner, *The Church after the Council* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 24-9, 71.

⁴Sanks, *Authority in the Church: A Study in Changing Paradigms*, 165. For an outstanding study on the notion of “People of God,” as present in the documents of Vatican II, see Yves Congar, “The People of God,” in *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1966), 197-207.

Jean-Marie R. Tillard suggests that, in the light of the Second Vatican Council's teachings, the Church can no longer be seen primarily in terms of a "perfect society" patterned upon a civil monarchy. *Lumen gentium*, according to the Dominican theologian, moved away from an ecclesiology that began with a universal Church partitioned into local churches. Rather, it presented an ecclesiology where the universal Church is seen as a communion of, or arising from the communion of, local churches.¹

The same tendency is present in other conciliar documents, such as the pastoral constitution, *Gaudium et spes*, promulgated on December 7, 1965, which called upon the entire body of believers, "especially pastors and theologians, to hear, distinguish, and interpret the many voices of our age, and to judge them in the light of the divine Word."² Similarly, *Dei Verbum* (1965) affirmed that the Holy Spirit caused "a growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed down. This happens through the contemplation and study made by believers, who treasure these things in their hearts."³ Finally, *Gaudium et spes* called for "lawful freedom of inquiry and of thought," thus, in the eyes of some interpreters, allowing for a measure of theological pluralism within the Church.⁴ Such passages suggested to some that intra-ecclesial cooperation between all believers was essential if the Church was to fulfill its missionary mandate.⁵

The world of Catholic theology generally welcomed these changes with great enthusiasm.⁶ The extensive use of and reliance upon the *periti*, the adoption of several

¹J. M. R. Tillard, *The Bishop of Rome* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983), 37.

²*Gaudium et spes* 44, in Abbott, 246.

³*Dei Verbum* 8, in Abbott, 116.

⁴*Gaudium et spes* 62, in Abbott, 270; cf. Scott Appleby, "The Contested Legacy of Vatican II," *Notre Dame Magazine* 28 (Summer 1999): 25; Nilson, 29.

⁵Nilson, 13.

⁶The title of Mark Schoof's book, *Breakthrough: Beginnings of the New Catholic Theology* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970), which was published soon after the Council, describes the general mood among progressive Catholic theologians: Schoof indicates how the pre-Vatican II tendency of Catholic theology to "bring up to date" a

views advocated by the adherents of the *nouvelle théologie*, as well as a general conviction that the Council had ushered in a new era of freedom and power-sharing in the various areas of ecclesial life contributed to the perception, on the part of many theologians, that they could play a special role with regard to doctrinal authority in the Church. Rather than mere agents of the hierarchy, expected to elucidate magisterial teachings and harmonize them with Scripture and tradition, they hoped to be able to participate in the process of discerning and formulating the Christian message for the present generation.¹ Expressing the general mood of the times, Yves Congar called for theologians to move beyond the Council and explore new territories: “Le danger est qu’on ne *cherche* plus, mais qu’on exploite simplement l’inépuisable magasin de Vatican II. . . . Ce serait trahir l’*aggiornamento* que de le croire fixé une fois pour toutes dans les textes de Vatican II.”² Likewise, Karl Rahner declared: “The Council marked the decisive beginning of the *aggiornamento*, it established the renewal, . . . it was only the beginning of the beginnings.” Theologians, Rahner believed, were called to do much more than provide a commentary to the conciliar texts.³

The Post-Conciliar Years

One of the areas which the Council failed to address specifically was the role and nature of Catholic theology. By allowing theologians to play a crucial role in drafting traditional Catholic theology was replaced by a new way of theologizing, which creatively met the challenge of pluralism (*ibid.*, 265). The title of the book’s last section optimistically proclaims: “Getting Used to the New Freedom” (*ibid.*).

¹Commenting on the new role of theologians in the post-Vatican II Church, Peter Hebblethwaite stated that “[the Council] ushered in a new, constructive, and sometimes combative role for theologians in the life of the Church. . . . No longer were they to be the conveyor-belt system of the magisterium; they were to be the heralds of the new and dynamic element in the Church.” Hebblethwaite, 103; cf. Wittstadt, 452.

²Yves Congar, quoted in Jean-Pierre Jossua, *Le Père Congar: La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu* (Paris: Les Éditions du cerf, 1967), 209 (*italics his*).

³Rahner, 19-20, 24. Rahner appropriately entitles the three chapters of his book: “The Council—A New Beginning;” “The Church—A New Image;” and “Theology—A New Challenge” (*ibid.*, 5).

conciliar documents, the Council fathers encouraged freedom of theological thought. At the same time, however, the Council affirmed the traditional papal and episcopal prerogatives. As a result of such ambiguities the period immediately following the Council saw the rapid breaking down of the oneness which Pius XII had called for.¹ Two basic post-conciliar mentalities emerged. Progressive theologians, claiming that the Council allowed them to share in doctrinal teaching, began to explore new theological and philosophical trends which they felt could contribute to the revitalization of Catholic teachings. They believed that the Council “accorded full and indeed decisive weight to the existential principle in theology,”² which called for the teachings of the Church to be attractively and convincingly packaged, in order to address the needs of a contemporary audience. Rather than relying upon coercion and assent, such teachings needed to appeal to peoples’ imaginations, hearts, and desire for meaningful lives. This principle, therefore, called for the re-evaluation and adjustment of all teachings and institutions which had failed to “convince.”³ While serious and committed Catholic theologians searched for ways in which Catholic teachings and institutions could genuinely be renewed, others took their newly perceived freedom to extremes and began to challenge various features of the Catholic heritage.⁴ This resulted in a powerful reaction on the part of those who believed

¹Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, foreword to *Vatican II Revisited by Those Who Were There*, ed. Alberic Stacpoole (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1986), xiii; cf. Congar, “A Brief History of the Forms of the Magisterium,” 327. For an in-depth study of the ambiguities present in the conciliar documents, see Richard A. McBrien, *Church: The Continuing Quest* (New York: Newman Press, 1970), 23-41.

²Sebastian Moore, “Change in Focus,” in *Authority in a Changing Church*, ed. John Dalrymple (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968), 1.

³*Ibid.*, 2.

⁴Martin E. Marty, *A Short History of American Catholicism* (Allen, TX: Thomas Moore Publishing, 1995), 185; cf. Hebblethwaite, 104. Similarly, Mark Schoof notes that “the openness in the Catholic Church that had to some extent been brought about by the Council meant, among other things, that the ‘radical’ theology which had originated outside Catholicism reached wide sections of the Catholic populations who had previously been protected and obedient. . . . This caused an unexpected and apparently irresistible speeding up inside a Church that had hitherto been well ordered and well organized, so that the inevitable result was a sensation of dizziness.” Schoof, 265.

that the integrity of Roman Catholicism was endangered. For them, the teachings of the Council represented a point of arrival, not of departure. The Council, they held, introduced so many innovations that the Church needed time to receive and incorporate them. Without rejecting the Council's teachings, they wanted to proceed slowly and carefully. In fact, as Schoof notes, they were "convinced that the process of *aggiornamento* had ended with the close of the Council, and that all that was needed was to put it into practice."¹

It is not surprising that in the years following the Council disagreements between the proponents of these opposing views often resulted in conflict. One of the first signs of the measure of polarization within the Church was the reception of Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae vitae* (1968). The issue was not so much the content of the encyclical—it did, after all, represent traditional Roman Catholic teaching—as much as the realization that, in spite of the Vatican II reforms, the magisterium continued to operate according to traditional dogmatic patterns.² The widespread dissent following the encyclical stunned ecclesiastical

¹Schoof, 267. Schoof notes that this group was represented by leading members of the Church hierarchy and conservative theologians, who had become unsettled by the "unrest and disorder" within the Church. Some of them became convinced "that the whole Council had been a mistake. This prompted them to make a series of statements and to suggest measures to save what could be saved, if possible by going back inside the fortress." The chief representative of this group, according to Schoof, was Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani (1890-1979) (ibid., 267); cf. Hebblethwaite, 104-05.

²Writing about the Vatican's procedures at the time, Karl Rahner commented that they were still undergirded by "traditional neo-Scholastic theology out of which all of us have come and which in Rome, despite Vatican II, still enjoys more or less unquestioned hegemony." Karl Rahner, "Open Questions in Dogma Considered by the Institutional Church as Definitively Answered," in *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 149. Likewise, Timothy E. O'Connell states that doctrinal power in the post-Vatican II Church continues to represent "a juridical model, where teaching is viewed as a function of office." Timothy E. O'Connell, "A Final Report," *CS* 17 (1978): 283. See also Karl Rahner, "The Dispute Concerning the Teaching Office of the Church," in *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 113-28; cf. Monika Helwig, "Who Is Truly a Catholic Theologian?" *CTSA* 42 (1987): 92; Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler, *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* and Christopher Derrick, *Church Authority and Intellectual Freedom* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981), 10-1.

authorities, caused lasting damage to Church authority¹ and an increased vigilance by the hierarchical magisterium with regard to teachings considered as threats to Catholic orthodoxy.²

As a result, much theological effort since 1968 has been devoted to the understanding of papal and episcopal authority, as well as to the nature and role of Catholic theology. The discussion has centered on issues such as the history, nature, and role of the hierarchical magisterium, as well as the obligatory character of its teachings and the consequences of dissent; the nature and role of Catholic theology and its relationship with the hierarchical magisterium;³ the possibility of more than one magisterium in the Church,

¹Paul Hofmann, *Anatomy of the Vatican* (London: Robert Hale, 1984), 31. The publication of the encyclical by Paul VI resulted in a statement of protest endorsed by more than six hundred theologians. The full text of the July 30, 1968, statement appears in Charles E. Curran and Robert E. Hunt, *Dissent in and for the Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969), 24-6.

²This has been especially evident during the pontificate of John Paul II. Celebrated cases where theologians have been either silenced or censored include Hans Küng, Charles Curran, Edward Schillebeeckx, and Leonardo Boff. For a description of the controversies surrounding these and other Catholic theologians, see Patrick Granfield, *The Limits of the Papacy: Authority and Autonomy in the Church* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1987).

³See, for example, *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978). The entire volume was dedicated to a discussion of the respective roles of the magisterium and of theology. A sample of other studies dealing with these issues includes: Richard P. McBrien, "Catholic Theology, 1974: Problems and Prospects," *CTSA* 29 (1974): 397-411; Jürgen Moltmann and Hans Küng, eds., *Who Has the Say in the Church?* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981); George Devine, ed., *Theology in Revolution* (New York: Alba House, 1970); Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, eds., *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982); idem, eds., *Readings in Moral Theology: Dissent in the Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982); Peter M. McCord, ed., *A Pope for All Christians?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1976); David Tracy, Hans Küng, and Johann B. Metz, eds., *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978).

One of the most important post-Vatican II attempts to define the role of theologians in the Church, as well as their relationship with the hierarchical magisterium, was the result of a symposium sponsored by the International Theological Commission, held in Rome from September 25 to October 1, 1975. Entitled "Theses on the Relationship Between the Ecclesiastical Magisterium and Theology," it was published in English by Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, eds., *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, 151-70. The theses also appear in *International Theological Commission, Texts and Documents 1969-1985* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989), 129-44. Francis Sullivan comments that "while on the one hand there is reason to believe that these 'theses' would reflect a fairly broad consensus in the Catholic theological community, on the other hand there is also reason to believe that they were acceptable to the official organ of the

as well as the authority of each and the nature of their relationship.¹ This all-too-brief portrayal of the Roman Catholic situation allows us to focus our sights still further on a theologian whose work significantly enriched the intra-ecclesial discussions on doctrinal authority in the Church, namely Avery Robert Dulles.

Avery Dulles: The Man and the Context

Since the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council, Avery Dulles, who is often referred to as “the dean of American Catholic theologians,”² has been involved in the

papal magisterium, namely, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.” Sullivan, *Magisterium*, 174.

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith also published a document in response to the growing problem of dissent in the Church. The Instruction, “On the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian,” appeared in English in *Origins* 20 (1990): 117-26. (*Origins*, a documentary service which provides complete texts of all major Vatican and Episcopal documents, is published by the Catholic News Service, a department of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops). While the Instruction elaborates on the importance of the theologian’s quest for truth, it also stresses the authority of the magisterium and the need for submission (*ibid.*). An insightful commentary on the Instruction was provided by Réal Tremblay, “Donum veritatis: un document qui donne à penser,” *Nouvelle revue théologique* 114 (1992): 391-411. The Instruction received an ambivalent reception among theologians. See Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 106-18; Joseph A. Komonchak, “The Magisterium and Theologians,” *CS* 29 (1990): 307-29; Marcel Lefebvre, “Quelle est la mission du théologien?” *Église et théologie* 22 (1991): 177-90.

¹See, for example, Raymond Brown, “The Dilemma of the Magisterium vs. the Theologians—Debunking Some Fictions,” *CS* 17 (1978): 290-307; Richard A. McCormick, “Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 40 (1979): 95-7. Members of the ecclesiastical magisterium, including Paul VI and John Paul II, also joined the debate. Several bishops participated in the work of the International Theological Commission, where they addressed these issues. For details, see O’Donovan, et. al., 328. See also the report of the U.S. Bishops’ Committee on Doctrine, which dealt with the nature of the ecclesiastical magisterium and its relationship with theologians. “Report: An Ongoing Discussion of Magisterium,” *Origins* 9 (1980): 541-51. The committee addressed issues such as “How should the notion of magisterium be understood in relation to the preaching, teaching and pastoral roles carried out by bishops and theologians? How does the notion of magisterium change as one’s model of the church varies? When is dissent legitimate in the church, and are there times when dissent serves the pastoral purposes of the church?” (*ibid.*, 551); cf. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Nature and Mission of Theology: Approaches to Understanding Its Role in the Light of Present Controversy* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995).

²See, for example, James Massa, “Dean of Theology: Avery Dulles at Eighty,” *Crisis*, September 1998, 16-21; Paul Lakeland, “Accommodation to Secularity: The Tracy-Dulles Controversy,” *The Month* 11 (1978): 163.

discussions regarding doctrinal authority in the Church and particularly the role of Catholic theologians. As a theologian of careful views, he has always attempted to seek mediating positions capable of holding extreme views in tension. His writings, lucid and captivating, have attracted readers of various backgrounds. To understand Dulles's views, however, some knowledge of his early life is essential, and, prior to this, a few remarks regarding the American Roman Catholic Church and the Jesuit order, of which he is a member, are appropriate.

The American Roman Catholic Church

During the last two hundred years, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has grown from insignificant beginnings to the largest and, in many ways, most powerful and influential religious organization in the country. It has molded American life in many ways. American Catholicism has been shaped primarily by two attitudes: unswerving loyalty to the Church and a desire to adapt to new circumstances. Both, to a large degree, are the result of the American Church's immigrant past.¹ The "immigrant Church," as it was often called, was subjected to anti-Catholic bias and persecution. As a result, Catholics tended to form close and cohesive communities, which strengthened the Church. For decades, Catholic communities exhibited a "ghetto mentality," successfully opposing the intrusion of traditional American values, such as freedom and democracy, and emphasizing the importance of a centralized ecclesiastical government, and of authority and discipline. Obedience and loyalty to Rome were considered principal values.²

¹Only from about the mid-nineteenth century may one speak of the beginnings of a strong, unified, and institutionalized Roman Catholic Church within the United States. This occurred mainly as the result of an unprecedented influx of Catholic immigrants from European countries. While the first American bishop, John Carroll (1735-1815), was named in 1789, the Catholic Church of America was considered a mission Church until 1908. In that year, Pius X, in his apostolic constitution *Sapienti consilio*, removed the U.S. church from under the jurisdiction of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide and established it on the basis of equality with other ancient churches.

²John Tracy Ellis, "The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life," in *The Catholic Church U.S.A.*, ed. Louis J. Putz (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956), 355; John Deedy, "American Catholicism," *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia* (1994), 23; Avery Dulles, "Vatican II and the American Experience of Church," in *Vatican II*:

While such a mentality helped many Catholics to respond to the challenges facing them in their adopted country, another segment of the Catholic population sought to move beyond the “ghetto mentality” and adapt to the new national way of living, in all spheres, religious, social, and political.¹ In the early years of the twentieth century, more progressive Catholics began to explore the possibilities of a rapprochement with American culture and its way of life.² This tendency was most prominently exhibited by John Tracy Ellis (1905-1992), Gustave Weigel (1906-1964), and John Courtney Murray (1904-1967), who emerged as leading American Catholic thinkers. These scholars believed that many aspects of the “American Proposition,” including the notions of democracy and individualism, were spiritually and ideologically compatible with Roman Catholic teachings.³ Both Weigel and Murray taught at the Jesuit Woodstock Theology School, influencing many young Jesuits, including Avery Dulles.⁴

Open Questions and New Horizons, ed. Gerald M. Fagin (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 39-42.

¹This was especially evident in the movement termed “Americanism,” the proponents of which sought to adapt, as far as possible, the external institutions of the Church to American ideals. Such virtues as humanitarianism and democracy were emphasized at the expense of submission to authority. “Americanism” was condemned by Leo XIII, in an Apostolic Letter, *Testem benevolentiae*, on January 22, 1899. The primary proponent of the early expression of “Americanism” was a Paulist priest, Isaac T. Hecker (1819-1888). For a detailed history, see McAvoy, *The Americanist Heresy in Roman Catholicism*.

²For a detailed account, see John Tracy Ellis, *American Catholicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 122-59; cf. Robert McAfee Brown and Gustave Weigel, *An American Dialogue: A Protestant Looks at Catholicism and a Catholic Looks at Protestantism* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960), 33-6.

³For details, see Ellis, “The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life,” 315-57; Gustave Weigel, *Catholic Theology in Dialogue* (New York: Harper, 1961), and John Courtney Murray, *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960); cf. Donald J. D’Elia and Stephen M. Krason, eds., *We Hold These Truths and More: Further Reflections on the American Proposition, the Thought of Fr. John Courtney Murray, S. J., and Its Relevance Today* (Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1993).

⁴Avery Dulles, “Helping the Kingdom Come,” interview by J. Wintz, *Saint Anthony Messenger*, January 1974, 25-6; Massa, 18.

The spirit of loyalty to the Church and the desire for cultural rapprochement became the main characteristics of the American Catholic Church in the mid-twentieth century. It is not surprising, therefore, that the majority of American bishops present at the Second Vatican Council reflected these twin characteristics. They were loyal to the Church and avoided unnecessary controversies, but they also strongly supported the Council's emphasis upon *aggiornamento* and an opening to the world.¹

The Society of Jesus and Its Post-Vatican II Transformation

Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556) established the Society of Jesus in 1534, hoping to be of service to the Church, especially in the areas of Catholic doctrine and life. Ignatius and a group of followers placed themselves at the disposal of the pope and vowed absolute obedience. In subsequent years, they proved to be invaluable to the Church, primarily in the areas of mission and education.² Always on the cutting edge, the Jesuits struggled at times to maintain their vow of obedience to the Roman pontiff. This became especially evident in the twentieth century when, according to some, the Society of Jesus began to "drift away from its constituting genius."³ In the decades prior to the Second Vatican Council, a number of Jesuits became part of the avant-garde of Catholic biblical and theological scholarship. They began to express dissatisfaction with some aspects of Church teaching and practice, which occasionally resulted in friction between the Vatican and the Jesuit order, as well as the censoring of some prominent Jesuits.⁴ During Vatican

¹Michael Walsh, "The History of the Council," in *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 41.

²Thomas M. King, "Society of Jesus," *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia* (1994), 817-18.

³Richard John Neuhaus, "The Public Square," *First Things*, April 1994, 63.

⁴According to Joseph M. Becker, who published a two-volume work dealing with the post-Vatican II history of the Society of Jesus, young men entering the Jesuit novitiate from the fifties onwards exhibited a new attitude of independence and uneasiness with the traditional teachings of the Church. As time progressed, this attitude became more explicit and insistent. Joseph M. Becker, *The Re-Formed Jesuits: A History of Changes in Jesuits' Formation During the Decade 1965-1975*, 2 vols. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992), 1:351-52.

II, some of these Jesuits functioned as Council's *periti* and exercised considerable influence as "liberal lobbyists."¹

The Second Vatican Council had a powerful impact upon the Society of Jesus as it unleashed the liberal forces immured within the order for decades. As a result, in the immediate post-conciliar years the order "underwent a significant internal transformation, probably greater than any it had experienced in its previous four hundred years."² Encouraged by the Council, Jesuit scholars, particularly in the United States and Western Europe, began questioning papal pronouncements as well as traditional Catholic teachings and practices. As one prominent Jesuit alleged, the Ignatian vow of obedience to the pope "would be distorted if it were interpreted in a rigid and legalistic way." The founder of the order provided for "maximum flexibility" in order to meet the requirements of the times and circumstances. "Jesuit identity demands a pioneering spirit, and ongoing commitment to innovation." To be an institution that met modern demands, the Society had to be capable of radical reinterpretation. The vocation of a modern Jesuit, therefore, "would appear to demand an insatiable restlessness toward the more universal good, a bold involvement in the world, and an intense personalization in the process of religious decision" rather than mere submission to the desires of the superior.³ Thus, for the modern Society of Jesus, service to the Church rather than to the pope became the chief endeavor.⁴

¹Hofmann, 216.

²Becker, 1:11.

³Avery Dulles, "The Contemporary Relevance of the Ignatian Vision," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 4 (1972): 152-53.

⁴Such a conclusion is clear, based on Avery Dulles's own words, expressed in an interview with a Polish Catholic Newspaper in 1973: "Historyczne Towarzystwo Jezusowe bylo scisle zwiazane z kontrreformacja i cechowal je w tym okresie duch niemal wojskowego posluszenstwa. W okresie mniej wiecej ostatniego dziesiatka lat Jezuici podjeli probe rewizji i ponownego okreslenia idei posluszenstwa w zakonie. Pragna widziec to posluszenstwo w kategoriach wspolnotowych decyzji osiaganych przez dialog, mniej natomiast w kategoriach rozkazow i wyrokow ferowanych przez jednego czlowieka, ktory rozkazuje z gory. Oczywiscie zawsze miec bedziemy przelozonych w zakonie, lecz oni prawdopodobnie beda dzialac bardziej demokratycznie. . . . Jezuitow pociagnela idea, by zakon oddal sie bardziej w sluzbe Kosciola powszechnego." (The historical Society of Jesus was closely associated with the Counter-Reformation and at the time it was

Considering this new self-perception on the part of many Jesuits in the post-Vatican II years, tensions have often flared between the order and the Roman see. Paul VI exhorted the Jesuits to become more balanced in their views and, soon after his election, John Paul II disciplined the order for causing “confusion in the Christian people and concern to the Church.”¹ Since John Paul II’s intervention, the Jesuits are no longer considered a threat to Catholic integrity, although they continue to be criticized in conservative circles.²

Avery Dulles stands out as a prominent American Catholic theologian and long-standing member of the Jesuit order whose views have influenced Catholic and Protestant theologians alike. At this point, before launching an investigation of his views on doctrinal authority in the following chapters, a few biographical notes should suffice.

Avery Dulles’s Academic Career

Avery Dulles was born in 1918 in Auburn, New York, to the nominally Presbyterian family of John Foster Dulles. The name Dulles has permanently etched itself characterized by a spirit of almost military obedience. Within the last ten or so years, the Jesuits have attempted to revise and adapt the idea of obedience for the order. They would like to see obedience in collegial categories where decisions are reached through dialogue, and not in categories of orders and decrees given by one man who orders from above. Of course, we will always have superiors, but they will most likely act more democratically. . . . Jesuits are drawn by the idea that the order should work for the good of the greater Church). Avery Dulles, “Rozmowa z Avery Dullesem, SJ,” interview by Jozef Krasinski, *Tygodnik Powszechny*, November 11, 1973, 3, translation mine.

¹John Paul II, quoted in Jonathan Kwitny, *Man of the Century: The Life and Times of Pope John Paul II* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1997), 403. For a detailed report on “the Jesuit Intervention” and the pope’s dealings with Father Pedro Arrupe (1927-1991), the General of the Society (1965-1981), see George Weigel, *Witness to Hope: The Biography of Pope John Paul II* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1999), 425-30.

²Richard John Neuhaus, “The Public Square,” *First Things*, August-September, 1995, 83; idem, “The Public Square,” *First Things*, November, 1995, 78; idem, “The Public Square,” *First Things*, October, 1996, 94-5; George A. Kelly, “Jesuits’ Old Views,” *Catholic New York*, July 15, 1999, 21; idem, interview by author, July 28, 1999, Andrews University. At times, John Paul II also continues to remind the Jesuits of their original vows. See the editorial “Pope Reminds Jesuits to Be Faithful to Magisterium,” *The Wanderer*, April 19, 2001, 1, 6.

into twentieth-century American history. Several members of the family have held crucial government posts. Dulles's father served as Secretary of State under president Dwight Eisenhower. His uncle Allen was CIA director during the same administration.

Disenchanted with Protestantism and its permeating liberalism, Dulles converted to Roman Catholicism in 1940 while studying at Harvard University. While at Harvard he was one of the founders of the St. Benedict Center—a thriving Catholic student organization.¹ In 1946, after spending five years in the U. S. Navy during World War II, Avery Dulles was received into the Society of Jesus. Following his novitiate, he spent three years studying philosophy at the Jesuit Theological School in Woodstock, MD. From 1951 to 1953 Dulles taught philosophy at Fordham University in New York,² following which he returned to Woodstock where, under the mentorship of Gustave Weigel, he was introduced to the ecumenical movement and contemporary Protestant theological thought. While there, he also became acquainted with new trends in Catholic theology, including the teachings of Henri de Lubac, Jean Daniélou, and Yves Congar, which prepared him for the Vatican II *aggiornamento*. Following his ordination in 1956, Dulles completed his Jesuit tertianship in Germany.³

Dulles completed his doctoral studies at the Pontifical Gregorian University in 1960,⁴ following which he returned to Woodstock College as a theology instructor. While there, he became an enthusiastic observer of the events associated with the Second Vatican Council. Following the Council, he was invited to contribute to the English edition of the

¹Avery Dulles, "Harvard as an Invitation to Catholicism," in *The Catholics of Harvard Square*, ed. Jeffrey Wills (Petersham, MA: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993), 119-24.

²Avery Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace and Reflections on a Theological Journey* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1996), 102.

³*Ibid.*, 103-05.

⁴Dulles's doctoral thesis dealt with the participation of Protestant churches in the prophetic office of the Church. The last chapter of Dulles's dissertation was published as *Protestant Churches and the Prophetic Office* (Woodstock, MD: Woodstock College Press, 1961).

documents of Vatican II by providing a commentary on *Lumen gentium*, one of the most important conciliar documents. This contribution launched his life-long task as a Catholic ecclesiologist and as an interpreter of the Second Vatican Council.¹ His other interests also included fundamental theology, particularly in the area of revelation, and ecumenism.

From 1966 to 1973, Dulles served as a consultant to the Papal Secretariat for Dialogue with Non-Believers. During this time, he was invited to become a member of the U. S. Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue.² He also served on the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, the Advisory Council for the United States Catholic Conference, and the Commission on Christian Unity of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. In 1974, Dulles accepted a teaching position at the Catholic University of America, where he taught for 14 years. In 1975, he became president of the Catholic Theological Society of America, and in 1978 assumed the presidency of the American Theological Society.³ Dulles is a past member of the International Theological Commission and the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Coordinating committee. He also served as a consultant to the Committee on Doctrine of the National Conference of Bishops.⁴ Following his retirement in 1988, Dulles returned to Fordham University, where he accepted the Laurence J. McGinley Chair of Religion and Society, a position which he still holds. He continues to serve as a visiting lecturer at many universities. During his distinguished academic career he has received twenty-five honorary doctorates from both American and foreign universities. He is the author of twenty-five books and approximately six hundred scholarly articles.

¹Avery Dulles, "The Church," in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 9-13. Dulles also authored the footnotes which accompany *Lumen gentium*. See *ibid.*, pp. 14-98.

²Dulles, "Helping the Kingdom Come," 26.

³Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace and Reflections on a Theological Journey* (1996), 120-21.

⁴This organization recently became known as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

In February 2001, in recognition of his outstanding service to the Church, John Paul II honored Avery Dulles by naming him to the College of Cardinals. Through this action, Cardinal Dulles became the first U.S. theologian, as well as the first American Jesuit, to be so honored, thus joined the ranks of such pre-eminent theologians as John Henry Newman, Yves Congar, Jean Daniélou, Henri de Lubac, and Hans Urs Von Balthasar. Like Congar and de Lubac, he declined to be consecrated as a bishop.

Not uncommonly at a given moment in history, a single figure can epitomize an entire school of thought. Like his cardinal-theologian predecessors, Dulles is an intellectual leader among American Roman Catholics. He belongs in the small company of those who, such as John Courtney Murray and Gustave Weigel, have almost single-handedly refashioned the thinking of important segments of the Church on vital matters dealing with the nature and role of the hierarchical magisterium in the Church, as well as its relationship with theologians.

In the chapter that follows, I intend to address the major concern of this dissertation during the years surrounding the Second Vatican Council. I shall do so in three ways: First, I examine the main characteristics of Avery Dulles's pre- and post-Vatican II ecclesiology. Second, I move to his reflection on the magisterium before, third, I focus on his proposal of two magisteria.

CHAPTER 2

THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIAN: PRE-VATICAN II AND EARLY POST-VATICAN II VIEWS

Introduction

The relationship between the magisterium and theologians is a complex issue that in the past several decades has been at the forefront of theological debate within the Roman Catholic communion. If we are to grasp Avery Dulles's views regarding this issue, it is important to consider them within the context of his ecclesiological convictions. In this chapter, I intend to (1) present the theological milieu within which Dulles was received into the Roman Catholic Church and outline his pre-Vatican II ecclesiology; (2) explore the major influences that may have contributed to the change in his views after the Second Vatican Council; (3) examine Dulles's post-Vatican II ecclesiology and the way in which it affected his view of authority in the Church; (4) discuss Dulles's view on the historicity of the magisterium and the problem of *ius divinum*; and (5) explore his views on the nature and role of the hierarchical magisterium and theologians, as well as the relationship between these two groups.

Catholic Ecclesiology in the Twentieth Century

As a specific theological discipline, ecclesiology was largely neglected throughout the first fifteen centuries of Church history. Only after the Council of Trent (1545-1563), as a result of the unrelenting challenge of the Protestant Reformation, did it become the focus of Catholic theological reflection and eventually a leading Catholic discipline, which

dominated the agenda of both Vatican Councils.¹ To grasp the broad lines of ecclesiological thought within the Roman Catholic communion, as well as to understand the influences which shaped the thinking of young Avery Dulles, it is essential to first examine Roman Catholic epistemology, the platform upon which its ecclesiology is built.

Revelation

Catholic theologians have always understood God's self-disclosure to humanity to be of primary importance for the Christian faith.² Prior to the modern era, the nature of revelation was hardly considered controversial and Christian theology focused mainly on the message contained in revelation. Traditional Catholic theology advocated that divine disclosure was provided in the form of cognitive propositional truth.³

During the Enlightenment, rationalistic ideology subjected the traditional concept of revelation to severe criticism.⁴ In response to the excesses of rationalism, as well as in the face of the gradual erosion of traditional values in the social, moral, and religious orders, Roman Catholic theology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries underwent a revival of medieval scholasticism. Neo-Scholasticism was given official recognition in the conciliar

¹For a stimulating history of the doctrine of the church, from a progressive Catholic perspective, see Küng's *The Church*.

²For a detailed Roman Catholic perspective on the development of the doctrine of revelation and its implication on other doctrines see René Latourelle's *Theology of Revelation* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1966), and Avery Dulles's *Revelation Theology: A History* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969). See also several concise articles under in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (NCE) (1967), s.v. "Revelation."

³G. H. Joyce, "Revelation," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1912), 13:1-2.

⁴For a concise commentary on the impact of rationalism and the scientific mode of thinking on the theology of revelation see Langdon Gilkey, *Religion and the Scientific Future* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), and especially chap. 1: "The Influence of Science on Recent Theology."

and Roman documents of the era.¹ It viewed revelation as an impersonal datum, capable of being captured in meaningful and immutable formulations.²

Ecclesiology

Neo-Scholastic epistemology led to a strictly hierarchical ecclesiology. It argued that all doctrinal and ecclesiastical powers should be centered in the hands of the magisterium. All revealed truth could be mediated only from 'on high' via divinely instituted authoritative organs.³ In the same period, the authority of the papal office was progressively elevated to unprecedented heights.⁴ Thus, the Church came to be seen as a pyramid, where everything came down "from the top." The episcopal hierarchy, and especially the papacy, was recognized as the only official bearer and interpreter of the

¹Latourelle, 193. Neo-Scholastic thought received official recognition in 1879, when Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) issued the encyclical *Aeterni patris*. This document officially "imposed the philosophico-theological system of St. Thomas Aquinas on the whole church. This was an unprecedented act, and its significance is often underrated." Gabriel Daly, "Catholicism and Modernity," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* (JAAR) 53 (1985): 775. Lord Acton noted that during this period of history "theology became almost entirely scholastic. It was regarded as complete, not susceptible of development, looking backwards and not forwards, more interested in the vindication of authoritative names than in the cultivation of those original studies which are needed for its advance." John Acton, *Essays on Church and State* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1952), 50. See also *Dei Filius*, in *Documents of Vatican Council I, 1869-1870*, sel. and trans. John F. Broderick (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1971), 41-2.

²This position was further entrenched when challenged by Catholic modernist thinkers such as Alfred Loisy (1857-1940) and George Tyrrell (1861-1909). Modernism was a movement that attempted to respond to the challenges of the liberal age by redefining the nature of revelation within the framework of rationalistic thought. Norman Provencher, "Modernism," *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology (DFT)* (1995), 719-20. Latourelle comments that "[Pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic] theology, in the twentieth century, is built upon the outline of the first Vatican Council and the anti-Modernist documents; it defines revelation in the perspective of these documents. What was needed was to protect the concept of revelation against the denials of rationalism and from the contamination of liberal Protestantism." Latourelle, 207.

³Tillard, 33.

⁴Richard Gaillardetz comments that "Vatican I's constitution, *Pastor aeternus*, was the culmination of a centuries-long historical trajectory toward a view of the Church that was pyramidal, juridical, and to some extent reactionary." Richard Gaillardetz, *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), 50.

content of revelation, which, by Christ, had been committed to the apostles and, subsequently, to their official successors.¹ This Neo-Scholastic system of thought deeply impressed young Avery Dulles and contributed to his decision to join the Roman Catholic Church.²

The Pre-Vatican II Ecclesiology of Avery Dulles

The primary influences that informed Dulles's pre-Vatican II ecclesiology were his rejection of the main tenets of Liberalism and, consequently, his view on the nature of revelation.

Rejection of Liberalism and a Conversion Experience

Dulles's conversion came about in two stages, philosophical and theological, the whole process lasting some three years.³ His philosophical conversion was marked by an increasing fascination with classical idealism and objective reality.⁴ He eventually

¹*Pastor aeternus*, in *Documents of Vatican Council I, 1869-1870*, 63. The movement towards hierarchical centralism, often associated with what is sometimes designated as a Christomonist view of the Church, was further fueled by the historical situation in which the Roman Catholic Church found itself in the nineteenth century. To offset the rise of nationalism, as well as several anti-authoritarian movements in the mode of Gallicanism or Jansenism, Neo-Scholastic theology stressed the visible, institutional, and hierarchical aspects of the Church. Such an ecclesiology, in turn, led to an unbalanced, narrow, and strictly juridical view of teaching authority in the Church. John J. Heaney, *The Modernist Crisis: Von Hügel* (Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1968), 34; Joseph Komonchak, "The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches," in *Where Does the Church Stand?* ed. Giuseppe Alberigo with Gustavo Gutiérrez (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Seabury Press, 1981), 30.

²In 1946 Avery Dulles published an account of his conversion entitled *A Testimonial to Grace*. Rather than a systematic treatise that elucidates Dulles's theology, this document is a personal reflection on his conversion. As Dulles's earliest apology of Roman Catholic teachings, it allows us to gain insight into his pre-Vatican II understanding of revelation and the doctrine of the church.

³*Ibid.*, 41; Avery Dulles, "Reason, Faith, and Theology: An Interview with Cardinal Avery Dulles, S.J.," interview by James Martin, *America*, March 5, 2001, 7-10.

⁴Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 41. This philosophical world view, with its "much sounder . . . outlook on the universe" as compared with modern philosophical systems, offered young Dulles an insight into the deeper concept of objective reality and the appreciation of the hierarchical orderliness of the universe (*ibid.*, 21, 25). Moral values, such as goodness and justice, corresponded to objective realities and no longer had their basis in the subjective desires of a particular group of people (*ibid.*, 25-6).

concluded that a fully satisfying life ought to be motivated by factors other than a hedonistic pursuit of personal pleasure, which he had hitherto espoused. This philosophical turnaround, from materialistic atheism to Platonic idealism, with its abstract and sterile concepts of the absolute,¹ did not satisfy Dulles, however. It neither provided him with a satisfactory object of devotion and sacrifice, nor did it adequately explain the meaning of human life, though it did provide a platform upon which his inchoate belief in a personal and benevolent God was eventually established.²

The second stage of Dulles's conversion resulted from his attempt, through a detailed investigation of the New Testament, to understand the nature and actions of the "god" he had discovered through philosophical contemplation.³ He longed to find a community of believers whose teachings would be consistent with his new concerns. Several encounters with various Protestant denominations convinced him that they had fallen victim to liberalism. He felt that Protestant doctrine disregarded the truthfulness of Christ's teachings, soft-pedaled his "hard" doctrines, and accepted human and provisional authority. Disappointed with Protestantism, Dulles turned to the Roman Catholic Church.⁴ While the liturgy, at first, held no attraction for him, he immersed himself in Catholic theology and eventually accepted the basic tenets of the Roman Catholic faith.⁵

¹Ibid., 44. Dulles's search had led him to accept the existence of moral absolutes, which affected his socio-political convictions. Democracy, an ideology previously viewed by him as an "unqualified blessing" which allowed the majority to determine the actions of the State, began to lose its appeal. Rather than conforming to "the whims and illusions" of public opinion, Dulles suggested that the State should serve some higher purpose, such as taking responsibility for the physical as well as spiritual well-being of society. Such views, in turn, brought him in conflict with "those liberalistic forces, so prevalent at Harvard at the time, which were constantly making the 'authoritarian' Catholic Church the butt of their invective. I, by contrast, became increasingly disposed to accept authority, not only in politics, but also in faith and morals" (ibid., 47).

²Ibid., 49-50, 57.

³Ibid., 79-80; idem, "Reason, Faith, and Theology: An Interview with Cardinal Avery Dulles, S.J.," 7-10.

⁴Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 81-3.

⁵Ibid., 88-9. Dulles's convictions were influenced by such masters of Scholastic thought as Maurice de Wulf (1867-1947), Jacques Maritain (1882-1973), and Étienne

The Nature of Revelation

The idealism of classical philosophy provided the foundation for Dulles's early epistemology. Divine revelation, he insisted, was not only possible but, having its foundation in objective reality, was indispensable and obligatory. The ability of the human mind to attain the objective truth of revelation, either through natural reason or divine enlightenment, was taken for granted by Dulles. In agreement with classic Neo-Scholastic teaching, he affirmed that divine revelation could either come through God's direct communication of propositional truth¹ or through natural reason.² Its greatest manifestation was granted through the teachings of Christ.³ As "the revealed word of God," they were encased as a deposit of faith committed to the church for eternity, and later formulated as dogmas. These dogmas were incumbent upon all believers under the pain of eternal damnation.⁴ With other Catholics, Dulles held that all modern dogmas formulated by the Roman Catholic Church were—some in an implicit form—part of the original deposit of truth, dating back to Christ.⁵ The Roman Catholic Church was the only Christian community that possessed the entire deposit of divine revelation.⁶

Gilson (1884-1978), as well as by the teachings of popes Leo XIII (1810-1903) and Pius XI (1857-1939).

¹Avery Dulles, "On Keeping the Faith," *From the Housetops (FH)*, September 1946, 61, 64.

²Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 98. It was Dulles's philosophical conversion that seemed to have predisposed him to accept the Neo-Scholastic teachings of the Roman Catholic theology of his day.

³*Ibid.*, 71.

⁴*Ibid.*, 84, 97, 98, 99; Avery Dulles, "The Council and the Sources of Revelation," *America*, December 1, 1962, 1176.

⁵As a typical Neo-Scholastic theologian, Dulles claimed that no post-apostolic dogma could be totally new, since revelation was closed. All new dogmas had to be justified by referring to earlier documents. For a review of this approach see Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 225-26.

⁶Avery Dulles, "Catholic Ecumenism: Possible, Useful, Necessary," *The Catholic Reporter (CR)*, May 4, 1962, 11.

The Nature of the Church

Dulles's reflections on the objective and propositional nature of divine revelation had a definite bearing on his understanding of the nature of the Church. The ecclesiology of his early years as a theologian is imbued with the institutionalism so prevalent in Neo-Scholasticism.

As Dulles saw it, the Church was founded by Christ as a bridge between himself and humanity.¹ Through his sacramental presence in the Church, Christ was able to continue his ministry on earth. As the mystical body of Christ,² the Church was to be a corporate and visible institution.³ The apostles and their successors were to provide instruction in matters of faith and morals, and to continue Christ's sanctifying work on earth.⁴ Dulles's study of Church history convinced him that the Roman Catholic Church, because of its corporate structure, had never deviated from the original doctrine, and that "the treasure of the faith had been preserved intact." This, he asserted, would not have been possible without divine protection.⁵ He concluded that the Church existed in order to protect the integrity of the faith, to proclaim the Gospel of Christ to all the world, to propagate the moral law, and to administer the sacraments.⁶

¹Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 103.

²Avery Dulles, "The Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission," *Theological Studies (TS)* 21 (1960): 562. This document was originally a part of Dulles's dissertation, completed at the Gregorian University in Rome. Despite the relevance of this dissertation to the topic of this chapter and in spite of my best efforts I have not been able to obtain a copy of it.

³Avery Dulles, "The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement," *Downside Review (DR)* 239 (January 1957): 38. An invisible society, as taught by Protestants, would not be able to adequately present a coherent bulwark against the rampant liberalism of the age rejected by Dulles in his philosophical journey. Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 104-10.

⁴Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 104.

⁵*Ibid.*, 109-10.

⁶*Ibid.*, 107. Dulles became so convinced that only one society on earth could fulfill all of these requirements that he exclaimed that "if there existed any power on earth which could authoritatively declare what the Christian should believe and how he should act, and

Teaching Authority in the Church

Dulles's understanding of teaching authority in the Church was likewise shaped by his rejection of Liberalism, an ideology which emphasized autonomy, self-determination, and the absolute equality of all human beings.¹

Roman Catholic social teachings seemed founded upon a much sounder analysis of human beings and their relationships to external authority. Institutions such as the family or a secular state were willed by God and established with the specific goal of creating a stable social environment in which human beings could prosper and live in peace.² At the same time, the structure of the Roman Catholic Church, like that of an ideal secular state, did not depend on the will or concurrence of the governed, but was rather willed by God.³ When Christ established the Church he also provided it with a hierarchical structure whose purpose was to perpetuate the memory of Christ, as well as to provide doctrinal and moral guidance for the fledgling Christian community.⁴ Under the leadership of Peter, the apostles were vested with the responsibility of proclaiming and transmitting the Christian

which could validly administer the Sacraments which Christ had instituted, there was no doubt in my mind that it was none of the Protestant sects. There was but one serious contender for the position, and that was the Catholic Church presided over by the Bishop of Rome" (ibid., 107). Dulles's convictions were strengthened when he subjected the claims of the Catholic Church to thorough scrutiny in terms of the traditional marks of the true church, i.e., its unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. He concluded that all of these signs were present within the Roman Catholic Church, thus attesting to its identity as the church established by Jesus Christ (ibid., 108).

¹Ibid., 93-5.

²Ibid., 96.

³Ibid., 106.

⁴Ibid., 104; idem, *Apologetics and the Biblical Christ* (New York: Missionary Society of Saint Paul the Apostle, 1963), 43. A properly functioning social or religious group, Dulles argued, needed an inherent system of authorities, performing various functions, that excluded the absolute equality of every member of the community. Thus, Dulles argued, "the inequalities and differences . . . in every organized community are as healthy as they are inevitable." Idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 96.

message.¹ The same apostles appointed successors who, under the leadership of the bishop of Rome,² inherited the plenitude of the transmitted functions.³ Thus, the authoritative teaching office was passed on to the Church's hierarchy, viz., the magisterium of bishops, which, Dulles proposed, "possesses ex officio a certain prophetic status."⁴

To Dulles, an examination of the origin of the Church in the Gospels attested to the fact that the disciples received not only the fullness of divine revelation, but also Christ's promise of the Holy Spirit. He was to protect their teachings and that of their successors from error.⁵ While the gift of the Holy Spirit could be received by all believers, those who received it were to remain in communion with the bishops who, in turn, were in communion with the bishop of Rome. Only then could the teaching of those who did not belong to the episcopate be considered efficacious.⁶ "The doctrine that there can be some doctrinal mission independent of the hierarchical magisterium," he stated, "is the beginning, or at least the end, of all heresies."⁷

The requirement that every Catholic place implicit faith in a living magisterium and respond to its doctrinal pronouncements with both inner and outer assent was no arbitrary authoritarianism. The doctrinal magisterium had been established by Providence with the

¹Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1946), 108-09.

²Roman primacy, according to Dulles, was already evident in the days of Cyprian. Cyprian erred, however, when he insisted that each bishop was accountable solely to God. Such a position, he argued, later to become "an abortive proclamation of Protestantism," led Cyprian into unnecessary conflict with the Roman See. Avery Dulles, "Church Unity and Roman Primacy in the Doctrine of St. Cyprian," *The Theologian* 10 (Spring 1954): 45.

³Dulles, "The Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission," 550.

⁴Ibid., 569.

⁵Dulles, *Apologetics and Biblical Christ*, viii.

⁶Dulles, "The Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission," 580. Dulles insisted that the bishops could suitably co-opt fellow workers to assist them in their work. By ordaining and empowering deacons and priests the bishop could, as it were, "extend his activity to places where he cannot be personally present" (ibid., 550).

⁷Ibid., 551.

specific purpose of providing the believers with a clear understanding of divine revelation.¹ Obedience to the hierarchical magisterium constituted a “means of achieving a closer and more vital union with God.”²

Avery Dulles and the Second Vatican Council

Towards the Second Vatican Council

While his writings in the years immediately prior to the Second Vatican Council continued to be dominated by the Neo-Scholastic school of thought, the late fifties show evidence that Dulles had become progressively influenced by the *nouvelle théologie* represented in the writings of such scholars as Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac, and Jean Daniélou.³ His thinking was also affected by his study of Protestant theological thought,⁴ which contributed to his interest in ecumenical issues.⁵ It seems that Dulles was perceiving flaws within Neo-Scholastic theology and its emphasis upon a pyramidal vision of the church. Such vision, he claimed, resulted in a disturbance of the balance between obedience to the directives coming from above and the spirit of initiative from below. His

¹Dulles, *Apologetics and Biblical Christ*, ix; idem, “The Protestant Concept of the Church,” *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (AER) 132 (1955): 332.

²Dulles, “The Protestant Concept of the Church,” 334-35.

³See for example Dulles, “Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission.” Although the article, originally a part of Dulles's dissertation, was written from the perspective of a Neo-Scholastic scholar, it shows considerable influence of Yves Congar's teaching on laity (ibid., 558 passim); cf. Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957), 359. At the same time, Dulles's work immediately before the Council also shows his softening attitude towards Protestantism and ecumenism, one of the characteristics of the *nouvelle théologie*. See, for example, Dulles, “The Protestant Concept of the Church,” 330-35, and idem, review of *Concile et retour à l'unité*, by Hans Küng, *TS* 22 (1961): 704-06. Later on, Dulles will acknowledge the influence of the same scholars. See his “Reflections on a Theological Journey,” in idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 104.

⁴One of the first Protestant theologians carefully analyzed by Dulles was Paul Tillich. See Avery Dulles, “Paul Tillich and the Bible,” *TS* 17 (1956): 345-67. He regarded Tillich's theology as of “exceptional interest for the Catholic theologian” (ibid., 345).

⁵See Dulles, “Catholic Ecumenism: Possible, Useful, Necessary,” 11; idem, “What Hopes and What Misgivings Do You Entertain Regarding the Currently Emerging Religious Dialogue in America?” *America*, January 14, 1961, 461.

increasing awareness of the inadequacy of the traditional “fortress mentality” permeating Roman Catholicism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries resulted in his desire to see the Church to renew its theology and adopt a more cooperative attitude toward its milieu.¹

It is not surprising, therefore, that Dulles anticipated the Second Vatican Council with considerable enthusiasm. He hoped that the Council would face the challenge of *aggiornamento* and adapt institutions and policies to modern reality, as set forth by Pope John XXIII.² For Dulles the theologian, *aggiornamento* would also grant Catholic scholars more freedom to use the modern tools of scholarship in the study of the Scriptures and tradition. He expressed the fear that the “outspoken minority” who opposed the historical-critical study of the Scriptures still might be able to influence the council fathers, and that progress in this area might be stifled.³

The Second Vatican Council

A review of post-Vatican II Catholic literature shows a Church polarized in the wake of the Council.⁴ In an article published in 1989, Dulles suggested that the

¹Avery Dulles, “Les catholiques américains à l’ère ‘post-protestante’,” *Christus* [Paris] 9 (1962): 540. In this document, directed toward a French audience, Dulles evaluated the state of American theology: “Les catholiques américains se rendent compte que leur théologie a été polémique à l’excès et qu’elle inclinait à faire abstraction de beaucoup d’éléments valables contenus dans les affirmations protestantes. Dans notre pays, comme ailleurs, le catholicisme était porté à négliger la Bible au profit de la tradition ecclésiastique; il mettait en valeur les sacrements au détriment de la Parole de Dieu; et, dans son insistance sur le sacerdoce hiérarchique, la théologie catholique tendait à minimiser le sacerdoce royal du peuple chrétien tout entier” (ibid.).

²Dulles, review of *Concile et retour à l’unité*, 704; idem, review of *The Council, Reform and Reunion*, by Hans Küng, *Catholic Book Reporter*, April-May 1962, 11; idem, review of the same in *America*, March 31, 1962, 861-62.

³Dulles pointed out that as early as 1943, in the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*, Pius XII encouraged theologians to perform their task “without fear of molestation from those whose piety was less sophisticated.” He hoped that the Council would further ratify and encourage Pius XII’s proposal. Dulles, “The Council and the Sources of Revelation,” 1177.

⁴History shows that every major Church council was followed by a period of confusion and turmoil. Vatican II proved to be no exception. Langdon Gilkey provides an incisive assessment of the post-Vatican II Roman Catholic Church. He notes that prior to the Council, the Church was “rigidly controlled and confined, restricted to certain areas of thought and life but taboo in other areas.” The Council lifted these restrictions and the

polarization was caused by variant interpretations of the Council's documents.¹ He identified two major trends. A first group of theologians favored a "hermeneutics of continuity" and interpreted the teachings of Vatican II as continuous with previous Catholic teaching. For a second group, the Second Vatican Council brought a change in the theological and ecclesiastical climate within the Church which removed the constricting and threatening atmosphere of Neo-Scholasticism. This group affirmed a "hermeneutics of discontinuity," claiming that Vatican II's "innovations were more central than its reaffirmations of previously official positions."²

Dulles's post-Vatican II writings, up to the mid-eighties, indicate that he identified with the latter group. During this period, he exhibited significant enthusiasm towards the "innovative" teachings of the Councils and dedicated his theological expertise to the implementation of the new vision of the Church, as he perceived it, in the Council's decrees. His teachings could be classified as affirming a "hermeneutics of discontinuity."

Hermeneutics of Discontinuity

The Second Vatican Council was, according to Dulles, one of the great turning points in Western religious history. It set the Church on a radically new course.³ While

Church intentionally attempted to adjust itself to the new situation through reinterpreting the forms of its thought and life. The end result of these attempts, Gilkey writes, was "intense confusion and chaos." Gilkey, *Catholicism Confronts Modernity*, 35-6. Dulles was keenly aware of the tension between the new and the old ways of thinking, which had resulted in a crisis of significant proportions. To him, however, this crisis seemed to have a constructive dimension. Faced with the need to change, any institution, he claimed, would experience crisis. But such crisis was "healthy" because it would eventually lead the Church towards reconciliation with the contemporary world, rather than becoming a museum exhibit. Andrew Wallace, "Church Is in Crisis of Transition, Needs Changes, Father Dulles Says," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 7 October 1972, 4.

¹Avery Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," *TS* 50 (1989): 430-31. Peter Hebblethwaite makes a similar point in his *The Runaway Church*, 103.

²Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," 430. Dulles placed in this group theologians such as Edward Schillebeeckx, Richard McBrien, and the Lutheran theologian George Lindbeck, of Yale University.

³Avery Dulles, "The Contemporary Magisterium," *Theology Digest (TD)* 17 (1969): 303-04.

the Council fathers had not wanted to break with the past or retract any Catholic dogmas—no Council could do that—they had acknowledged the Church's shortcomings, as well as its need for serious updating.¹ The real genius of the Council, however, was in a deliberate de-emphasizing of those aspects of the doctrinal heritage that had proven divisive in the past, and in the encouragement given to open theological inquiry.² A fear of change and the dangers associated with it were not to detract from the fact that change was necessary. To fear or resist change "would betray a lack of confidence in the Holy Spirit, who continues today, as in the past, to fulfill Christ's promise."³

A Closed Society versus an Open Society

The change advocated by Dulles also included a new openness of Catholics towards their milieu and to non-Catholic Christianity. Applying Henri Bergson's distinction between two types of societies, the closed and the open,⁴ he began to set forth his vision of the post-Vatican II Church. A closed society, with its ghetto-like mentality, caring little for the world outside, clings together, ever ready to fend off external threats. For the sake

¹Avery Dulles, "The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal," *The Hartford Quarterly (HQ)* 7 (Summer 1967): 8; idem, "The Modern Dilemma of Faith," in *Toward a Theology of Christian Faith*, ed. Michael Mooney, Joseph J. Koechler, John Dinges, and Michael C. Scheible (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1968), 15-6. In a commentary on *Lumen gentium*, Dulles remarked that when the Council fathers came together "they immediately saw the need of setting forth a radically different vision of the Church, more biblical, more historical, more vital, and dynamic." Idem, "The Church," 10-1; idem, "The Church Is Communications," *The Catholic Mind (CM)*, October 1971, 15-6.

²Dulles, "The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal," 8, 9. While Dulles embraced the spirit of reform, it is important to note that he saw the necessity of a renewal effected within the framework of its own tradition. He still considered the Church to be "a hierarchical society, established in the world by Christ, essentially requiring communion with the Petrine see" (ibid., 11).

³Avery Dulles, "Faith and New Opinions," *America*, October 28, 1967, 479. Dulles's recognition of the need for change, however, did not indicate that he advocated radical reformism. He strongly criticized radicalism in any form and cautioned that, if implemented, some proposals could lead to the loss of Christian and Catholic identity. See Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 6, 37-8, 63-91; idem, "The Modern Dilemma of Faith," 17; idem, "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology," *TD* 26 (1978): 392.

⁴See Henri Bergson, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion* (New York: H. Holt, 1935), 255-62, 266.

of self-protection its members value strict discipline and conformity to common values. On the other hand, an open society, which does not posit itself against any external threat or power, has the ability in principle to embrace all of humanity. It is governed by love and looks towards a greater future, while promoting freedom and responsibility.¹

In the nineteenth century, the Church, scarred by the ravages wrought by the Reformation and the Enlightenment, emerged as a fundamentally closed society.² This defensive, closed, and static mentality was pervasive in the Church in which Dulles's generation had been trained. It collided head on with John XXIII's vision of the open Church, which called for internal renewal and the restoration of a positive relationship with the contemporary world.³ Dulles shared G. C. Berkouwer's observation that the new openness of the Church promoted by Vatican II meant a change in direction.⁴

This openness would also allow for the possibility of an open theological exchange with Protestant theologians, even that of adopting some of their insights within Catholic theology.⁵ Such an open-ended exchange could be facilitated by a new understanding of

¹Avery Dulles, "The Open Church," *CS* 8 (Spring 1969): 17; idem, *The Dimensions of the Church* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1967), 2-4.

²Dulles, "The Open Church," 18.

³Ibid., 19. Dulles's application of Bergson's two-societies analogy to the Church is reminiscent of John L. McKenzie's description of the closed society—the Organization—which is governed by a spirit of conformity rather than love, and has manifested itself in the life of the Church in recent centuries. Cf. McKenzie, 137-50.

⁴G. C. Berkouwer refers to "open" and "closed" Catholicism and defines these terms much like Dulles. *The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965). See especially pp. 34-6; cf. Dulles, "The Modern Dilemma of Faith," 16-8; idem, "Catholic Theology and the Secondary School," *CM*, September 1973, 20-2.

⁵Dulles, "The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal," 13. Such a possibility was opened by the Council when it accepted the fact that genuine ecclesial elements existed outside of the Roman Catholic communion. Cf. *Unitatis redintegratio* 1.3,4, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 345-49.

the catholicity of the Church, which, as Dulles understood it, was no longer to be viewed in terms of “its present fullness,” but as an unlimited capacity to learn and absorb.¹

Dulles's stress on the need for ecumenical rapprochement, however, did not imply that he advocated religious indifferentism. Despite his far-reaching views on the openness of the Church, he was always ready to recognize, albeit with certain reservations, that the full patrimony of Christ was available only within Roman Catholicism.² At the same time he admitted that the renewal of the Church might, in some way, be dependent upon other Christian traditions.³ Thus within the context of this new openness, Catholic scholars were to be encouraged to look at Protestant authors, such as Barth, Brunner, Bultmann, and Tillich, who might offer inspiration and encouragement in the work of restating the gospel message in a modern way and in a Catholic fashion.⁴

Dulles's Critique of Neo-Scholasticism

Dulles's writings in the years following the Second Vatican Council were marked by a measured but incisive and systematic critique of Neo-Scholastic theology. In his view, the inspiration of Vatican II was not scholastic or Thomistic. In agreement with

¹Dulles, “The Open Church,” 20.

²Ibid., 22.

³Ibid., 22-3.

⁴Dulles, “The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal,” 13. In an article published soon after the death of Karl Barth (1886-1968), Dulles suggested that the Vatican II document on revelation, *Dei Verbum*, was influenced by the views of Catholic theologians who “favored a rapprochement with contemporary Protestant theology of the Barthian variety.” This group of theologians, according to Dulles, triumphed over the “Catholic controversialists,” who did all they could to maintain the continuity of the Church with post-Tridentine theology. Idem, “Karl Barth: A Catholic Appreciation,” *Christian Century (CC)*, March 26, 1969, 409; idem, review of *The Church*, by Hans Küng, *America*, April 20, 1968, 545-46.

Dulles's willingness to draw inspiration and encouragement for the renewal of the Roman Catholic Church from Protestant thought was coupled with his earnest plea for Protestants to remain fully committed to their own beliefs and traditions, while imitating Christ and being loyal to the gospel. This, he contended, would be the most helpful thing that Protestants could do in forwarding the cause of Catholic renewal. Idem, “The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal,” 15-6.

Michael Novak, he stated that in its fundamental affirmations the Council had departed from Thomism and non-historical orthodoxy.¹ The “decadent scholasticism” that had dominated Catholic theology in the centuries prior to the Second Vatican Council was “a distortion of the true genius of Catholicism” and, due to the visionary fathers of the Council, had “in principle been transcended.”² Through disciplinary action, the Church could have resolved to perpetuate the Thomistic system of theology with its abstract, scholastic, metaphysical, and highly juridical categories present in most of the conciliar and other Roman documents issued in the pre-Vatican II era. It could also have continued to use the dead liturgical language (Latin), and insisted on medieval forms of liturgy as well as a monarchical style of government. This, however, would have rendered Catholicism increasingly antiquated and irrelevant.³ While acknowledging the possibility that greater freedom within the Church could lead to excesses, Dulles seemed to have no doubt that a movement away from the old Neo-Scholastic system of belief and the security it allegedly offered was “generally enriching and healthy.”⁴

¹ Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, xi, 166; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 171; cf. Michael Novak, *The Open Church* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1964), 52-66.

² Dulles, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 19. Dulles was particularly critical of the encyclical *Humani generis* (1950) for its Neo-Scholastic emphasis upon ecclesiocentrism. In his view, Vatican II had “quietly reversed” this trend and had encouraged a reformulation of the essential teachings of Vatican I in a way that would be more biblical, more pastoral, and less legalistic. See Dulles, *Revelation Theology: A History*, 152-53; idem, “The Meaning of Revelation,” in *The Dynamic in Christian Thought*, ed. Joseph Papin (Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1971), 55; idem, “Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II,” *America*, June 27, 1970, 672; idem, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” *TS* 33 (1972): 210; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 115, 176; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 109, 115; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 145; idem, “The Idea of a National Pastoral Council,” in *A National Pastoral Council: Proceedings of an Interdisciplinary Consultation August 28-30, 1970 in Chicago, Ill.*, ed. J. Paul O’Connor (Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1971), 10; idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 309; idem, “The Papacy: Bond or Barrier?” *CM*, September 1974, 54-5; idem, “The Open Church,” 20.

³ Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 15, 18, 20-1.

⁴ Dulles, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 22-3.

Dulles suggested that only through a participatory style of government, as well as an emphasis upon personal conscience and the responsible freedom of each member, could the Church hope to creatively engage the best minds and become relevant in a modern culture.¹ Too often bent on preserving and protecting the ancient deposit, the Church had exhibited an inimical attitude toward new ideas and discouraged believers from participating in “the forward thrust of the human spirit.”²

The Council, Dulles stated, allowed Catholics to “think for themselves and even, within limits, to depart from traditionally accepted views.” With Gregory Baum he applauded the fathers of the Council who, by rejecting the Roman schemas, courageously inspired the Church to move beyond Neo-Scholasticism and thus provided “a stirring example of Christian independence.” The Council, therefore, Dulles continued, encouraged the Church to take on the features of a free society where doctrinal consensus would be reached through the means of free discussion. Such a community, capable of genuine self-reform, would “become a more effective sign and harbinger of that unity in freedom which Christ wills for all mankind.”³

In synthesis, influenced in part by the *nouvelle théologie* and by Protestant theological thought, Dulles, during the sixties, embraced a progressive agenda for the Church which, he believed, was endorsed by the Second Vatican Council. He maintained

¹Dulles, “Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II,” 672-73.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 149. Dulles expressed disapproval of some conservative Roman Catholics’ preoccupation with certainty. In the current philosophical and social climate, the credibility of Roman Catholicism had to be established by rigorous inquiry and honest debate rather than by the “bland statements” of the Roman magisterium. No Catholic intellectual, Dulles propounded, could “achieve honest certitude by accepting every Roman document, regardless of its relative solemnity and of its theological quality, as though it were the very word of God.” Avery Dulles, “A Response—Certainty in the Catholic Church,” *Long Island Catholic (LIC)*, Thursday, December 9, 1976, 8.

³Dulles, “Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II,” 672; See also idem, “Luther’s Unfinished Reformation,” *CM*, April 1965, 34; idem, “Ecumenical Dialogue and Apostolic Renewal,” *AER* 153 (November 1965): 307-10; idem, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Theology Department, 1974), 41-2; cf. Gregory Baum, foreword to *The Democratic Church*, by Donald E. Nicodemus (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1969), x.

that a new era of openness and freedom had arrived, forcing the Church to re-evaluate its Neo-Scholastic heritage, and to readjust its message and structures to the demands of the modern era.

Avery Dulles's Post-Vatican II Ecclesiology

Dulles's desire to readjust Roman Catholic teaching was particularly evident in the area of ecclesiology, which was increasingly becoming his major concern. This concern may have been precipitated, in part, by his interest in the nature of doctrinal authority which in turn was rooted in his understanding of the doctrine of revelation. Let us briefly review the changes that occurred in this area of Dulles's theology in the immediate aftermath of Vatican II.

The Nature of Revelation¹

Dulles belonged to a group of scholars who enthusiastically welcomed Vatican II's dogmatic constitution on revelation, *Dei Verbum*, a document regarded as having taken "advantage of nearly a century of biblical research and scholarly reflection since the previous Council."² Although the constitution was not intended to be seen as a departure from the official teachings of the Church, Dulles agreed with Gregory Baum and other

¹For a detailed analysis of Dulles's prolific writings on the doctrine of revelation, see John F. Russell, "The Development of Theology of Revelation in the United States in the Decade after *Dei Verbum*: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Theological Writings of Avery Dulles, S. J. and Gabriel Moran, F. S. C.," and Ross A. Shecterle, *The Theology of Revelation of Avery Dulles, 1980-1994: Symbolic Mediation* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996). Dulles's own book, *Models of Revelation* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1983), also offers insight into his views on revelation.

²Avery Dulles, "Revelation in Recent Catholic Theology," *Theology Today* (TT) 24 (October 1967): 350. For a full text of the constitution *Dei Verbum*, promulgated on November 18, 1965, see Abbott, 111-28. The constitution was not born without controversy. For the issues surrounding its origin and promulgation see Gregory Baum, "Vatican II's Constitution on Revelation: History and Interpretation," *TS* 28 (1967): 51-75, and Gerald O'Collins, *Retrieving Fundamental Theology: The Three Styles of Contemporary Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 48-62. See also Latourelle, 453-88, for a helpful commentary of the constitution itself.

progressive Catholic scholars that its teachings constituted a new approach to the Christian doctrine of revelation and a new beginning for doctrinal development in this area.¹

Beyond the Neo-Scholastic Conception of Revelation

As was to be expected, Dulles perceived certain deficiencies in the Neo-Scholastic doctrine of revelation even before *Dei Verbum* was promulgated in 1965.² He claimed that while Protestant work on revelation, notably led by Karl Barth, had successfully responded to rationalistic and liberal challenges, the Catholic theology of revelation had lagged behind, having focused mainly on apologetics.³ In Neo-Scholasticism, revelation was presented as objective, rationalistic, abstract, scholastic, and capable of being propositionally captured in immutable formulations. A reformulation of accepted doctrinal formulas was considered tantamount to tampering with God's word.⁴

Such a view of revelation ended up in an emphasis on the teaching powers of the Church's magisterium. A divinely commissioned class of individuals alone could act as the official interpreter and mediator of the content of revelation.⁵ Divine revelation was seen

¹Dulles, "Revelation in Recent Catholic Theology," 351; idem, *Revelation Theology: A History*, 177; cf. Baum, "Vatican II's Constitution on Revelation: History and Interpretation," 75. See also Hermann J. Pottmeyer, "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpretation of the Council," in *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean-Pierre Jossua, and Joseph A. Komonchak (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 33-4, and Donald Senior, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, 18 November, 1965," in *Vatican II and Its Documents*, ed. Timothy E. O'Connell (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1986), 125-27.

²Dulles, "The Council and the Sources of Revelation," 1176-177.

³Dulles, "The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal," 9; idem, "The Constitution on Divine Revelation in Ecumenical Perspective," *AER* 154 (1966): 220; idem, "The Meaning of Revelation," 54-6, 72; idem, "Karl Barth: A Catholic Appreciation," 409; idem, *Revelation Theology*, 163, 172-73; idem, "The Problem of Revelation," *CTSA* 29 (1974): 79; idem, "Catholic Theology and the Secondary School," 19; idem, *Models of Revelation* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992), xix.

⁴Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 191; idem, "Revelation in Recent Catholic Theology," 351.

⁵Dulles, *Revelation Theology*, 172-73.

“as descending from the pope through the bishops to the pastors to the laity.”¹ Such mediating epistemology required unconditional submission from believers.²

For Dulles, the view of divine revelation set forth in the documents of Vatican I was now superseded by a new, more personalistic understanding of the communication between God and humanity, with emphasis on personal encounter and commitment rather than mere obedience.³ Only such a view of revelation, Dulles claimed, would appeal to modern believers who, living in an entirely different socio-cultural environment, often reacted against the traditional conceptions of revelation as communication.⁴ How, then, did he describe the concept?

The Concept of Revelation

Dulles identified four fundamental characteristics of revelation. First, revelation was God's self-communication. It was preconceptual. No human formulations could adequately grasp its meaning in propositional statements. Rather than as a set of doctrinal formulations, revelation should primarily be understood as a participation in divine life, accessible to every member of the Church.⁵ As far as dogmas of the Church are concerned, they were to be recognized as expressions of “the constant patterns of revelation,” rather than equated with revelation itself.⁶ In Dulles's opinion, the failure of

¹Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 115.

²Dulles, *Revelation Theology*, 173.

³Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 23; idem, “Constitution on Divine Revelation in Ecumenical Perspective,” 220; idem, *Revelation Theology*, 176. *Dei Verbum*, according to Dulles, was strongly influenced by Protestant biblical theology, particularly the teachings of Karl Barth.

⁴Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 23-5; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 34.

⁵Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308; idem, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 21; idem, “Faith, Reason and the Logic of Discovery,” *Thought* 45 (1970): 488-89. Dulles wrote that while in the documents of Vatican II “propositional dogmatic teaching is certainly not rejected . . . it is subordinated to man's interpersonal relationship with the God of love.” Idem, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 56.

⁶Dulles, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 54-5, 72, 77-8.

Neo-Scholastic theology to recognize this distinction resulted in undue exaltation of “the authority of the institution.”¹

Second, revelation was Christocentric,² “fully and unsurpassably communicated in Christ.”³ Thus the initial commitment of a Christian believer was not to any particular confession of faith or set of doctrines. Although it was inevitable that groups of Christians gathered around a creed, a Christian should, above all, be committed to Christ, who was the “high point of God’s loving self-communication.”⁴

Third, revelation was ecclesial. While it reached its climax in Jesus Christ, it was to be expressed and perpetuated within a community of believers. The affirmation that the community of believers was the locus of revelation implied that revelation could be expressed in a variety of modes and “refracted” through different agencies within the entire Church.⁵

¹Ibid., 54-5.

²Avery Dulles, review of *Faith Under Challenge*, by Heinrich Fries, in *Commonweal*, May 15, 1970, 229. Dulles does not hide that this aspect of his theology of revelation was strongly influenced by Karl Barth. See idem, “Karl Barth: A Catholic Appreciation,” 408-10; idem, “Scripture: Recent Protestant and Catholic Views,” in *The Authoritative Word: Essays on the Nature of Scripture*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 240-01; idem, “Catholic Ecumenism: Possible, Useful, Necessary,” 11; idem, *Revelation Theology*, 163.

³Avery Dulles, review of *Revelation Theology*, by Edward Schillebeeckx, *Commonweal*, 5 April 1968, 81; idem, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 71.

⁴Dulles, “How Can Christian Faith Be Justified Today?” *Communio* 2 (1975): 350. It must be noted, however, that while Dulles generally favored a Christological emphasis in his revelation theology, he also sounded a note of caution. Single-minded insistence on the centrality of Jesus Christ could, in his mind, “lead to a dilution of the full content of Catholic Christianity.” See idem, “The Theology of Hans Küng: A Comment,” *Union Seminary Quarterly Review (USQR)* 27 (1972): 141.

⁵Dulles, “Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II,” 673; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 87. When discussing the ecclesial dimension of revelation, Dulles often invoked the “classical” principle of the *sensus fidelium*. This concept was “definitely a force to be reckoned with, especially in this democratic age.” Ibid., 84; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 98. The *sensus fidelium*, Dulles contended, pointed to the fact that the Holy Spirit was active within the whole Church and His work was not limited to a small ruling class. Idem, “The Idea of a National Pastoral Council,” 8-9; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 38.

Finally, revelation was continuous. While the Vatican I documents presented revelation as “constitutive,” i.e., completed during apostolic times, Dulles suggested that *Dei Verbum* presented an “explicative” view of revelation, i.e., that God’s revealing action was present throughout the history of the world.¹ Therefore, without actually employing the term “continuing revelation,” Vatican II provided openings for such an understanding of God’s self-communication.²

Dulles’s view of revelation, with its personalistic and ecclesial emphases, was clearly in tension with a traditional juridical and authoritarian ecclesiology. It is not surprising, therefore, that his post-Vatican II ecclesiology eventually conformed to his new conception of revelation. This shift was more notably exemplified in two of his publications. In 1968 he published his *Revelation and the Quest for Unity*,³ a collection of articles reaching back to the early sixties. Although the volume reflected new theological developments in the areas of revelation and ecclesiology, it still largely represented the “old ecclesiology.” In marked contrast was the publication, in 1971, of *The Survival of Dogma*, where Dulles’s ecclesiology strikes one as more in line with his new conception of revelation. It is to his view of the nature of the Church that we now turn our attention.

The Nature of the Church

While rejecting the monolithism of Neo-Scholastic ecclesiology, like other progressive theologians Dulles found it necessary to move beyond Vatican II and develop

¹Avery Dulles, review of *Revelation and Theology*, 81. This distinction was utilized by the Holy See in various documents, especially those dealing with modernism (ibid.).

²Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 30. The concept of continuing revelation, Dulles argued, demanded “a less propositional view of revelation than even Schillebeeckx has given us. If revelation is essentially a matter of objective statements . . . one can hardly show how it was fully and unsurpassably communicated in Christ.” Idem, review of *Revelation and Theology*, 81; cf. Edward Schillebeeckx, *Revelation and Theology* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967).

³Avery Dulles, *Revelation and the Quest for Unity* (Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1968).

original approaches to Catholic ecclesiology.¹ From approximately the mid-sixties to the mid-eighties, Dulles's ecclesiology expressed itself in three successive and overlapping stages. Each was characterized by different, though inter-related, images of the Church. The first stage extended from the years of the Council to the early seventies and was dominated by the image of the Church as the pilgrim People of God. In the second stage, from the early seventies to the early eighties, the image of the Church as sacrament became prominent. Finally, in the eighties, Dulles moved towards the image of the Church as a community of disciples. These successive images are not without importance for one's understanding of the doctrine of the Church.

The Church as the Pilgrim People of God

Of all the images of the Church present in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, the image of the Church as the pilgrim People of God seemed to be the most innovative and, in the words of Karl Rahner, "runs through the whole decree."² Although inextricably tied with the history of ancient Israel, this concept, as subscribed to by the authors of *Lumen gentium*, could also be applied to the "New Israel"—the Church.³ Dulles emphatically embraced the People of God conception of the Church and, with Karl Rahner, agreed that the Council subordinated all other images to it.⁴ In doing so, the

¹While the Council's teachings intensified the dissatisfaction of Catholic thinkers with a pre-Vatican, institutionally oriented ecclesiology, Dulles argued that it "failed to propose an alternative image that proved truly viable." Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 6; cf. idem, "The Open Church," 26.

²Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, vol. 6 (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1969), 281. Other images favored by Vatican II included the body of Christ (*Lumen gentium*, 1.7, in Abbott, 20-1), institution (*Lumen gentium*, 3.18-29, in Abbott, 37-56), and sacrament (*Lumen gentium*, 2.9, 7.48, in Abbott, 24-6, 78-80; *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 1.10, 41, in Abbott, 142-43, 152).

³What happened to Israel in the Old Testament (revelation, election, blessing, covenant) occurred "by way of preparation and as a figure of that new and perfect covenant which was to be ratified in Christ." *Lumen gentium*, 2.9, in Abbott, 25.

⁴Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 6, 60; idem, "Bergamo, 1968: A Theological Reflection," *Worldmission* 19 (Fall 1968): 22, 25; idem, *The Dimensions of the Church*, 44. Dulles saw in the structure of *Lumen gentium*, where the chapter dealing with the Church as God's people precedes the articles describing Church structure and government,

bishops sought to emphasize the human and communal aspects of the Church, rather than its institutional and hierarchical dimensions.¹

Dulles identified several advantages of the People of God concept. First, it presented a Church on a journey, “an active participant in the world and its history.”² Besides, in a Church seen as the People of God, the prophetic function was ascribed to the entire Church. The prophetic office was exercised both through the authoritative teaching of the hierarchy and through the unofficial witness of all other believers.³

Moreover, the People of God model presented the world with a Church which at times could be found unfaithful and imperfect. Attempts to conceal mistakes in pre-Vatican II times only revealed a lack of understanding of what the pilgrim status of the Church meant, i.e., a human society in need of constant reformation.⁴

an indication of the Council’s preferences, implying its wish to bring out the “free, conscious, and personal participation of all the members in the total life of the Mystical Body.” Idem, “The Idea of a National Pastoral Council,” 8; cf. idem, “The Church,” 12. Rahner, however, expressed himself more cautiously stating that “in the decree [*Lumen gentium*] the concept of the people of God . . . [is] almost being preferred to the concept of the ‘mystical Body of Christ’, and so becomes something of a guide-line for the whole of Conciliar ecclesiology.” Rahner, *Theological Investigations: Concerning Vatican Council II*, 282. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger objects to assigning any significance to the order of *Lumen gentium* chapters. See his *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroads, 1988), 14-20.

¹Dulles, *The Dimensions of the Church*, 1; idem, n. 27, *Lumen gentium*, in Abbott, 24. The very concept of “People of God,” according to Dulles, was based on a “*communio* theology.” Idem, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 50-1.

²Avery Dulles, review of *A Question of Conscience*, by Charles Davis, in *America*, November 11, 1967, 570; idem, “Current Trends in Mission Theology,” *TD* 20 (Spring 1972): 29; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 87.

³Avery Dulles, “The Succession of Prophets in the Church,” in *Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity*, ed. Hans Küng (Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1968), 58; idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” in *Theology in Revolution*, ed. George Devine (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1970), 32.

⁴Avery Dulles, “Conscience and Church Authority,” in *Conscience: Theological and Psychological Perspectives*, ed. C. Ellis Nelson (New York: Newman Press, 1973), 119.

While this model de-emphasized the institutional aspect of the Church,¹ it allowed for the existence of a universal and abiding structure, in recognizable continuity with its past, which was a necessary sign of the unity of the Church. More democratic and flexible than it had been in previous centuries, however, this institution would allow all believers to participate in the government of the Church.² Rather than insisting on mere obedience to ecclesiastical authorities, its unity would be the result of a “constitutive bond of inner cohesion . . . [formed by] none other than the Holy Spirit,” who would bestow His charisma upon the entire “people of God.”³

The Church as Sacrament

Dulles’s emphasis upon the People of God was eventually supplanted by a view of the Church as sacrament. Published in 1974, *Models of the Church*⁴ represents the most comprehensive presentation of Dulles’s ecclesiology to the present. This much acclaimed and at times criticized volume reflects his desire to offer a balanced picture of the nature of the Church. Notwithstanding his wish to be seen as a moderate theologian, one detects

¹Dulles, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 17-23.

²Dulles, review of *A Question of Conscience*, 571; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 90; idem, “The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal,” 10, 15; idem, “The Church,” 12; idem, “The Idea of a National Pastoral Council,” 9.

³Dulles, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 222-23; idem, “The Idea of a National Pastoral Council,” 9; idem, “Current Trends in Mission Theology,” 26-34.

⁴Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974). The book has gone through several editions and updatings. It is regarded as a very good presentation on ecclesiology in the English language and is used in numerous Catholic and Protestant universities and seminaries. Dulles envisions the Church as the ineffable mystery of God’s dwelling with humanity. As such, it is impossible to express its full reality by means of a single dimension. Various expressions must be taken into consideration in order to avoid the imbalances that affected the Church in the past. Dulles, therefore, presents several interrelated models representing the reality of the Church, i.e., the Church as an institution, mystical communion, sacrament, herald and servant, devoting a separate chapter to each model. Setting forth the strengths and weaknesses of each model, he asks three basic questions each time: What are the bonds of union? Who are the beneficiaries? and What is the goal or purpose of the Church? The book is a synthesis of Dulles’s ecclesiological thought of the late sixties and early seventies.

Dulles's leanings towards a vision of the Church as sacrament.¹ On the other hand, the model of the Church as an institution, and its associated authoritarianism and juridicism, received rather harsh treatment. The critique was so severe that several conservative Catholic reviewers, as well as Protestant readers, took him to task for denigrating the Roman Catholic Church, advocating anti-institutionalism and introducing Protestant elements into Catholic ecclesiology.² Given the specific purpose of this dissertation, a brief look at the institutional and sacramental models of the Church should suffice.

Critique of the institutional model

Chapter 2 of *Models of the Church* represents the most pointed critique of institutionalism in Dulles's writings. It appears that, in these pages, apart from describing pre-conciliar ecclesiology, he also wanted to comment on the state of the Church in the seventies, a Church which seemed to be regressing to a pre-conciliar institutionalism.³

¹It is not that Dulles disregarded the image of the Church as People of God during this period. He simply had come to perceive certain liabilities associated with this model. See Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 4-5. It is also possible that the movement in Dulles's ecclesiology toward a sacramental understanding of the Church was incited by the excesses of liberal thinkers who, seemingly in the spirit of Vatican II, sought to rationalize, demystify and desacralize what the Church stood for.

²See Stephen McKenna, review of *Models of the Church*, *Best Sellers*, May 1, 1974, 67; Kenneth Baker, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Homiletic and Pastoral Review (HPR)*, October 1974, 75; J. R. Sheets, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *America*, March 23, 1974, 224; Jaroslav Pelikan, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Commonweal*, April 1975, 90-1. Still, some commentators, both Catholic and Protestant, responded warmly to the volume. See J. P. Thiesent, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Worship* 48 (1974): 500-01; Donald Bloesh, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *CC*, January 29, 1975, 89-91. Incidentally, Bloesh praised Dulles for his "earnest attempt to build bridges between the traditional Roman Catholic concept of the church and the kerygmatic Protestant emphasis." *Ibid.*, 91.

³Dulles distinguished between "institutionalism" and "institutional elements" within Church structures. As he saw it, institutionalism "defines the Church primarily in terms of its visible structures, especially the rights and powers of its officers." On the other hand, one has to accept institutional and organizational elements in the Church, without which its mission in the world would be hampered (*Models of the Church*, 31-2).

For Dulles, as for Leonardo Boff later on,¹ the Second Vatican Council represented the end of an era during which the Roman Catholic Church had been primarily viewed in institutional terms. He rejected the Neo-Scholastic vision of the Church as a *societas perfecta* as woefully deficient, “a deformation of the true nature of the Church.”² It reduced the Church to a merely visible society, divided into those who taught, sanctified, and governed (*ecclesia docens*) on the one hand, and those who were taught, sanctified, and governed (*ecclesia discens*) on the other.

To claim that the foundation for such an ecclesiology had been laid by Christ was incongruous with the discoveries of modern historical criticism.³ It lacked the support of the Scriptures and of the early Church tradition. In contrast with Paul’s perception of the Church as communitarian and mystical, the institutional model promoted juridicism, clericalism and obedience, overlooking the dynamic role of the Spirit. Besides, an institutional ecclesiology inhibited the development of a creative and fruitful theology. It constrained theology too exclusively “to the defense of currently official positions, and thus diminishes critical and exploratory thinking.”⁴ Such an institutional model of the Church was “out of phase with the demands of the times.” In a democratic and pluralistic age it

¹It is interesting to note that, like Dulles, Leonardo Boff also speaks of a plurality of co-existing ecclesiologies and criticizes the traditional Neo-Scholastic model of authority in the Church. In his *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (New York: Crossroads, 1985), without specifically crediting Dulles, Boff adopts the models methodology. Like Dulles, he strongly criticized the institutional model which, for him, resides in “the Church as City of God,” and “the Church as *Mater et Magistra*.” Contrary to Dulles, who eventually opted for the model of the Church as sacrament and, later, as a community of disciples, Boff adopts a new model: “a Church from the poor” (ibid., 2-8); cf. idem, *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church* (New York: Orbis Books, 1986), 23-4.

²Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 32. The excessive institutionalism of the Church during the Middle Ages, which refused to reform and correct itself, was, according to Dulles, responsible for the Reformation and the division it brought. Idem, “The Succession of Prophets in the Church,” 56; idem, *Models of the Church*, 33.

³Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 34-5, 37.

⁴Ibid., 41.

was increasingly difficult for a Church seen primarily in institutional terms to attract new believers and to retain current members.¹

The Church as sacrament

Such liabilities warranted a return to a more biblical ecclesiology, i.e., a vision of the Church as sacrament, an image more congruent with the New Testament's ecclesiology.² "After some years of work in ecclesiology, I am inclined to think that there is no better definition."³

The Church, Dulles wrote, is essentially the mystery of divine-human communion.⁴ While no individual model could express its essence in an adequate way, a vision of the Church as sacrament had the best chance of bringing together the various aspects of the ecclesiological reality.⁵ To Dulles, the sacramental vision of the Church had both an external and an internal dimension. Without a visible aspect, some form of external unity, the Church would cease to be a sacrament and dissolve into a multitude of disconnected signs. This visible element, moreover, connected the Church with its

¹Ibid.; see also idem, "Church, Churches, Catholic Church," 222. While continuing his call to intra-ecclesial reform, Dulles's critique of institutionalism was somewhat tempered in the following years. Cf. idem, *The Resilient Church*, 18.

²This preference was perceived by several reviewers. See Bloesh, 90; O'Donnell, 138; Raoul Dederen, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 13 (1975): 81; cf. Herwi Rikhof, *The Concept of Church* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1981), 221.

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 26. In the 1987 edition of *Models of the Church* Dulles hinted that in 1974, when the original version of the was published, he had already considered that the sacramental model of the Church could serve as the basis for a systematic ecclesiology. See idem, *Models of the Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 206.

⁴Dulles, *Church Membership as Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 6; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 143.

⁵Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 143.

apostolic past. The institutional elements of the Church, however, were to be understood as more “operative and functional . . . than as ends in themselves.”¹

A proper vision of the Church as sacrament demanded also an internal aspect, an inner and invisible reality,² which for Dulles was “the event in which Christ is dynamically present through the Holy Spirit.”³ This internal reality seemed to take precedence over the external, institutional, or visible dimension of the Church.⁴ To help believers center their lives on Christ the visible structures were to be continually aligned towards the inner reality and incarnated in a historically relevant way.⁵ Only then, could “the event of grace” be

¹Dulles, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 224. Dulles's writings during those years reveal a certain ambivalence regarding the nature of Catholic institutions such as the episcopal hierarchy. In some places, depending upon his purpose, he seemed to view Church institutions more ontologically, whereas elsewhere he tended to view them more functionally. The latter was especially evident when he contrasted *ius divinum* with *ius humanum*, on the issue of the development of the specific form in which episcopal ministry was exercised. Judging the episcopal office according to its function allows one to focus on the historicity of the way in which the ministry is performed and allows for a reinterpretation and/or reversal of historical developments, as well as a return to the original form. An ontological view, on the other hand, implies a more static and unchangeable nature of the hierarchical office. Dulles's oscillation between an ontological and functional understanding of ecclesial structures seems particularly evident in his article “*Ius Divinum* as an Ecumenical Problem,” *TS* 38 (1977): 681-708; cf. idem, *The Resilient Church*, 41; idem, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 229. This point was also brought out by Dulles's ardent critic Msgr. George A. Kelly in his article “Fr. Dulles's Church to Believe In,” *HPR*, October 1983, 13-4.

²Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 64-5.

³Dulles, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 224. Dulles also defined the internal reality as “the faith, hope, and love of living men.” Idem, *Models of the Church* (1974), 64.

⁴This impression is conveyed by Dulles's assertion that God's gift of grace is not confined to visible structures. The Bible conveys the image of God as the Father of all people and His redemptive love as extended to all, not just to those who are in visible communion with the Roman Catholic Church. Second, the primary task of the Church, as a channel of grace, is to make its members open and responsive to the calling of the Holy Spirit, thus receiving guidance from God himself. A secondary task is to bring human beings into communion with each other. Ibid., 65-6, 68; idem, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 224; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 39; idem, “The Church: Sacrament and Ground of Faith,” in *Problems and Perspectives of Fundamental Theology*, ed. René Latourelle and Gerald O'Collins (New York: Ramsay, 1982), 266-67; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 24-5; idem, “The Church Is Communications,” 7-8.

⁵Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 63, 68.

expected to occur.¹ Such a sacramental ecclesiology, where the internal reality took precedence over the external one, prevented any “deification” of ecclesial structures, for it acknowledged “that the symbolic expressions of grace are never adequate to the life of grace itself.”²

It should be noted, however, that the clear distinction between the “institutional” and “sacramental” models of the Church set forth in *Models of the Church* (1974) is less evident in Dulles’s later writings. Thus, in *The Resilient Church* (1977) he writes: “Even in its visible structures, the Church is not a mere organization to be judged on the grounds of efficiency, but a sacrament of God’s saving deed in Jesus Christ.”³ This progressive blurring of the distinction between the “institutional” and “sacramental” may have led him to advocate yet another model of the Church.

The Church as a Community of Disciples

The 1987 edition of *Models of the Church* included a new model which brought the book “into alignment with my current thinking,” i.e., the Church as a community of disciples.⁴ He suggested that this model would help to overcome the crippling divisions that had overtaken the Church in the post-Vatican II era. As he saw it, the designation

¹Dulles, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 224; idem, *Models of the Church* (1974), 63.

²Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 68. For this reason, “the Church of Vatican II . . . is one that stands under continual demand for conversion and reform. It does not adhere jealously to its own past institutions, but is prepared to take on new forms and structures as the needs of various times and cultures may require.” Idem, “Current Trends in Mission Theology,” 29.

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 39, 40.

⁴Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1987), 13. The chapter dealing with the Church as a community of disciples was initially published as an article under the title “Community of Disciples as a Model of Church,” *Philosophy and Theology* 1 (Fall 1986): 99-120. An earlier version came out in his *A Church to Believe In*, 7-14. The text of the article found in the 1987 edition of *Models of the Church* was much less “anti-institutional” than the earlier approach found in *A Church to Believe In* (1982). The reasons for Dulles’s desire to tender a new model are described in his *A Church to Believe In*, 5.

“community of disciples” had deep roots in the New Testament,¹ setting forth a group of people who had personally been called by Christ to abandon the world and its values, and make a full commitment to their Lord.²

While different members were assigned different functions within the Church, all were disciples of Christ—believers who had not yet achieved their full potential but representing a continual movement towards eschatological fulfillment. Loyalty to the Church should not be perceived as a “passive acceptance of a list of doctrines, or abject submission to a set of precepts, but rather the adventure of following Jesus in new and ever changing situations.”³

The principles undergirding the discipleship model pointed to the type of leadership that would befit it. Although he did not endorse a fully representative, democratic form of Church government, Dulles held that the only way to protect the Church against authoritarianism would be to carefully screen its leaders. These leaders were to be selected “on the basis of proved discipleship,” and “properly . . . entrusted with large responsibilities.” These, in turn, were not to appeal to formal authority or attempt to impose conformity, as such actions would destroy the trust-relationship upon which the discipleship model of the Church was based.⁴ The discipleship model demanded the mutual interdependence of all members in every area of Church life. The disciple status, being the common denominator uniting all believers, would eschew excessive clericalism, thus undermining “the illusion that some in the Church are lords and masters.”⁵

¹While it may be difficult to assert whether Christ intended to, or did, establish a church, there seems to be no doubt that he founded a community of followers. A recognition of this fact allows for the application of the Gospel passages dealing with discipleship to the life of the Church. Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 9.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 10.

⁴Ibid., 11-2.

⁵Ibid. Dulles noted that “by viewing ministry as discipleship, we can avoid making too sharp a distinction between the minister and those ministered to. Discipleship is the

The Nature of Doctrinal Authority

Each of the models of the Church espoused by Dulles had roots in the teachings of the Second Vatican Council. Each was in line with a more personalistic vision of revelation, which had been committed to the entire Church rather than to a select class of individuals. Within each model, the invisible and inner reality of the Church was to shape its visible structures and, while maintaining a connection with its past, allowed for the reconstruction and adaptation of the external and visible structures, in response to the needs of the contemporary Church and its mission. It appears that Dulles's ecclesiology during this period could hardly be defined as an ecclesiology essentially from above,¹ which had significant implications for the nature and exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

Christianity: A Religion of Authority

Dulles never hesitated to affirm that authority was essential to the survival of Christianity. In contrast with a purely charismatic conception of authority represented by Liberal Protestantism and exemplified through the work of theologians such as Auguste Sabatier and Emil Brunner,² Dulles refused to regard the charismatic alone as normative. To be a Christian meant submitting to the authority of God and the incarnated Christ, whose message was communicated to the Christian community via the apostles. While not revelation itself, the apostles' witness constituted a "reliable and normative" authority for Christians. It was from the apostles that the Church, as one of the "channels of God's self-
common factor uniting all Christians with one another, for no one of them is anything but a follower and a learner to Jesus Christ" (ibid.).

¹A penetrating description of "ecclesiology from above" and "ecclesiology from below" is provided by Joseph Komonchak. See his "The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches," 30-1.

²Cf. Auguste Sabatier, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* (New York: McClure, Philipps, 1904), and Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church* (London: Lutterworth, 1952).

communication,” derived its authority in the world.¹ Without this mediating agency in which humans could place their trust, the divine-human relationship would be impossible.²

While he accepted the necessity of authority within Christianity, Dulles disagreed with the traditional, pre-Vatican II structures of authority, which generated a negative image for Christianity itself.³ Along with John Dalrymple, he contended that although strict democracy, “a government from below,” would not necessarily be beneficial for the Church at large, authoritarianism, which attempted to retain believers in a state of subservient dependence, likewise had no place in the Church as a community of disciples.⁴ Neither would a Church operating as a quasi-military society governed by an official hierarchy, nor one which was dominated by chaos and disorder, retain believers and attract new ones.⁵ Thus, in agreement with John L. McKenzie, Dulles concluded that the nature of teaching authority and the way in which it operated needed to be reinterpreted according to the principles he perceived as present in the documents of Vatican II.⁶ Humanity, he

¹Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 394; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 82.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 38-9, 42-3. This trust, Dulles qualified, “can never be absolute because a man can never transfer to anyone else the responsibility for his own religious faith” (ibid.).

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 94-5, 108-09; idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 301-03.

⁴Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 11-2. John Dalrymple suggested that the Church is a democracy which denies neither a hierarchical order nor that government should come from below. He emphatically underlined that it was a democracy in the sense “that there is in her a balance of powers with no absolute initiative reserved to the hierarchy, but a constant expectation that at any time the Holy Spirit may choose to exert influence from below rather than from above.” John Dalrymple, “The Holy Spirit and Personal Responsibility,” in *Authority in a Changing Church*, ed. John Dalrymple (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968), 206.

⁵Avery Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” *National Catholic Reporter (NCR)*, October 8, 1982, 9.

⁶Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 390; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 120; cf. McKenzie, 97. Dulles would not go as far as McKenzie when the latter wrote that “although the Church has yet to reflect the features of the democratic or the republican state, there is no reason to think that it will not” (ibid.).

insisted, was entering a new age and, thus, “new styles of teaching authority are to be expected.”¹ How, then, did Dulles envision the nature of authority?

The Nature of True Authority

Genuine authority within the Church, Dulles observed, was not extrinsic. Nor could it be measured in terms of position or office. True authority was intrinsic, rooted in “truth, understanding and the example of a life transformed in Christ.”² Such authority was “real” because it educated wonder and respect rather than coercive submission. Over against the intrinsic authority of the truth, he saw the extrinsic authority of office as merely “pedagogic.” Its role was to bring an individual to the point where the Holy Spirit could take over and illumine one’s mind with divine truth. From that point on, the believer was subject to God’s leadership, and the need for extrinsic authority lessened.³ Only then would the relationship between office holders and the rest of the believers within the Church be based on mutual trust.⁴ In other words, Dulles envisioned a healthy Christian community as a place of free consensus where all believers should mutually interact, cooperate, and draw wisdom from each other.⁵

¹Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 32.

²Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9. In Dulles’s interpretation, Vatican II supported such a conclusion. The documents of the Council “insist,” he wrote, that the Church’s teaching office was “under the word of God, not above it” (ibid.).

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 39; idem, “Faith, Reason and the Logic of Discovery,” 499. The support for such a position, Dulles believed, could be found in the writings of Thomas Aquinas. He also drew from the writings of Jacques Maritain. Cf. Maritain’s *The Range of Reason* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953), 208-10.

⁴Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 80.

⁵Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9; idem, “Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II,” 672. Dulles’s emphasis upon the importance of intrinsic authority may have been caused by what he saw as a general societal distrust of extrinsic authority, a characteristic of post-World War II society. For Dulles’s commentary on these developments, see his *The Survival of Dogma*, 33-4.

The Structure of Authority: A Pluralistic Theory

As he had disowned both the strictly democratic¹ and primarily institutional models of the Church, along with their respective concepts of authority, Dulles proposed a “pluralistic theory of authority in the Church.”² He began with a distinction between “uncreated” and “created” or “secondary authorities.” God, in his self-revelation in Christ and in his continual presence in the Holy Spirit, was the primary, uncreated, and absolute locus of religious authority. Hence, all secondary authorities, including the ecclesiastical magisterium, were “subject to criticism and correction.”³ While authority was both

¹This statement requires qualification. In his writings, Dulles was often positively inclined toward a democratic model of Church governance. A careful reading of Dulles's writings of the period discussed in this chapter has convinced me that he only wrote negatively about the democratic model of the Church when the notion of democracy was taken to its extreme, which, he believed would result in anarchy, chaos, and conflict. See, for example, Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9. At the same time, he believed that Vatican II “did much to reactivate the democratic principle within Catholicism,” and was “sympathetic” with the proposals of Richard P. McBrien, who suggested a restructuring of the Church along the lines of a contemporary, participatory democracy. Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 305; idem, review of *The Remaking of the Church*, by Richard P. McBrien, *America*, November 10, 1973, 358; cf. Richard P. McBrien, *The Remaking of the Church* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

²Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 99. This theory is a logical extension of Dulles's views on ecclesiology and revelation. In ecclesiology he used the method of complementary models to explain the nature of the Church. His doctrine of revelation, likewise, allowed for a variety of paradigms or models which complemented each other. See idem, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” in *Episcopalians and Roman Catholics: Can They Ever Get Together?* ed. H. J. Ryan and J. R. Wright (Denville, NJ: Dimension Books, 1972), 56.

This pluralistic theory, he believed, had its roots in the Scriptural description of the primitive Church. Idem, “The Succession of Prophets in the Church,” 52-3. He taught that while it was possible to defend the monolithic theory of Church teaching authority on the basis of selected, out-of-context passages of the Bible, such a position neglected the no less important New Testament texts which ascribed teaching authority to the whole Church. Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 304. It was also seminally present in the documents of Vatican II, which adopted an “organically diversified view of the Church.” Idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 97; cf. *Lumen gentium* 2.12, in Abbott, 29-30. Dulles understood this to be a mandate for reform toward a more pluralistic and participatory Church, where “authority would be more widely shared.” Idem, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9; idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 32; idem, “Dogma as an Ecumenical Problem,” *TS* 29 (1968): 409; idem, “Bergamo, 1968: A Theological Reflection,” 26.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 84; idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 394.

necessary and permanent, the way in which it was exercised within the Church could be subject to change.¹

In the descending hierarchical system of secondary authorities, Dulles ascribed the primary place to Scripture, which he saw as the reference point for all Christian teachings.² In the same category, the second authoritative voice in the Church was sacred tradition, placed on a par with the Bible within the Roman Catholic communion and therefore authoritative.³ Third came the *sensus fidelium*. Dulles welcomed the fact that, following the Second Vatican Council, Roman Catholic theology had begun to emphasize the active role of all believers in the development of doctrine.⁴ Such an emphasis, he argued, corrected centuries of an “unhealthy concentration of all active power in the hands of a small ruling class,” which had reduced “the lower classes” to a state of total passivity.⁵ The final place in Dulles's order of authorities went to individuals who, on the basis of their particular gift or position, had “special qualifications to speak with authority.” These included, first, those whose learning, ability, and prudence qualified them to speak authoritatively; next, the persons who possessed spiritual gifts and could offer “prophetic insights” to the entire community; and, finally, the magisterium of the Church, i.e., those

¹Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 85, 87. Dulles wrote: “We shall have to remould some of the secondary structures which have been built up in the past, to simplify or adapt them to our times, and to purify the Church of any accretions foreign to the gospel.” Idem, “The Open Church,” 22.

²As a secondary religious authority the Bible could not be considered an absolute authority. Scripture must always be read in the light of tradition. Such reasoning, in Dulles's opinion, invalidated the Protestant principle of *Sola Scriptura*. Ibid., 84-5.

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 100.

⁴The *sensus fidelium* dimension is developed below in the chapter.

⁵Ibid., 98. Dulles did not, however, want to equate the *sensus fidelium* with the shifting opinions of the public. For him, the *sensus fidelium* was the voice of “generous, intelligent, prayerful, and committed Christians” who gave serious attention to the problems facing the Church. Their reflection might lead them into conflict with the approved teachings of the Church. Because of their commitment, such a shift could be an indication of the work of the Holy Spirit. Their views, therefore, deserved special consideration. Caution and discernment needed to be exercised, however, in order to avoid confusing secular inclination with divine leading. Ibid., 100.

who were appointed to authoritative offices in the Church.¹ It appears that, in the period of time addressed in this chapter, Dulles viewed these secondary or created authorities as distinct but equal, inseparably connected and interrelated on every level. Such a view often lent itself to a harsh critique on the part of Dulles's more conservative colleagues.²

There were several benefits in such an understanding of authority. No authority would be absolutized at the expense of the others.³ Moreover, a plurality of authorities would protect a believer from "being crushed by the weight of any single authority," since it would restrain any one authority from acting independently from other authoritative sources.⁴ Finally, a plurality of authorities in the Church would lead to a greater sharing of teaching authority as well as to new forms of evangelism, thus reaching a greater variety of peoples around the world.⁵

The Historicity of the Magisterium

As observed earlier, it appears that in the two decades following the Second Vatican Council Dulles favored an "ecclesiology from below." Consequently, he developed a pluralistic theory of authority in the Church that emphasized the historical relativity of a

¹Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 100. It seems significant that Dulles placed the authority of office at the end of his hierarchy of authorities.

²This view was severely criticized by Joseph Varacalli who expressed the regret that a Catholic theologian of Dulles's stature would advocate "a conceptually unclear and vague" call for a dissemination of doctrinal authority. According to Varacalli, Dulles advocated a model in which there were "too many chiefs and not enough Indians," where "there is no clear ultimate and chief authority." Joseph Varacalli, "Neo-Orthodoxy, the Crisis of Authority and the Future of the Catholic Church in the United States," *Faith and Reason* 15 (Fall 1989): 203. Similar sentiments were issued by John J. Mulloy, "The Dulles Changes," *The Wanderer*, November 16, 1972, 5.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 85, 86-9.

⁴Ibid., 88. Dulles wrote: "These authorities serve as mutual checks and balances. They exist in a state of natural tension and dialogue, and only when they spontaneously converge can authority make itself fully felt." Idem, *The Resilient Church*, 99. On this point, Dulles's views were informed by the teachings of Yves Congar. Cf. Yves Congar, "Norms of Christian Allegiance and Identity in the History of the Church," in *Truth and Certainty*, ed. E. Schillebeeckx (New York: Herder and Herder, 1973), 24-5.

⁵Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 89.

system of “created” or “secondary authorities” as he describes them.¹ Such views raise valid questions regarding the nature, structure, and role of the doctrinal magisterium, a created authority within the Church. As we shall see, Dulles was not satisfied with the traditional understanding of the authority of the magisterium, which restricted doctrinal teaching to the hierarchy alone. With this in mind, he attempted a reinterpretation of the nature of the magisterium, according to the principles that, in his view, were laid down in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.² He wrote: “The times call for an ‘epochal’ reinterpretation of the very notion of magisterium. . . . Unless the style of the magisterium is reshaped to meet the demands of our time . . . we may expect the present loss of credibility to intensify.”³ Any reinterpretation of such an institution involves a consideration of its historicity and of its *ius divinum*.⁴

The term “magisterium” refers to those who are authorized to teach and to establish Church doctrine. According to traditional Catholic doctrine, this office has its roots in the apostolic ministry.⁵ Like Yves Congar, Dulles believed that, in each era, the style of the

¹Ibid., 84-8; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 99-101.

²Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 32. Dulles made it clear that the most difficult questions about the magisterium in the Church concern not so much the existence of the magisterium as its nature (ibid., 35).

³Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 304.

⁴The notion of *ius divinum* is rather unclear and ambiguous and has been the subject of intense controversy both in Roman Catholic and Protestant circles. The exact translation of the Latin term means “divine law.” The Roman Catholic Church often appeals to *ius divinum* in defense of its institutions and sacraments and uses it as a tool to settle disputes. The term, as applied to Church life and structure, simply means that certain institutions and rites were established directly by God and, therefore, cannot be abolished. The problem arises when an attempt is made to distinguish between *ius divinum* and *ius humanum*. For a more extended discussion of *ius divinum* and its implications see Carl J. Peter, “Dimensions of *Jus Divinum* in Roman Catholic Theology,” *TS* 34 (1973): 227-50; Edward Schillebeeckx, “The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church,” *TS* 30 (1969): 567-87; Michael A. Fahey, “Continuity in the Church Amid Structural Changes,” *TS* 35 (1974): 415-40; cf. Dulles, “*Ius Divinum* as an Ecumenical Problem,” 681-708.

⁵It is accepted, however, that the actual expression “magisterium,” in the sense in which it is used in the contemporary Church, was not applied to the teaching authority of the Church until the nineteenth century. At various times in history, the magisterial function of teaching authority in the Church experienced evolutionary development and was assumed by a variety of agencies. Since the Reformation, the term “magisterium” has been

magisterium responded to its cultural milieu and to the needs of contemporary society. The dynamic nature of the magisterium, as well as its historical development, indicated that, while the institution may indeed have been willed by God, its form and the way it was exercised were subject to change.¹ To substantiate this conviction, Dulles called on historical evidence, beginning with the apostolic church.

The New Testament

The New Testament, as Dulles saw it, did not prescribe a particular way in which the doctrinal ministry of the Church was to be exercised. The apostles emerged as the leaders of the early Church. Their teaching authority was partly grounded in their experience with Christ and their unique role in establishing the Christian community. As authoritative witnesses/founders of the Church, they had no successors. Furthermore, Dulles stipulated, the assertion that the apostles had wanted to provide the Church with a class of individuals holding “supreme power to teach and govern in the Church” was an “inference, not strictly deducible from the New Testament.”²

The Patristic Era

The patristic or “traditionalist” model of Church authority, according to Dulles, is exemplified in the writings of early Church fathers, more particularly Clement of Rome (fl. ca. 96), Irenaeus (ca. 130-200), and Tertulian (ca. 155-220). These fathers describe the increasingly applied to the hierarchy of the Church, which has come to be seen as the true, divinely instituted doctrinal authority in the Church. John E. Lynch, “The Magisterium and Theologians from the Apostolic Fathers to the Gregorian Reform,” *CS* 17 (Summer 1978): 188; Avery Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” *CTSA* 35 (1980): 156.

¹Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 300. Congar published a penetrating study on the meaning and evolution of the term “magisterium.” Cf. Congar, “A Semantic History of the Term Magisterium,” 297-313.

²Avery Dulles, “The Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection,” *CS* 17 (1978): 265. Dulles pointed out that the events during the Council of Jerusalem, i.e., the interaction of the apostles, presbyters and the believers, provided a powerful illustration of the manner in which doctrinal teaching in the early church was exercised (*ibid.*). See also *idem*, “An Ecclesial Model for Theological Reflection: The Council of Jerusalem,” in *Tracing the Spirit*, ed. James E. Hug (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 218-41.

first attempts of the Christian community to establish some sort of continuity with apostolic teachings. According to this model, the apostles received full revelation, which they passed on as the deposit of faith to their successors in key apostolic sees. Thus, the early doctrinal magisterium, consisting of the leaders of the local churches in these sees, had been established. Adherence to the teachings of these leaders assured orthodoxy.¹

Although the bishops gathered in councils taught with authority, they were not the only participants in the early councils. Priests, deacons, monks, and theologians also took part in debates and had voting powers, notes Dulles. Whatever disagreements occurred in such gatherings were solved by the consensus of those present.²

The Middle Ages

During the Middle Ages, the Church developed a complex system of authoritative mediation. A structure of “feudally graded,” hierarchical officers was established in order to communicate the Christian message to the masses, which had very little access to the Christian Scriptures or the Catholic tradition.³

From the Counter-Reformation to the Second Vatican Council

Following the Reformation, the magisterium was increasingly juridicized and clericalized. Much of the teaching power was concentrated in the hands of the Roman pontiff. During this period, Dulles contended, even the concept of teaching underwent significant change. Rather than providing insight and enlightenment, doctrinal teaching

¹Dulles, “The Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection,” 267.

²Ibid., 268-71. This development struck Dulles as crucial. It provided him with a foundation upon which his model of the Church’s magisterium might exercise its authority. The power of consensus and a representational model of a teaching Church proved, he believed, that the Holy Spirit was operative in the universal Church, especially in conciliar discussions. While he conceded that the representational model may not have been devoid of pitfalls, Dulles suggested that doctrinal unity attained “from below” could serve as a paradigm for the post-Vatican II Church (ibid.).

³Dulles, “The Church Is Communications,” 8.

was reduced to the believers' assent to officially ratified formulas.¹ Like other believers, theologians were called to recognize and support the teachings of the hierarchical magisterium as "the proximate rule of faith."² Such an understanding of magisterial authority persisted in the Roman Catholic Church until the mid-twentieth century, when several prominent Catholic scholars began challenging the Neo-Scholastic paradigms of authority. Responding to the criticism and "anxious not to bring about new divisions," the Second Vatican Council "supplied a helpful corrective to the juridicism and papalism of the post-Tridentine and Neo-Scholastic periods."³

*The Second Vatican Council and
the 'Ius Divinum' Issue*

Dulles's views on the achievements of the Council⁴ in the area of teaching authority seemed to develop as time progressed.⁵ During and soon after the Council, he saw the magisterium of the Church as a divinely established institution, endowed by God with special charism to authoritatively interpret the deposit of faith. This was the charism bestowed upon the authors of the Bible. While he welcomed the emphasis of *Lumen gentium* upon the collegiality of all bishops, it seems that Dulles did not see the Council's teachings on the authority and prerogatives of the doctrinal magisterium as having moved

¹This development reached its climax, Dulles explained, in the nineteenth century and especially in the decrees of the First Vatican Council. In these documents, the magisterium clearly adopts the role of the defender of the deposit of faith. Dulles, "The Contemporary Magisterium," 301; idem, "Church, Churches, Catholic Church," 224.

²Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 114; cf. Pius XII, *Humani generis*, in *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, 24-36.

³Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 116-17; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 117-88.

⁴Following Dulles's approach, I will use an upper case "C" when referring to the Second Vatican Council.

⁵His writings in the sixties stand in marked contrast to his work in the seventies. In the early years after the Council he seems to have been more conservative regarding the teachings of the Council. Cf. Dulles, *Revelation and the Quest for Unity*, and idem, *The Survival of Dogma*.

much beyond traditional Roman Catholic teachings. The magisterium still appeared in his writings as the sole authoritative teacher of doctrine in the Church, whose role was to teach, sanctify, and govern.¹

These initial reactions were soon supplanted by a more adventurous exploration of the Council's message. Thus we find him immersing himself in a reinterpretation of the nature and role of the doctrinal magisterium. A few years after the end of the Council he concluded that as the institution of the magisterium "reflects the influence of cultural and social forces since New Testament times,"² it was difficult to determine which elements of the structure of the Church came under the umbrella of "divine institution."³ Therefore, the use of *ius divinum* as a foundation stone of the current ecclesiastical institutions would need to be carefully reconsidered, and include an element of reversibility.⁴ Dulles went as far as to suggest that *ius divinum* should not be used to justify the existence of redundant rites or institutions. He found it incomprehensible that God would desire the continuance of institutions, even those "that he himself had established," when they had lost their relevance.⁵ He asked poignantly:

Why could He [God] not institute something that is intended to last for a given period only? If a given structure ceases to be functional, may we not properly infer that it was not intended by God to abide forever? Perhaps there are some

¹Dulles, "The Church," 12; idem, "Constitution on Divine Revelation in Ecumenical Perspective," 224-45; idem, "A Different Reading," *Commonweal*, January 22, 1965, 530.

²Avery Dulles, "Ministry and Intercommunion," *TS* 34 (1973): 678.

³Dulles, "Church, Churches, Catholic Church," 228. Thus, Dulles declared, any notion that the elements of a created reality, such as the episcopate or the papacy, were permanent and immutable "owes more to Greek philosophy than to biblical revelation." Idem, "The Contemporary Relevance of the Ignatian Vision," 147.

⁴Dulles, "Ministry and Intercommunion," 678; idem, "Church, Churches, Catholic Church," 228; idem, "The Papacy: Bond or Barrier?" 52.

⁵Dulles, "The Contemporary Relevance of the Ignatian Vision," 147. On this point Dulles was in apparent agreement with Schillebeeckx. See Schillebeeckx, "The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church," 569.

immutable structures, but for the modern mind this has to be proved rather than presumed.¹

Such difficulties compelled Dulles to seek a new understanding of *ius divinum*. He suggested that *ius divinum* might have been given “inchoatively at the beginning,” and that rather than granted in an unchanging form from the outset, the concept developed with time.² A reinterpretation of *ius divinum* would not lead to the dissolution of Roman Catholic Christianity since Christ had promised the Church the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit, who was to protect it against heresy and disintegration till the end of times.³

Besides should the Church, in an era of democratization, continue to view itself “as being by divine constitution a class society in which all decisive power regarding doctrine and discipline is placed in the hands of a governing class”?⁴ Serious study had led him to conclude that it could no longer be claimed that the episcopal hierarchy had “exclusive, absolute, or unlimited doctrinal authority.” Rather, in agreement with his understanding of

¹Dulles, “Church, Churches, Catholic Church,” 228-29; idem, “*Ius Divinum* as an Ecumenical Problem,” 705. Elsewhere, Dulles was even more blunt. He asserted that it was not “verifiable that Jesus had established the papal-episcopal form of government or that he had instituted the seven sacraments. The appeal to divine institution as the ground for acceptance looked suspiciously like ‘ideology’ in the Marxist sense of the word—that is, a theory concocted in order to reinforce the existing power structures.” Idem, “The Contemporary Relevance of the Ignatian Vision,” 146. Dulles also applied his reasoning to certain dogmas irreversibly taught by the Church. He noted that various doctrinal issues in the Catholic tradition were not settled as they were thought to have been a century earlier. Some of these dogmas would, therefore, have to be reformulated with the help of modern philosophical tools, in order to make them more palatable to modern humanity. Considering the historicity of certain irreformable dogmas, as well as their position in the hierarchy of truth, Dulles proposed the lifting of the anathemas associated with them. Idem, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” 57-60; idem, “A Proposal to Lift Anathemas,” *CM*, May 1975, 40-5. A similar point is made in idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 148, and idem, “Conscience and Church Authority,” 120.

²Dulles agreed that such a dynamic and historical concept of divine law was not explicitly taught by the Second Vatican Council. Implicitly, however, by its “nuanced” approach to the hierarchical order in *Lumen gentium*, the Council had inadvertently made room for such a view. If accepted, a historical and developmental approach toward *ius divinum* would correspond to the concept of revelation presented in *Dei Verbum*. Dulles, “*Ius Divinum* as an Ecumenical Problem,” 690; cf. *Dei Verbum*, 2.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 202-03; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 36; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 96; idem, *The Dimensions of the Church*, 40-1.

⁴Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 304.

the nature of authority in the Church, he suggested that the teachings of the magisterium should be considered as only one of several elements that constituted the total witness of the Church.¹ For these reasons, Dulles proposed a new understanding of the magisterium that would, in his mind, renew the image and restore the authority of the Church.

Avery Dulles's Proposal of Two Magisteria

Since the whole Church, and not just the pope and the bishops, was anointed by the Holy Spirit, all members should contribute to its teaching ministry.² In this context there was one group which could contribute in a special way to the teaching magisterium of the Church, i.e., Catholic theologians.³

Hierarchical and Theological Magisteria

The task and role of theology in the Church emerged as a major issue in the post-Vatican II Church. In those years Dulles joined a growing body of theologians who struggled for greater recognition of their role in determining and teaching the doctrines of the Church. He thus proposed a view which, in his mind, would not only clarify the role of theologians but would also bring the Church up to date with the demands of modern society. His controversial thesis held that the Church needed two kinds of teachers: those who could establish the official doctrine of the Church and commit the Church to a certain

¹Dulles, "The Magisterium and Authority in the Church," 36-7. Dulles did not discount the fact that it was possible to support the existence of the Church as a magisterial society on the basis of a few isolated biblical passages. These passages, however, were vague, at best, and based on the belief that the status of a modern bishop was equal to that of an apostle. On the other hand, there were biblical passages that strongly militated against such a position, and which seemed to confer doctrinal authority upon the whole Church. Idem, "The Contemporary Magisterium," 304.

²While in several places in his writings Dulles dealt with the laity, the issues related to its place and role in the Church did not seem to be his focus. When he did write on the laity, he often used the insights of other writers, such as John Henry Newman, Yves Congar, and Karl Rahner.

³Although Dulles did not deny the fact that there were theologians among the bishops, he usually applied the term "theologians" to those Catholic scholars who were outside the college of bishops.

course, and those whose main task would be to investigate problems relating to faith in a scholarly fashion. These two groups fit under the common designation of “magisterium.”¹ For the sake of clarity and distinction, however, Dulles thought it proper to assign a different adjective to each group.² The episcopate was designated as the “hierarchical magisterium,” in contrast with the “theological magisterium.”³ Since during the Middle Ages the term “magisterium” had also been applied to theologians who exercised a genuine

¹Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 118-20; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 105.

Dulles's thesis was a logical extension of his views presented during the 1976 conference of the Catholic Theological Society of America, although at the time Dulles did not apply the term “magisterium” to theologians. Cf. Dulles, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 235-46.

²Dulles struggled with the qualifying adjective that could be linked to the term “magisterium” with reference to the highest ecclesiastical officers. In Catholic literature, he observed, four terms are normally used: pastoral, authentic, ecclesiastical and hierarchical. The last two alone, he wrote, expressed the true nature of the magisterium. The adjective “pastoral” was inadequate because it implied something merely practical and non-dogmatic, whereas “authentic” conveyed the idea that the magisterium with which such a term was associated was the only true magisterium making the existence of other magisteria redundant. Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 156.

³Dulles was not the first Catholic scholar who toyed with the idea of two magisteria. The possibility had often been discussed during the 1970s meetings of the Catholic Theological Society of America. It is Dulles, however, because of his prominence as a Catholic scholar, who has most often been associated with the view. Cf. Richard A. McCormick, “The Teaching of the Magisterium and Theologians,” *CTSA* 24 (1969): 239-54; John R. Quinn, “The Magisterium and Theology,” *CTSA* 24 (1969): 255-61. See also Brown, “The Dilemma of the Magisterium vs. the Theologians—Debunking Some Fictions,” 290-307. Brown was careful to point out, however, that an attempt to reclaim the designation “magisterium” for theologians would not be successful. He concluded: “I personally do not think the battle worth fighting so long as, under any other name, *the legitimate role of theologians in shaping the teaching of the Church is respected*” (ibid., 291, emphasis his). Richard McCormick and Francis A. Sullivan, while generally agreeing with Dulles, also expressed reservations about the attempt to apply the term magisterium to theologians. McCormick, “Notes on Moral Theology,” *TS* 40 (1979): 95; Sullivan, *Magisterium*, 28-9. Other scholars, like William E. May, strongly disagreed with Dulles's position on the two magisteria. The unity of the Church, he argued, demanded only one magisterium, and theologians had to allow themselves to be judged and corrected by the only true doctrinal magisterium, that of the pope and bishops. William E. May, “The Magisterium and Moral Theology,” in *Symposium on the Magisterium: A Positive Statement*, ed. John J. O'Rourke and Thomas Greenburg (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1978), 71-94. In the nineties, Dulles's proposal was picked up by Richard R. Gaillardetz, who, while avoiding the “two magisteria” terminology, put forth a proposal that contained all the original elements of Dulles's thesis. See Gaillardetz, 159-62.

teaching function in the Church, Dulles felt justified to use the designation “theological magisterium.”¹

While the dual application of the term “magisterium” could lead to confusion, applying it to both groups would point to the fact that two classes of individuals in the Church had been jointly called to teach sacred doctrine with acknowledged competence.² Still, in order for Church authority to function properly, no more than two magisteria could exist. While the hierarchical and theological magisteria were requisite for the advancement of the gospel, admitting more than two would cause unnecessary tension and confusion within the Church.³

The Need for Two Magisteria

Dulles saw several reasons why the Church needed two magisteria. First, the post-Vatican II Church needed to move beyond narrow Neo-Scholastic definitions.⁴ He suggested that while bishops had often functioned as theologians in the past, in the modern, multinational Church they were burdened with too many administrative duties to

¹Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 156.

²Dulles believed that the Vatican II documents made way for such an interpretation of the term “magisterium.” At least there was no evidence, he insisted, that the Council restricted the term “magisterium” to the hierarchical order. Although *Lumen gentium* affirmed that the episcopal order had supreme teaching power in the Church, it did not deny “that persons other than bishops may also share in the Church’s magisterium.” The fact that some non-bishops had voting power during the Council was seen as an indication that, under certain circumstances, individuals who did not possess episcopal ordination could participate with the hierarchy in exercising teaching power. Ibid., 157; idem, “Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection,” 280.

³Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 157.

⁴Dulles often praised the achievements of the Second Vatican Council and attempted to remain faithful to its directives. Regarding the issues related to the function of the magisterium in the Church, however, he affirmed that Vatican II did not provide a consistent paradigm according to which the Church could build its understanding of the magisterium. The Council, therefore, “left to the postconciliar church the task of completing its own program.” Idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 117. He went as far as to suggest that the authors of *Lumen gentium* did not sufficiently allow for the social and ideological gap dividing the worldviews of the nineteenth and late twentieth centuries (ibid., 143).

deal with the theological issues facing the Church. "A greater differentiation of functions is desirable."¹

Second, Vatican II did not promote any particular way in which the magisterium was to exercise its power. It neither affirmed nor denied the possibility of a second, complementary magisterium, that of theologians.² In fact, Dulles saw the concept of a theological magisterium implied in many Conciliar pronouncements, especially those that emphasized the fact that the Church relied on theologians in discerning "the many voices of our age, in grappling with new questions of a technical or scientific character, and in finding more appropriate ways of communicating Christian doctrine."³

Third, Dulles's early writings on the magisterium emerged from a strong conviction that there was a crisis of authority, or, in his words, "the collapse of credibility in the official teaching of the Church."⁴ As a result, "the papacy and the bishops no longer have the power to decide effectively what the people shall believe on controverted points."⁵ A revitalized notion of the magisterium, Dulles contended, could only contribute to a reversal of this crisis.⁶

¹Ibid., 108. Dulles noted that, in the early centuries of the Christian era, the concentration of teaching power in the hands of the episcopate did not bring much harm, probably because a significant number of theologians were bishops themselves. Idem, *The Resilient Church*, 104.

²Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 116.

³Ibid., 117; cf. *Gaudium et spes*, 1.44 and 2.62, in Abbott, 245-46, 268-70.

⁴Dulles, "The Theologian and the Magisterium," 238. For Dulles, the most striking example of such a decline was the reaction of the believers to the encyclical *Humanae vitae*, issued in 1968. Dulles agreed with Richard A. McCormick, who asserted that it was safe to say that the authority of the hierarchical magisterium was in serious trouble. McCormick wrote: "For many of the educated faithful it has ceased to be truly credible." Richard A. McCormick, "The Teaching Role of the Magisterium and of Theologians," *CTSA* 24 (1969): 251. Dulles quotes McCormick in "The Contemporary Magisterium," 299. See also "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology," 389-90; idem, "The Magisterium and Authority in the Church," 30.

⁵Dulles, "Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement," 62.

⁶Dulles conceded that his idea of two magisteria was merely one factor that might help to resolve the crisis of authority. Nevertheless, the archaic way in which the Church was governed, as well as the frequently evident intellectual incompetence of its highest

Dulles's thesis of two, co-existing magisteria reflected his dissatisfaction with the way in which theologians had hitherto been treated by the hierarchy.¹ It also revealed his abiding desire to provide the Catholic theological community, of which he was a member, with a legitimate and definite role in fashioning the official teachings of the Church.²

While his proposal was assessed by some as “provocative”³ and strongly opposed by Catholic commentators such as Joseph A. Varacalli and George A. Kelly,⁴ Dulles believed that his suggestion laid the foundation upon which one might normalize the often awkward relationship between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians—one of his major concerns, to which he devoted much time during the period under study—and help them to

officers, was partly to blame. If this was so, Dulles asked, why should the decisive doctrinal power and the right to commit the Church officially to certain teaching be placed in the hands of “officers who notoriously lack the requisite skill?” While hostility against any form of authority was evident in modern society, the Church, according to Dulles, was even more susceptible to internal dissent since the highest officers were not elected by the consent of the representative body, nor were they required to demonstrate competence in doctrinal matters. Idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 30. On the other hand, Dulles contended, a more representative form of government, as well as contemporary methods of teaching and communication, seemed to harmonize with the message of the gospel. Thus, a modernization of the notion of the magisterium could only prove beneficial, because it would allow the Church to take advantage of all the new ecclesiological possibilities available to it. Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 304; cf. idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 129.

¹Dulles wrote poignantly: “A certain ‘spice of martyrdom’ has indeed been added to the lives of some theologians in recent months.” Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 30.

²On the other hand, “those who militantly oppose talk of a theological magisterium frequently have little respect for scholarship and incline toward an almost magical view of the attainment of truth in matters of faith.” Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 157.

³T. Pawikowski, review of *A Church to Believe In*, by Avery Dulles, *Catholic Sentinel*, August 27, 1982, 12.

⁴Cf. Joseph A. Varacalli, *Toward the Establishment of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983), 251. Varacalli notes that the overwhelmingly positive reception of *Models of the Church* and an inclination towards a “theology of pluralism,” present in the writings of theologians such as Avery Dulles and David Tracy, “may be indicative of such a possible development” (ibid.). Also Kelly, “Fr. Dulles' Church to Believe In,” 11-22; cf. David Tracy, “The Church,” in *Liberty and Justice for All: Discussion Guide* (Washington, DC: N.C.C.B. Committee for the Bicentennial, 1975), 75-93.

“overcome their mutual suspicions and to respect each other’s legitimate concerns.”¹ A discussion of the principles of such a relationship, however, would not be complete without presenting Dulles’s views regarding the task of the hierarchical magisterium as well as his views on the nature and role of the theological magisterium.

The Hierarchical Magisterium

Dulles never became a vocal opponent of the hierarchical magisterium. Still, he felt it necessary, within the context of his “ecclesiology from below” and his emphasis upon the *sensus fidelium*, to set forth his understanding of the hierarchical magisterium’s task.

The Task of the Hierarchical Magisterium

Dulles maintained that the ecclesiastical magisterium—the college of bishops in communion with the Roman pontiff “as its center and head”—fulfilled an indispensable role in the Church. As “successors of the apostles” the bishops, in every age, inherited the function of supervising the Church.²

Their primary task was the proclamation of the Christian message, not just in the sense of merely restating and defending what had already been established³—which was important for the sake of maintaining continuity with the past and unity within the

¹Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 168.

²Avery Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” in *Who Has the Say in the Church?* ed. Jürgen Moltmann and Hans Küng (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), 62.

³Dulles noted that “in recent times the magisterium has been almost totally concerned with preserving what is old and with guarding against ‘profane novelties,’ as they are called. The church has been affected by an anxious conservatism more reminiscent of the servant who buried his talent in the ground than of those who invested their master’s capital to bring in interest.” Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308-09, 310.

Church¹—but also in finding “new ways of expressing the gospel of Jesus Christ,”² ways which would be relevant to different cultures and ages.³

Pastoral leadership was also part of the task of the hierarchical magisterium. Drawing upon the New Testament, Dulles asserted that collectively bishops fulfilled the roles of administrators and pastors—the “true shepherd[s] of the flock.”⁴ They were responsible for preaching, for maintaining doctrinal standards among believers, for determining modes of worship and patterns of behavior mandatory for the entire community of faith, for maintaining order among believers, for regulating the conditions according to which believers could access the sacraments, and for supervising the mission of the Church. Essential for the existence and preservation of the Church these functions were to be performed without turning the Church into a “totalitarian or tyrannical organization.”⁵ Not only had Vatican II depicted the role of the magisterium primarily “in

¹Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 129.

²Dulles, “Conscience and Church Authority,” 119.

³Dulles, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 73. Dulles realized that recasting the gospel in a new, contemporary way also brought forth the issue of the immutability of dogma and the infallibility of the magisterium. While the danger of diluting the essence of the gospel when attempting to restate it did exist, a far greater danger was that the Christian message would become stale and irrelevant unless it was “restated in a challenging way for every time and culture.” Careful reformulations, Dulles stressed, would affect only the language, imagery, and conceptual structures of the older formulations, while leaving the essence of the message intact. In no way would this affect the issue of infallibility. To support his view, Dulles referred to Gregory Baum, who made the following statement: “The gift of infallibility means that the church is able to remain faithful to the past and is yet free to reformulate Christian teaching as the Good News for the contemporary world” (*ibid.*, 307). Gregory Baum, *Faith and Doctrine* (Paramus, NJ: Newman Press, 1969), 133.

⁴Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 103. Dulles claimed that in the centuries leading up to the Second Vatican Council, the importance of the pastoral side of episcopal ministry was unduly diminished to the advantage of the judgmental function. He believed that the documents of the Council brought the pastoral function once again to the forefront of episcopal activities. *Idem*, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308.

⁵Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 75.

terms of service rather than domination,” but the model of the Church as a community of disciples excluded the notion that there are masters and subjects in the Church.¹

Finally, bishops were to provide doctrinal and juridical leadership, i.e., give official endorsement to the doctrines of the Church. As traditionally expressed, bishops possessed that ecclesiastical teaching power designated as *munus docendi* as well as the power of jurisdiction.² They had received the gift of grace, a special charism of truth, by which the Holy Spirit assisted them in their work.³ Echoing Hans Küng’s concern, however, Dulles did not hesitate to point out that the assistance of the Holy Spirit did not endow bishops with mythical powers that protected them from error. There was no reason to invoke “magical powers” in order to escape responsibility for one’s actions or to refuse to allow for necessary reforms—“all this in the name of God.”⁴ Bishops were exhorted to recognize that their authority was to be supplemented by the authority of the voice of the faithful.

The Bishops and the *Sensus Fidelium*

What would be the role and the authority of the *sensus fidelium*? Dulles recognized it as playing an indispensable part in the bishop’s task. In fact, his emphasis upon the *sensus fidelium*⁵ led him to conclude that bishops served as official “spokesmen” for the

¹Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 141; idem, “The Open Church,” 26-7; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 12.

²Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 157. These powers, as noted before, could only be exercised within the context of the collegial relationship, as outlined in the documents of Vatican II (ibid.).

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 96-7.

⁴Avery Dulles, “Incarnation, 1973: Reflections at Christmas,” *Commonweal*, December 28, 1973, 335-36; cf. Hans Küng, *Structures of the Church* (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964), 184.

⁵Dulles wrote: “Catholics of the preconciliar period were inclined to think of the Holy Spirit as assisting the official teachers, and only through their mediation, the generality of the faithful. According to the present view, the Holy Spirit is given in the first instance to the Church as a whole, and only secondarily to certain particular officers. . . . Seeing each individual member of the Church as immediately related to the Holy Spirit, Vatican II attached great importance to the “sense of the faith” aroused and sustained in the

Church.¹ Rarely, he contended, was the magisterium the source of doctrine.² In agreement with Gregory Baum, Dulles suggested that the doctrinal role of the hierarchical magisterium was to gather insights already present in the Church and to express them officially.³ Backing up J. M. R. Tillard, he proposed that the magisterium serve as a “lens” through which the revelation already present in the Church was brought into focus and set forth in words.⁴ To have binding force, all magisterial statements needed to proceed from the community of faith and to faithfully reflect its faith.⁵ Hence, rather than inhibiting the initiatives of the Holy Spirit within the Church, the episcopate needed to encourage believers to new initiatives;⁶ aiming “not to restrict or suffocate creative thinking, but rather to make the church an authentic home of courage and responsible freedom.”⁷ Statements such as these once again tend to support the contention that, in the whole Body of Christ by the Spirit of truth.” Dulles, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 21.

¹Several times in his writings of this period, Dulles applied the term “spokesmen” to the highest ecclesiastical officers. This designation seems to indicate Dulles's preference for an “ecclesiology from below.” See Dulles, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” 62-3; idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 36; idem, “Method in Fundamental Theology: Reflections on David Tracy’s *Blessed Rage for Order*,” TS 37 (1976): 311.

²Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 165.

³Dulles, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 244; idem, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 162; idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 44-5; cf. Gregory Baum, *The Credibility of the Church Today* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 188-209.

⁴Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 44-5; cf. J. M. R. Tillard, “Sensus Fidelium,” *One in Christ* 11 (1975): 28.

⁵Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 97.

⁶Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 36.

⁷Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308; idem, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 41. This was necessary because, as Dulles pointed out, the magisterium no longer carried the same authority as it had in past ages. Modern-day believers, imbued with liberal ideas and living in a free society, expected the Church to adopt a similar attitude toward doctrinal instruction. The faithful no longer responded to coercion but tended to make up their minds on the basis of solid evidence. Dulles, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” 63; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 141.

years following Vatican II, Dulles showed a preference for an “ecclesiology from below,” where the *sensus fidelium* was the primary concept that guided the magisterium in its work. Thus, concluded Howland Sanks while commenting on Dulles’s views, “the pyramidal model has been reversed.”¹ Besides agreeing with the *sensus fidelium*, all magisterial statements were also to be permanently subject to the Word of God, the Holy Scriptures.²

In other words, doctrinal leadership in the modern Church could hardly continue to follow the preconciliar attitude, which implied that whenever the episcopate defined doctrinal teaching, the laity was to submit and obey. Coercive submission, under pain of canonical penalties, was no longer an effective way of achieving compliance.³ Such an attitude would render all participation and personal responsibility redundant. Doctrinal leadership in the modern situation should consist of persuading and assisting the faithful in fulfilling their divinely mandated mission.⁴

This did not mean, Dulles insisted, that the episcopate was a powerless body, driven by public opinion. Doctrinal controversies had to be settled and Church leaders needed to be able to take a clear stand against, even excommunicate, those who espoused

¹Howland Sanks, *Authority in the Church: A Study in Changing Paradigms*, 173.

²Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 38; idem, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 73; idem, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9.

³Dulles noted that papal attempts to end discussions regarding issues such as clerical celibacy, transubstantiation, or artificial contraception had proven futile and had only fueled further dissent. Dulles, “Conscience and Church Authority,” 121; idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 305; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 36-7.

⁴Dulles, “Conscience and Church Authority,” 121. In his article “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” Dulles outlined his vision of the doctrinal teaching in the Church. His remarks primarily addressed the high-school environment. His ideas, however, applied to the way doctrinal teaching should happen within the Church. The teacher, rather than telling the students what they should or should not believe, could only “properly invite his students to share in the beliefs that he himself professes. This is what he would be expected to do in other fields, whether history, or literature, or music, or philosophy. Without any detriment to the students’ freedom, the teacher can share with them his own tastes, preferences, and honest convictions. The student may be urged to fear that he might err through pride or passion or some other excess, but he should not be deterred from honestly and openly expressing his difficulties. It should not be assumed that every difficulty against current Church teaching arises out of some moral fault” (ibid., 22).

views that were “repugnant to the gospel and destructive of its [the Church’s] own existence as a community of faith.”¹ Any other stand would “undermine the apostolicity and catholic unity essential to the Church.”² The work of the Church hierarchy would be enhanced greatly if its members were open to dialogue with other elements of the body of Christ.³

In summary, Dulles believed that the Second Vatican Council sanctioned a review of the manner in which the doctrinal magisterium was to exercise its teaching authority. In that context, he put forth the suggestion of two magisteria in an attempt to clarify the role of Catholic theologians in the post-Vatican II Church. He believed that, in order to function properly, the Church needed committed theologians who could exercise a genuine teaching function. We now turn to the examination of the nature and task of this body.

The Theological Magisterium

Next to the hierarchical magisterium, Dulles taught, that Roman Catholic theologians, by virtue of their “specialized theological training,”⁴ could indeed offer a special contribution in the areas of doctrinal leadership and judgment of orthodoxy.⁵ The

¹Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 299-300. It is interesting to note that, in Dulles’s opinion, issues such as idolatry, superstition, and racism constituted grounds for the most severe action of the magisterium (ibid.). Regarding theological views, however, he advised that the magisterium needed to be more permissive. Views that were not destructive of the essential nature of the gospel or detrimental to the community of faith should be allowed to co-exist, and the hierarchical magisterium needed to avoid issuing definitive pronouncements that “purport” to settle debates. “As a matter of fact, any attempt to settle controversies by decree is almost foredoomed to failure in the pluralistic Church of our time.” Idem, “Conscience and Church Authority,” 121; cf. idem, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” 52.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 91; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 74.

³Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9.

⁴The reason why Dulles singled out theologians as a special group in the Church was because “as a rule they [‘simple and devout believers’] have not been trained to distinguish between the deposit of faith and the traditional formulations, nor have they been sensitized to the cultural relativity of doctrinal pronouncements.” Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 167.

⁵Avery Dulles, “Heresy Today?” *America*, March 1, 1980, 162; idem, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 155. Dulles admitted that, strictly speaking, juridical

teaching ministry of bishops would be hampered, to the detriment of the entire Church, if they did not recognize the theologians' calling to participate in authoritative teaching. Dulles expressed himself quite clearly on the rationale for the existence of a distinct theological magisterium, as well as its nature, task, and authority.

A Historical and Theological Rationale

The Historical Precedence

Theological enterprise, Dulles stated, was almost as old as the Church itself. Its rise within early Christianity seemed to be precipitated by the changing manner in which the Christian message was proclaimed. During the apostolic era, Christ's teachings were transmitted orally to the believers. The content of revelation was designated as "gospel" or "kerygma."¹ With the closure of the apostolic age, the mode of communication shifted toward the written word. The Christian message had to be extracted from the Holy Writings and interpreted. With the prevalence of illiteracy, it fell to the literate class, mainly the clerks or clergy, to study and interpret the Scriptures for the people at large. With the passage of time, theologians, who came to be considered experts in reading and interpretation, achieved a highly recognized position within the Church.²

The development of universities facilitated further recognition of the theological profession in the Church; so much so that "in the High Middle Ages the university theologians became the unacknowledged rulers of the church. They were the power behind

authority belonged to the episcopate alone. He qualified this statement, however, with the assertion that the juridical function of the episcopate could not be performed without the active participation of all elements of the People of God, and especially theologians. It seems, therefore, that Dulles viewed the hierarchical magisterium as subject to the rest of the Church, thus preventing it from performing its juridical function independently. Idem, "The Idea of a National Pastoral Council," 9; cf. *Lumen gentium*, 30, in Abbott, 56-7.

¹"Gospel," Dulles suggested, designated the good news of Christ's revelation, whereas "kerygma" pointed to the manner in which it was proclaimed by official witnesses.

²Avery Dulles, "The Church as Multimedia," *New Catholic World*, January-February 1972, 23.

the papal and episcopal thrones.”¹ Thus, Thomas Aquinas came to distinguish between the *officium praelationis*, which belonged to the bishops, and the *officium magisterii*, which belonged to theologians.² As a result of his influence, Catholic theologians came to be recognized as another legitimate teaching authority in the Church. Various councils accepted the vote of theologians as equal to that of bishops, and in some cases the decrees of the councils were sent to theological centers for approval.³ Hence, Dulles concluded, the Neo-Scholastic theory which claimed that “bishops, and they alone, are authentic teachers,” had no historical foundation.⁴

The Ambivalence of Apostolic Succession

What about apostolic succession? Dulles held the doctrine itself in high regard. His attitude toward the traditional Catholic teaching on the subject, however, was rather ambivalent. He simply contested the right to restrict apostolic succession to the episcopate alone.⁵ His concept of apostolic succession may be summarized as follows:

First, the doctrine of apostolic succession should have a broader application, subsuming the entire Church rather than the episcopate alone. Agreeing with Richard McBrien and Hans Küng, Dulles concluded that apostolicity “involves succession to the

¹Ibid.

²Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 104-05.

³Dulles illustrated his point with an incident that occurred in the fourteenth century. Pope Clement V ordered that the decrees of the Council of Vienne (1311-1312) were to be promulgated as official, provided they were accepted by the theological faculties of influential universities. Idem, *The Resilient Church*, 105.

⁴Dulles, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 243; idem, *The Resilient Church*, 105.

⁵Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 60. The Post-Tridentine, and particularly the Neo-Scholastic, theory of apostolic succession adhered to the belief that the bishops alone were true successors of the apostles. The sacrament of episcopal ordination bestowed upon them a special charism of truth. The pope, in this theory, as the successor of Peter and the head of the Church, had as much authority as the whole body of bishops. “Thus he was the supreme and universal teacher of all Christians, equipped with that infallibility with which Christ had endowed his Church.” This theory, Dulles lamented, was regrettably still present in some circles of the Church. Idem, *The Resilient Church*, 97.

apostles in life, doctrine, and mission.”¹ Thus, to be apostolic meant more than submission to the teaching of the bishops. It signified, primarily, faithfulness to Christ and to apostolic teaching, as well as remaining in a visible community which could document a historical connection with the original community of disciples.²

Besides, as Christ’s true successor, the entire Church was, as Christ was, God’s apostle, prophet and teacher.³ The New Testament itself provided the Church with a paradigm of the way in which these functions were to operate. Rather than amalgamating them into one office, Paul advocated a certain division of work, where various members of the Church exercised their ministries in different areas.⁴ Their fundamental purpose was to build up the body of Christ and to facilitate the mission of the Church. Without these three functions, the mission of the Church would be hampered.⁵

Finally, in agreement with Raymond Brown, Dulles suggested that the notion of the doctrinal superiority of bishops had little Scriptural support. The New Testament did not *“provide direct evidence that any of the Twelve ever ordained bishops or looked on bishops*

¹Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 60. Both McBrien and Küng advocate a broader application of the doctrine of apostolic succession. Cf. McBrien, who writes: “Apostolic succession is better applied to the whole Church rather than to any particular ministerial group or single official within that Church.” *The Remaking of the Church*, 120; cf. Küng, *The Church*, 354-59.

²Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 50.

³See Heb 3:1, Matt 21:11, and Matt 8:9 respectively.

⁴Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 61.

⁵Ibid. With time, the prophetic office ceased to exist and the teachers, in whom Dulles saw the precursors of modern theologians, were gradually subordinated to the bishops. Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 300. See also Jerome D. Quinn, “*Charisma Veritatis Certum*, Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.26.2,” *TS* 39 (1978): 520-25, and Gonzalez, 1:143-50; cf. Karl Rahner, *Visions and Prophecies* (London: Burns and Oates, 1963), 106.

as successors to the Twelve.”¹ True, Irenaeus² had aimed at providing a useful instrument through which heresies could be distinguished from genuine Christian teaching.

Unfortunately, this was eventually used to secure doctrinal prerogatives for the episcopate, which resulted in the eventual absorption of the original New Testament teaching function by the episcopate, all in the name of apostolic succession.³

The traditional view of apostolic succession, which defended the monopoly of doctrinal authority by the episcopate, was simply wanting. While characteristic of the episcopate, it could also be applied to the *doctores* of the Church, thus allowing for a distinct and relatively independent theological magisterium.⁴ He perceived this interpretation as consistent with the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and underlined by prominent New Testament Catholic scholars.⁵

¹Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 65 (emphasis his); cf. Raymond Brown, *Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections* (New York: Paulist Press, 1970), 72.

²An early Church father, Irenaeus developed the concept of apostolic succession. Not all the fathers of the Church, however, agreed with him. Thus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen held that, in areas related to teaching doctrine, the teachers in the Church stood in apostolic succession in their own way and did not need to “look exclusively to the hierarchical magisterium for pure apostolic doctrine.” Tertulian seemed to have reduced the role of bishops to a disciplinary one. Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 300.

³Ibid. Thirteen years later, in a chapter dealing with the magisterium in his book *A Church to Believe In* (1982), Dulles still espoused similar views (ibid., 60). In his investigation into the doctrine of apostolic succession, Dulles seemed to have been influenced not only by the teachings of contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, such as Yves Congar or Raymond Brown, but also by the writings of prominent Protestant scholars, including Hans von Campenhausen, who is the author of an important and well researched book, *Ecclesial Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*.

⁴Dulles also pointed out that apostolic succession, as applied to theologians, did not necessarily depend upon historical continuity. There were times when the Church was deprived of such leadership. At other times, on the other hand, entire groups of *doctores* appeared on the theological horizon and powerfully influenced the direction of the Church. Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 66.

⁵ On this issue, Dulles concurred with both Yves Congar and Hans Küng. For an overview of Congar’s understanding of the doctrine of apostolic succession, see Carlos Steger’s doctoral dissertation. Steger concludes that, while Congar’s understanding of apostolic succession was shaped by Catholic tradition, he refused to identify the doctrine with “merely the uninterrupted continuity in the occupancy of an episcopal chair.” Like Dulles, Congar seemed to reject a merely material understanding of apostolic succession.

Regarding the 'Charisma Veritatis Certum'

According to traditional Roman Catholic teaching, through the act of episcopal consecration, bishops are endowed with a charismatic gift, the *charisma veritatis certum*, which allows them to discern truth and error.¹ Dulles did not dispute the fact that the episcopate was indeed endowed with such a gift. What he seemed to challenge, however, was the theory that the bishops were the only members of the Church who could claim such a gift.² The result of post-Tridentine and Neo-Scholastic theology, he saw this theory leading to unbearable pressure and responsibility for bishops, placing them in a position of having "to settle intellectually all disputed doctrinal questions," including those outside of their sphere of competence.³ It also overlooked the fact that Irenaeus, in several statements, had indicated that the gift extended beyond episcopal circles.⁴

Carlos A. Steger, *Apostolic Succession: In the Writings of Yves Congar and Oscar Cullmann* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1993), 94-5; cf. Yves Congar, *L'Eglise une, sainte, catholique et apostolique* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1970), 205; cf. Küng, *The Church*, 457, 563, and idem, "What Is the Essence of Apostolic Succession?" in *Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity*, ed. Hans Küng (New York: Paulist Press, 1968), 28-35. See also Karl Rahner, *Vorfragen zu einem ökumenischen Amtsverständnis* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974).

¹See NCE (1967), s.v. "Teaching Authority of the Church (Magisterium)"; cf. *Dei Verbum* 8, in Abbott, 115-17.

²Dulles wrote that this theory, having its roots in Neo-Scholastic theology, was not viable because "it fails to give a rationale for the kind of collaboration between bishop and theologians that has normally existed in the Church. There are ample resources for a better theory both in the New Testament and in the earlier theological tradition." Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 103; cf. idem, *A Church to Believe in*, 34, and idem, "The Theologian and the Magisterium," 238, 243.

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 102; idem, "The Theologian and the Magisterium," 238. To illustrate his point, Dulles quoted from the directives of the Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Facilities, published by the United States Episcopal Conference in 1971. It stated: "The moral evaluation of new scientific developments and legitimately debated questions must be finally submitted to the teaching authority of the church in the person of the local bishop, who has the ultimate responsibility for teaching Catholic doctrine" (ibid., 103); cf. John Dedek, *Contemporary Medical Ethics* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1975), 208.

⁴Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 103.

The bishop was not “expected to be a paragon of learning or to appropriate all doctrinal functions to himself.”¹ Dulles agreed with Myles Bourke, whom he quoted as saying that if the *charisma veritatis certum* existed in the Church “apart from the hierarchy—and to deny that it does is utterly arbitrary—it is surely possessed by the theologians.”² In his view, those who fiercely opposed the ministry of the *charisma veritatis certum* outside of episcopal circles often showed little respect towards scholarship and were inclined towards “an almost magical view of the attainment of truth in matters of faith.”³

About the Canonical Mission⁴

Dulles was also critical of the view that Catholic theologians should be required to obtain a canonical mission in order to teach authoritatively. Paul’s *didaskaloi*, he

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., 104; Myles M. Bourke, “Collegial Decision-Making in the New Testament,” in *Who Decides for the Church?* ed. J. A. Coriden (Hartford: Canon Law Society of America, 1971), 13; Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 110; idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 43; idem, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 243.

³Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 157. In his writings Dulles steadfastly refused to identify the “charism of truth” with any mythical powers that the bishops might possess. He seemed to have been so opposed to such an identification that in several places he used the terms “alleged charism,” or “so called charism,” in reference to its possession by the episcopacy. He also stated that no amount of charism could be substituted for a lack of professional competence. See, for example, *The Survival of Dogma*, 96, and idem, “Theologian and Magisterium,” 238. Elsewhere, he wrote: “This marvelous power was traced to their [bishops] grace of office, which allegedly included a special ‘charism of truth’.” Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 302.

⁴The issue of whether Catholic theologians need a canonical mission in order to authoritatively teach the doctrine of the Church has been one of the most hotly contested issues in ecclesiastical discussions in the decades following the Second Vatican Council. Prior to the Council, the standard belief was that all non-episcopal teaching must be subordinated to the hierarchical magisterium. Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 301-02. Debates regarding the role of theologians and the nature of doctrinal teaching of the Church have often been conducted during the annual CTSA conferences. See for example CTSA 24 (1969) and 42 (1987). It may be stated, however, that since Vatican II, the official Church adopted a new practice which allowed theologians to conduct theological research and teaching without specific commissioning by the hierarchy. This practice has come under fire in recent years. See n. 2 on p. 192 of this dissertation.

contended, “could teach in their own right, and were not viewed as mere representatives of the *episkopoi* or *presbyteroi*.” Many passages in the New Testament seemed to present the *didaskaloi* as a separate class, whose teaching authority stemmed directly from Christ.¹ The biblical evidence did not support the view that New Testament teachers and their modern successors required episcopal endorsement in order to perform their teaching function.

Moreover, conferring a canonical mission upon theologians meant that, rather than fulfilling the function of a scholarly or theological magisterium, they were merely participating in the functions and authority of the hierarchical magisterium. Such a situation could prove detrimental to both groups, since the hierarchy could become unnecessarily embroiled in theological controversies while theology could lose its autonomy and the critical distance necessary for proper functioning.²

At the same time he warned that an independent theological magisterium could not be viewed in absolute terms, as this would weaken the corporate witness of the Church. Thus, the theological magisterium, “while preserving its scientific integrity and autonomy, . . . should be conscious of its ties with the *magisterium*.”³ Dulles's view on the practical dimensions of the relationship between the two magisteria will be considered at a later point.⁴

Qualifications for Membership

Who was to belong to the theological magisterium? Dulles regarded three criteria as essential. First, to be considered a Catholic theologian one had to be a committed member of the Roman Catholic Church. Membership in this magisterium had to be “ecclesially

¹Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 103.

²Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 160.

³Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 41.

⁴See pp. 120-24 below.

grounded in faith, baptism and sacramental communion with the Church.”¹ Such a commitment to the Catholic faith implied submission to the apostolic tradition transmitted through the hierarchical leadership. While such submission was not absolute, as a theologian’s supreme commitment was to the pursuit of truth,² it was nevertheless necessary, for without it there would be no heritage to work with. Theological work was to be “guided by the symbols and by past formulations, especially those which have normative value in the Church.”³ The testimony of the Scriptures and the decisions of ecumenical councils were to be accepted as authoritative.⁴ Only when theologians demonstrated a genuine commitment to the Roman Catholic faith would others, including the hierarchical magisterium, be open to new formulations if needed.⁵

Catholic theologians were also to show professional competence. The title “Catholic theologian” should not be trivialized and applied to any ordinary “run-of-the-mill” college or seminary professor. It should exhibit a professional competence that was recognized and acknowledged by other theologians.⁶ Thus, members of the theological

¹Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 159; idem, “The Church: Sacrament and Ground of Faith,” 272.

²Dulles, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 246. In agreement with his theory of two magisteria, Dulles understood submission in terms of co-responsibility. Borrowing terms from Leo-Josef Cardinal Suenens, he emphasized that a theologian must feel co-responsible for the teaching of the Church and be “anxious that his personal charisms of wisdom and knowledge should redound to the benefit of the whole Church, making it better able to articulate its faith.” Idem, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 41. For an exposition of Cardinal Suenens’s views, upon which Dulles often relied in his writings, see Leo-Josef Suenens, *Co-responsibility in the Church* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 136-51.

³Dulles, “The Church: Sacrament and Ground of Faith,” 272; idem, “Constitution on Divine Revelation in Ecumenical Perspective,” 222; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 37; idem, “Faith, Justice and the University,” *CM*, October, 1978, 27-8.

⁴Dulles, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 56; idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 395.

⁵Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 203.

⁶Furthermore, it would be expected that each member of the theological magisterium hold an advanced theological degree, have a distinguished teaching career, and produce noteworthy publications. Dulles, “Two Magisterial: An Interim Reflection,” 159; idem, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 63.

magisterium would be recognized, not by a canonical mission offered by the bishops, but “by their peers on the basis of scholarly achievement.”¹

Finally, to be a part of the theological magisterium one had to exhibit humility and the ability to work with others. He challenged the theological community to act collegially, arguing that the teachings of *Lumen gentium* on the issue of collegiality also applied to the theological community, and exhorting his colleagues to renounce individualism, reciprocal jealousy, and petty ambitions.² Only through the power of consensus could theological statements be recognized as having “a genuine and recognized authority in the Church.”³

The Nature of Theological Enterprise

Dulles saw three main ways in which theology could be done within the Church: hierarchical-scholastic or magisterial, kerygmatic-biblical, and secular-dialogic. Each approach had its merits and shortcomings.⁴

Hierarchical-Scholastic Theology

Hierarchical-scholastic theology, also labeled magisterial, had prevailed in Roman Catholicism since the Counter-Reformation. In this system, theologians looked toward the official magisterium to provide authoritative doctrinal leadership. The primary sources of this type of theology were the official doctrinal pronouncements and the Scriptures. The role of theologians in this system was to reflect upon and provide theological justification for official doctrinal pronouncements.⁵

¹Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 63. It was possible, Dulles asserted, that a distinguished theologian could be ahead of his time, in which case his work would be recognized only by later generations. Such was the case, for example, of Thomas Aquinas (*ibid.*).

²Avery Dulles, “Homily for the Convention Eucharist,” *CTSA* 30 (1975): 268.

³Dulles, “The Magisterium in History: Theological Consideration,” 273. As early as 1960 Dulles mentioned the common consent of theologians as authoritative. *Idem*, “Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission,” 557.

⁴Dulles, “The Church Is Communications,” 9, 12.

⁵*Ibid.*, 9.

Kerygmatic-Biblical Theology

The kerygmatic-biblical approach to theology arose partly in response to both the magisterial theology of Roman Catholicism and to Protestant liberalism. Biblical theology, exemplified by scholars such as Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr, focused on the existential method of biblical proclamation, and recognized that God was presently active within the world, reaching out to all believers. Its primary source was divine revelation, which found its expression in the Scriptures. The task of biblical theology was to facilitate the proclamation of the *kerygma* and to apply the norms of the original apostolic faith to the belief and preaching of contemporary Christianity.¹

Dulles suggested that the Catholic scholars of the immediate pre-Vatican II era, stimulated by the kerygmatic-biblical approach to theology, “awoke from their dogmatic slumbers” and began to re-evaluate their hitherto unquestioned theological methods.² The showdown during the Second Vatican Council resulted in a moderate victory for the kerygmatic-biblical faction, though this was not accomplished “without large concessions made to the hierarchical-scholastic party.”³

Secular-Dialogic Theology

Soon after the Council, another group of theologians, classified by Dulles as the Catholic “left,” popularized a secular approach to theology. While in 1971 Dulles still had certain reservations about this type of theology, by 1973, following the lead of Edward

¹Ibid., 9-10.

²Dulles agreed with the assessment of a noted Protestant scholar, Carl Braaten, that because of the non-dynamic nature of Neo-Scholastic thought, Roman Catholic theology of the pre-Vatican II era lagged behind its Protestant counterpart. Only within the immediate decade before the Second Vatican Council did the situation begin to change. In 1966, Braaten observed that “Roman Catholic theology today is catching up with Protestant theology.” Dulles, “The Meaning of Revelation,” 52; cf. Carl Braaten, *History of Hermeneutics* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 11.

³Dulles, “The Church Is Communications,” 10. While, as Dulles noted, Vatican II did not fully embrace this type of theology, it provided openings and endorsement for its development. This was mostly evident in the Vatican II’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church, *Gaudium et spes*. Ibid.

Schillebeeckx and Gregory Baum, he seemed to have accepted the secular-dialogic as a preeminent theological method.¹

Without rejecting the former approaches, which he regarded as having an important role to play in the life of the Church, Dulles viewed the secular-dialogic method of theological reflection as more compatible with the modern world.² The other two, he contended, were primarily oriented toward the past and addressed old questions and problems, some of them hardly relevant to modern humanity.³ While it attempted to align itself with the Scriptures and with Tradition, secular-dialogic theology looked primarily toward the future. Rather than being confined to the Church and its life, God was seen as an active participant in the world's affairs, present in the events of secular history through which the future of humanity was being shaped. Such a theology saw the gospel as "a program for making men responsible citizens of the world, and the Church, as a service

¹See two of Dulles's articles, "The Church Is Communications" (1971), and "The Apostolate of Theological Reflection," *The Way* 20 (Autumn 1973): 114-23. Even though in former years, in an attempt to maintain a centrist stance, Dulles affirmed that all three types of theology were valid within the Roman Catholic communion, his language already conveyed his preference for a secular-dialogic theology. His attraction to secular theology may have been aroused by his early interest in the theological writings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. See "The Church in Bonhoeffer's 'Wordly Christianity'," in his book *The Dimensions of the Church*, 87-111. It is also possible that Dulles's embrace of secular theology was stimulated by the writings of popular Catholic theologians like Johannes Metz and Gustavo Gutiérrez. It seems, however, that the most decisive factor was the encouragement given by Father Pedro Arrupe, Jesuit superior general, who wrote: "In the arena of intellectual concern, I consider theological reflection to be of prime importance. I think that the great issues of our time—the human problems of today's world—urgently require rethinking in terms of a truly evangelical theology. I am referring to such issues as humanism, freedom, mass culture, development, violence. In my view, theological reflection is incomplete without the insights of the human and exact sciences. . . . What I have in mind are solutions that are very concrete, a contemporary incarnation of a God-view of our present world, arrived at by a search illumined by faith." Pedro Arrupe, "Questions for a Globe-trotting General," *America*, August 7, 1971, 57; cf. Dulles, "The Apostolate of Theological Reflection," 115; cf. Edward Schillebeeckx, "The Church and Mankind," in *The Church and Mankind*, ed. Edward Schillebeeckx (Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1965), 88-96, Gregory Baum, "Toward a New Catholic Theism," *The Ecumenist* 8 (1970): 54, and idem, *The Credibility of the Church Today*, 153.

²Dulles, "The Church Is Communications," 14.

³Dulles, "The Apostolate of Theological Reflection," 114.

agency, seek[ing] to prepare the world for the establishment of the Kingdom of God.”¹

By 1977, however, somewhat alarmed by the widespread anti-institutionalism of the post-conciliar years, Dulles once again began to perceive dangers associated with the secular-dialogic method, including a serious devitalization of devotion to the Church.²

The Task of the Theological Magisterium

Formative Function

Given the nature of theological enterprise which we just considered, the primary task of the theological magisterium, as Dulles saw it, was to provide a methodic, critical, and systematic reflection of the Catholic faith.³ Catholic theologians were to offer an orderly and logical systematization of the Catholic faith, as well as the terminology, thought-categories, and theories that could be utilized to convey the Christian message.⁴

¹Dulles, “The Church Is Communications,” 10.

²Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 18. Dulles was most positively inclined toward secular-dialogic theology during the early seventies. In later years, he seemed to become weary of the excesses of some who practiced secular theology. In his book, *The Resilient Church* (1977), 17-21, Dulles seemed to be more critical of the secular-dialogic vision of theological enterprise than ever before. He agreed that secular-dialogic theology served an important role in the renewal of the Church and in bringing it “up to date” with the contemporary world. Still, he warned that a full acceptance of this theological paradigm would be suicidal and theologically false, “since it seriously undermined devotion to the Church” (ibid.).

³Dulles, “The Church: Sacrament and Ground of Faith,” 272; idem, “Response to Krister Stendahl’s ‘Method in the Study of Biblical Theology,’” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), 215. For a more complete presentation of Dulles’s principles and methods see especially idem, “Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement,” 51-66; cf. idem, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 17-24; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 87-8; idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 398; idem, “Jesus of History and Christ of Faith,” in *God, Jesus, and Spirit*, ed. Daniel Callahan (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 94-5, 104-05; idem, “Faith and New Opinions,” 479.

⁴Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 165. Dulles lists four different types of theology: fundamental theology, biblical and historical theology, systematic theology, and pastoral theology. All types, according to Dulles, had a place under the general umbrella of the theological magisterium (ibid., 162-63); cf. idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 395; idem, “Method in Fundamental Theology: Reflections on David Tracy’s *Blessed Rage for Order*,” 309; idem, “Response to Krister Stendahl’s ‘Methods in the Study of Biblical Theology,’” 215.

Since theology was closely related to personal experience and, thus, a continually changing and growing discipline, the challenge for Catholic theology was to “bring the light of faith more fully to bear upon the life and world of the contemporary believer.”¹ Theologians were to bring out the content and implications of God’s revelation as they themselves understood it,² discern “what has not yet been taught,” and formulate it in a manner acceptable to modern humanity.³

In so doing theologians might at times overstep the boundaries of orthodoxy. This, Dulles insisted, was their right, provided it be done in a theologically responsible way. In the name of theological freedom, they were to “insist” on what was “important for the good of the Church,” even if this meant urging “positions at variance with those that are presently official.”⁴ They were to speak with such “clarity and wisdom” that they would become authorities to those who were responsible for formulating the official positions of the Church.⁵ As the result of careful scholarship, theologians’ treatises on faith usually

¹Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 396. Note that such a definition of theology falls more particularly within the boundaries of “dialogic-secular” theology.

²Dulles, “Response to Krister Stendahl’s ‘Method in the Study of Biblical Theology,’” 213.

³Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 34. Dulles noted that struggling over subtle questions of faith, theologians come to form various working hypotheses. Hypotheses could be either rejected or accepted and enriched through the further work of other theologians. If consensus was reached among theologians, they could be submitted to the hierarchical magisterium for approval as the official teaching of the Church (ibid., 34-45). “One must be grateful,” Dulles commented, “that there are theologians with the courage to launch out into the deep and seek radically new solutions for problems that are in many respects new. In more than one case the heresies of the fathers have foreshadowed the orthodoxy of the children and grandchildren.” Avery Dulles, *History of Apologetics* (New York: Corpus Instrumentorum, 1971), 245-46.

⁴Dulles, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 245-46. In 1968, in a discussion with conservative theologians, Dulles defended his appreciative review of Hans Küng’s book *The Church* against what he perceived as unfair attacks. He suggested that Küng’s critics should be aware that Catholic theologians such as Newman, Möhler, and Adam (the latter two of the Tübingen school) were fiercely denounced by their contemporaries. See Dulles’s reply to the criticism of his book review “Fr. Dulles Replies,” *America*, May 25, 1968, 685-86; cf. idem, review of *The Church*, by Hans Küng, 545-46.

⁵Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 398-99.

had greater clarity, and were richer and more gratifying, than “the characteristically compact and jejune statements that issue from hierarchical agencies.” There was no reason, therefore, for theologians not to achieve an authentic and acknowledged authority in the Church.¹ Since the hierarchical magisterium originated its own doctrine “only to a very minor extent,² it was essential that Church leaders recognize “the legitimate role of theologians in shaping the teaching of the Church,” at least in their formative steps.³

The Second Vatican Council was, for Dulles, an example of such an appreciation of the role of theologians. He contended that it was not the intention of the Council fathers to “blaze new trails” when, for instance, they promulgated the constitution on revelation, *Dei Verbum*. Still, they gave official approbation to ideas which had circulated in “sophisticated theological circles” prior to the Council.⁴

Corrective Function

We have noted that Dulles discarded any notion of the “magic” or “mythical powers,” which were at times ascribed to the bishops.⁵ The hierarchical magisterium was not exempt from making errors of judgment. If the inspired authors of the Bible could be liable to making mistakes, how could anyone expect the councils and popes never to fall

¹Dulles, “Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection,” 273. Once consensus was achieved, theological views were to be presented to the hierarchical magisterium for official approval. Though theologians were experts in Catholic theology, they were not always qualified to make judgments regarding orthodoxy. Theological methods were “too specialized to establish, by themselves alone, what is or is not consonant with the preaching, worship and behavior of the Christian community as such.” Idem, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 163; idem, “Heresy Today?” 163.

²Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 164-65. “For the most part it takes over the terminology, thought-categories, and theories of theologians, insofar as these can be made to bear and convey the Christian faith, as believed and held by the Church at large” (ibid., 165).

³Dulles, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 157; cf. Brown, “The Dilemma of the Magisterium vs. the Theologians—Debunking Some Fictions,” 291.

⁴Dulles, “Revelation in Recent Catholic Theology,” 351.

⁵See above, p. 100.

“short in their understanding of the realities to which they stammeringly bear witness?”

Hence, the theological magisterium was called to critically review the entire doctrinal heritage, including the biblical message,¹ and to keep “under constant review” the statements of the official Church, past and present, “questioning what is really questionable and denying what [it] believes to be false.”²

Speaking from a traditional Catholic stance, Dulles conceded that such a view of the role of theologians could lead to conflict between the theologians and the hierarchy. Unhealthy friction between these two bodies, however, could be mitigated by accepting that “the ultimate authority in theology is that of the revealing God” and not the episcopate. Trained theologians, therefore, should be allowed and encouraged to “detect the limitations and deficiencies” of the human expressions of God’s thought.³ Such a procedure was not

¹Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 27-8; idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 397-98.

²Dulles, “Faith and New Opinions,” 479. All ecclesiastical pronouncements, thus, had to be “critically analyzed,” since “the mere juridical formalities are not enough to guarantee . . . [their] authenticity.” Idem, “Hans Kung’s Infallible? An Inquiry: A Symposium,” *America*, April 24, 1971, 428; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 182. In this context, Dulles’s writings were at times “highly disturbing” to some Roman Catholic churchmen. One of them, Msgr. George Kelly, more than once spoke up to rebut Dulles. In 1976, the *Long Island Catholic* newspaper published Kelly’s article, in which he attacked those theologians who shared Dulles’s views, pronouncing that efforts to cast doubt on papal and episcopal teachings were undermining the authority of the Church. He also denounced the critical analysis of episcopal pronouncements and the concept of a “second authoritative teaching voice of the church.” See his, “An Uncertain Church? One View—Uncertain Catholic Church Revisited,” *LIC*, December 9, 1976, 8. In the same issue of the newspaper Dulles responded to Kelly’s article, suggesting that Monsignor Kelly was too preoccupied with certitude. While it would be gratifying to have “easy certitudes” about important questions in a climate of questioning and doubt, certitude, in most cases, could only be achieved through rigorous inquiry and earnest debate. “No thinking person,” Dulles added, “can achieve honest certitude by accepting every Roman document, regardless of its relative solemnity and of its theological quality, as though it were the very word of God.” Dulles, “A Response—Certainty in the Catholic Church,” 8. Elsewhere, Dulles insisted “We are called to a faith that is neither naive nor credulous, but severely critical of its own affirmations.” Idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 149. Dulles seemed to accept that, in order to be effective, a theologian had to be prepared to live with the possibility that his or her teachings could become highly unpopular. He considered this an occupational hazard of theologians. Idem, “Heresy Today?” 163; cf. description of the controversy between Kelly and Dulles in George A. Kelly, *Inside My Father’s House* (New York: Doubleday, 1989), 274-76.

³Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 398; idem, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 165-69. Dulles expressed certain reservations

a threat to the Catholic faith. In fact, the opposite was true. Only when human “aberrations and superstitions”¹ were separated from divine revelation would it be possible to discover the true essence of revelation hidden behind the imperfect words of its human witnesses.²

Never to be taken for granted, the Church’s faithfulness to the gospel had to be “won anew in every generation”³ in order to arrive at a better and more meaningful formulation of the revelation of God in Christ.⁴ Moreover, honest criticism of biblical and magisterial statements, performed by theologians committed to the Catholic faith, would be an invaluable service to the Church.⁵

On the Working Relationship between the Two Magisteria

How could the post-Conciliar Church go about establishing a congenial working relationship between the supreme teaching authority of the episcopate and the “equally undeniable” right of other believers, particularly theologians, “to exercise their doctrinal

regarding the view that all Church dogmas were necessarily of divine origin and therefore could never be challenged. Such a protective mentality, he declared, had not been beneficial to the Church: “Many of us can remember the painful efforts we made, only a few years ago, to suppress our own doubts about whether Eve had been fashioned from one of Adam’s ribs, whether the Flood had covered the whole earth, or whether Jonah had really lived three days and nights in the belly of the great fish. Now that a more liberal understanding of the Bible has prevailed, thanks to the courageous insistence of Scripture scholars, we smile at the naïveté of our former difficulties. But we should not forget that in the meanwhile many sincere and intelligent men have left the Church because it seemed to require them to accept myths and legends as facts; and many more, who by rights should have found their spiritual home in the Church, were kept out.” Idem, “Faith and New Opinions,” 479.

¹Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 63.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 182. For this reason, Dulles contended, “the theologian . . . will always be on guard against attributing divine authority to the understanding of the revealed mysteries achieved at any given point in history.” Idem, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 397.

³Dulles, “Incarnation, 1973: Reflections at Christmas,” 336.

⁴Dulles, review of *A Question of Conscience*, 568.

⁵Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 28; idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 182.

responsibility?”¹ The attributes of each, as well as the respective principles of their operation, should inform such a relationship to a significant degree. Both were endowed with the *charisma veritatis certum*. Both could claim an apostolic pedigree. Although each magisterium was to remain relatively independent and have specific functions within the Church, they were equally valid and indispensable to the body of Christ. Hence, Dulles suggested some basic principles on the basis of which the magisteria could relate to each other.

Three Basic Approaches

Dulles noted that throughout the history of the Roman Catholic Church three fundamental approaches to the relationship between the magisterium and theologians had prevailed. First, a reductionist approach suggested that since the *charisma veritatis certum* was the exclusive possession of the episcopal order, the role of theologians was limited to defending magisterial statements. Second, the separatist approach, according to which the two magisteria were completely independent of each other, perceived theology as an independent discipline whose object was to conduct unlimited inquiry into the questions of faith with the help of critical tools and without deference to authority.² Given the evident shortcomings of these two, Dulles proposed a third approach that fell somewhere between the two extremes. This new procedure, he believed, would provide for “a dialectical relationship of relative autonomy within mutual acceptance.”³ A successful relationship between the bishops and theologians, Dulles concluded, required that neither group should “*usurp the specialization of the other . . . or seek to reduce the other . . . to innocuous servitude.*”⁴

¹Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 37.

²Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 163.

³Ibid., 164.

⁴Dulles, “*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum*,” 64 (emphasis his); cf. 1 Cor 12:21-2.

The Principles of a Dialectical Relationship

Here again Dulles came up with specific suggestions. He enunciated several of them during a 1975 debate between members of the then U. S. Catholic Bishops Conference¹ and Catholic theologians, in which the main theme had to do with the way a valuable consultation could occur between the episcopate and other Catholic believers on the social issues facing modern society.²

The Responsibilities of the Bishops

First, prior to addressing important issues, bishops should consult competent experts “who have studied the problem in the light of the gospel.”³ If episcopal statements, even papal encyclicals, were presented with the endorsement of theologians, their authority “would not be reduced but rather enhanced.”⁴ The main reason why the Second Vatican Council achieved such resounding success was because the most talented theologians from various countries had been involved in crafting its documents and its “successive drafts were submitted to the criticism of numerous experts.”⁵

Next, the episcopate would benefit from informing the believers how certain decisions were reached. Medieval secrecy was no longer acceptable. Karl Rahner, likewise, would later write that the magisterium was “bound to explain to the faithful *how* it has reached [doctrinal] decisions in relation to the totality of the unique divine revelation actively adhered to by the faithful.”⁶ The bishops, Dulles asserted, should reveal the

¹In recent years this body became known as National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

²See Avery Dulles, “Dilemmas Facing the Church in the World,” *Origins* 4 (1975): 549-50. The debate was held on February 3-5, 1975.

³*Ibid.*, 549.

⁴Dulles, “Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection,” 273-74.

⁵*Ibid.*, 43.

⁶Karl Rahner, “Magisterium,” *Dictionary of Theology* (1981), 287 (emphasis his).

sources utilized by the authors of episcopal statements in order to “give credibility to their stand.”¹

Third, bishops should avoid unnecessary authoritarianism and express themselves “in a manner that invites thoughtful agreement rather than one that seems to threaten those who dissent.” While, at times, protection of the Catholic heritage required the use of authoritative language, in most instances the manner in which the bishops expressed themselves needed to be one of persuasion rather than command.²

Fourth, since the modern Roman Catholic Church was a place of freedom and consent rather than intimidation and coercion, room should be made for disagreement with official pronouncements, if those who dissented found “reasons of equal or greater weight opposed to the stand of the officials.” Their convictions and teachings were to be weighed against the beliefs of other members of the Church.³

Finally, once a pronouncement was made, the bishops needed to “follow up their words with appropriate actions.” There was little use in teaching the world how to follow Christ if the Church itself was struggling to apply his message to its own household. No noble principles regarding human rights should be officially enunciated by the Church while the rights of its own members, especially the theologians, were being denied.⁴

Though invariably insisting that the hierarchical magisterium held formal authority in the Church, Dulles argued that it could not rely on such authority alone. It was fundamentally necessary that the bishops used all means possible to secure the knowledge

¹Dulles, “Dilemmas Facing the Church in the World,” 549.

²Ibid.

³Ibid. Dulles's ideas evoked strong opposition from various conservative quarters of the Church. Commenting on Dulles's ideas, the late Archbishop Robert Dwyer, of Portland, remarked: “But what is of far greater moment is the grim fact that in this, as in other of his pronouncements of late, Father Dulles would seem to advertise his view of the Church as little more than a polite debating society.” Robert Dwyer, “Catholic Church as Debating Society,” *NCR*, January 5, 1975, 4.

⁴Dulles, “Dilemmas Facing the Church in the World,” 549.

necessary to proclaim the gospel in a relevant and effective manner. If the bishops disregarded the expertise of the theological magisterium, “the hierarchical magisterium may fail to speak when and as it should; it may even, in some respects, deviate from the Christian message.”¹ Just as other believers, bishops were part of the “learning Church.”²

At the same time, in so doing, the hierarchical magisterium would offer Catholic theologians a measure of protection.³ As such, the magisterium would not only shield theologians from the attacks of those outside of theological circles, as for instance from conservative-minded laymen, but it would also serve to curb the antagonism between various theological schools.⁴ Those were the bishops responsibilities, as Dulles perceived them, but what about theologians?

The Responsibilities of Theologians

As established earlier, Dulles always held that in order to be fruitful Catholic theologians had to recognize and accept the authority of the hierarchical magisterium.⁵ He recognized that the absolute autonomy of theological enterprise could result in serious destabilization and weakening of the universal Church. Theologians, therefore, had to accept the necessity of their solidarity with the hierarchical Church, feel co-responsible for the corporate good of the Church; and, thus, be “anxious that [their] personal charisms . . .

¹Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 165.

²Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 305.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 85.

⁴Dulles, “Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 161. To support his argument for “a permissive and protective exercise of the ecclesiastical magisterium,” Dulles used the example of the seventeenth-century dispute between the Jesuits and Dominicans regarding the nature of grace (ibid.).

⁵Ibid., 164. “Theology,” Dulles asserted, “depends on the hierarchical magisterium, for, as an understanding achieved within faith, it must accept the revealed datum as proclaimed and safeguarded by the official organs of the Church. To the extent that it reinterprets the tenets of faith, theology will turn to the hierarchical magisterium for confirmation of the acceptability of the reinterpretation. If the magisterium fails to respond, theology may lose its bearings and become erratic” (ibid.).

benefit . . . the whole Church, making it better able to articulate its faith.”¹ Their work was to be of service to the Church at large.²

In addition, Dulles asserted, while they wielded a certain measure of independence to fulfill their ministry, theologians were to remember that, like that of the bishops, the result of their study was not necessarily free of ideological distortion. Their work would benefit from the criticism offered by the episcopate.³

Avery Dulles's Early Ecumenical Perspective

Though not the main theme of this dissertation, Dulles's ecumenical views need to be referred to, however briefly.⁴ Such views were indeed developed in tandem with and as a corollary of his ecclesiology. An overview of Dulles's writings of the two decades following Vatican II reveals his optimism and interest in inter-ecclesial dialogue.⁵ He believed that the Second Vatican Council opened the door for an ecumenical rapprochement, by recognizing the existence of authentic Christian faith outside of Roman Catholicism.⁶ His wish to see the ecumenical movement succeed was primarily motivated by his concern to see Christianity as a sign of reconciliation for the entire world. In the Scriptures, “the Church is appropriately defined as the divinely given sign of the oneness of all mankind, the sacrament of a world reintegrated under its true head.”⁷

¹Dulles, “The Magisterium and Authority in the Church,” 41.

²Dulles, “Dogma as an Ecumenical Problem,” 406.

³Dulles, “Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology,” 398.

⁴Dulles's ecumenical views were specifically addressed in Anne-Marie Kirmse's dissertation, “The Church and the Churches.”

⁵This interest was evident as early as in 1962, when Dulles, influenced by the thought of Pope John XXIII, exclaimed that “more than most other Christian groups, we Catholics must deliberately school ourselves in ecumenism. Otherwise our very confidence in the wealth of our own heritage can betray us into spiritual imperialism or isolationism.” Dulles, “Catholic Ecumenism: Possible, Useful, Necessary,” 11.

⁶Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 22.

⁷Avery Dulles, “The Ecumenical Movement Is in Trouble,” *The Lamp*, April 1968, 32.

Such a vision would not be possible unless Christians themselves rescinded their attitudes of hostility and denominationalism, which had plagued the Church throughout the second millennium of its existence.¹ Hence, the goal of the ecumenical movement, i.e., the unity of the Church, needed to be a priority for all Christians. It was through unity that Christ could bring about “the solidarity of all mankind and the harmony of all creation.”² From the Catholic point of view, Dulles asserted, the ecumenical impetus needed to flow from the conviction that while non-Roman Catholic churches were indeed “institutionally deficient,”³ they were nevertheless not “inferior” to the Roman Catholic Church in other respects. Their forms of piety, passion for their faith, and ardor for worship were things which Catholic believers “would do well to emulate.”⁴

It is not that Dulles wished to endorse religious indifferentism. But, on the one hand, Vatican II taught that God’s grace was available to all Christians, and that whether one was Catholic or not was not a matter of “*greatest possible* difference.”⁵ On the other hand, the Council insisted that the fullness of catholicity and apostolicity subsisted only within the Roman Catholic Church. This was not to be an ecumenical hurdle, but rather than seeing it from an exclusivist point of view, “we should be the more ashamed that we have not made better use of those gifts” and have failed to properly utilize them in ministering to other Christians.⁶

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Dulles points out that the Council “evidently” assured Catholics that their Church had “the full institutional patrimony bequeathed by Christ to his Church—the complete doctrinal and sacramental heritage together with a hierarchical ministry with fully legitimate apostolic succession.” Dulles, “The Open Church,” 21.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 21-2 (emphasis his).

⁶Ibid., 21.

The responsibility of healing inter-denominational divisions, Dulles claimed, largely rested on Catholic efforts to adapt their “obsolete” patterns of thought to modern reality. In agreement with Schillebeeckx, Dulles wrote that Vatican II “implicitly committed the Church to the formidable task of reinterpreting its entire dogmatic heritage,”¹ which entailed the reassessment of the nature of dogma, the way it was formulated, as well as current practices and institutions. In the past the Roman Catholic Church had required others to accept all of its irreversibly defined dogmas as a condition of unity. If Christian reunion continued to be perceived in this light, it would remain “a one-sided affair,” since other churches would be expected to adapt their dogmatic heritage, with no corresponding Catholic concessions. Such a position would be thoroughly unecumenical.² In order to make the Catholic doctrinal heritage more engaging to other Christians, Dulles suggested a critical evaluation of such traditional Catholic notions as identifying dogma with revelation, and its conceptual objectivity, immutability, and universality. He agreed with Carl Braaten that dogmatic pronouncements were developed dynamically, and influenced by linguistic and socio-cultural factors, hence subject to reassessment and further development. “Catholic dogmas,” he stated, “as presently formulated and understood may be significantly changed.”³ Furthermore, on the basis of the New Testament and early Church history, Dulles challenged the belief that Church dogmas, once officially pronounced, were to be believed everywhere and by all. Various “thought-forms” or modes of expression could be tolerated without impinging on the unity of the Church. For

¹Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 18, 22; cf. Edward Schillebeeckx, “Faith Functioning in Human Self-Understanding,” in *The Word in History*, ed. T. P. Burke (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), 58-9.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 154.

³Ibid., 164; cf. Carl Braaten, “Reunion, Yes; Return, No,” *Una Sancta* 23 (1966): 32-3.

this reason, the “positive acceptance of all the dogmas may not be absolutely necessary for communion with the Roman Church.”¹

Likewise, in Dulles's perception, Vatican II called for a reform of Church institutions and requested Catholics to “remould some of the secondary structures which have been built up in the past, to simplify or adapt them to our times.”² Thus, for instance, the papacy no longer needed to be viewed in the terms set forth by the First Vatican Council. While in their historical context Vatican I's formulations served to protect intra-ecclesial unity, they reflected “the religious ‘style’ of the baroque Church and the exegesis of an age less sensitive to historicity.” Christian unity would be within reach, Dulles suggested, if Catholics ceased to expect other Christians to submit to deficient formulations of faith and obsolete institutions.³

Such a program of *aggiornamento*, however, would not be possible without positive input from other Christians. Dulles, thus, extended a plea to non-Catholic Christianity to support Catholic reforms and to offer useful suggestions.⁴ He suggested that Catholic indifference toward an ecumenical rapprochement could be perceived as a lack of concern for the well-being of the Catholic Church itself. Refusing to listen to the concerns of outsiders could result in failing “to renew our own institutional structures and theological views.”⁵ It would keep Christians “bogged down in acrimonious disputes

¹Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 163-64. Dulles developed the point further by suggesting that if one accepted that “the same faith can be differently formulated for different historical epochs,” there was no reason to discard the idea that “variety may be tolerated for different cultures in a single chronological period” (ibid., 166).

²Dulles, “The Open Church,” 22. For an explanation of what Dulles means when he uses the term “secondary structures,” see p. 84 above.

³Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 165. For Dulles's vision of a reformed papacy, see idem, *The Resilient Church*, 113-32, and idem, “Papal Authority in Roman Catholicism,” 48-70.

⁴Dulles, “The Open Church,” 22; cf. idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 84-5. See also “Dulles Sees New Shape for Authority,” *NCR*, October 15, 1969, 7.

⁵Dulles, “The Open Church,” 23.

about issues that are no longer vital today.”¹ Too many Catholics still exhibited a post-Tridentine mentality, which compelled them to view the Vatican II vision with suspicion and to resist any ecumenical initiatives which would “radically challenge the present structures or undermine the full autonomy” of Roman Catholicism. Unable to catch the ecumenical vision, such believers opted for a static and stale form of Christianity, with no possibility of real reconciliation. For them, the only form of unity was “the old-fashioned concept of a return of the straying sheep to the one fold of Peter.”²

Dulles contended that, at the same time—paired with “the spirit of fraternal dialogue and friendly cooperation”³—genuine ecumenism required a sincere commitment to one’s own confession, including his.⁴ Christians should encourage one another to remain loyal to their own communities, while recognizing “that the things that bind Catholics to other Christians are more important than the things that separate sincere Christians [*sic*] from one another.”⁵

Conclusion

For centuries, since the Council of Trent (1545-1563), the main interest in Catholic ecclesiology was apologetic. A desire to protect the Church from external dangers led to a rather simplistic ecclesiology in which the Church was viewed as a *societas perfecta*, governed by the pope with the assistance of the bishops. Doctrinal authority was mainly considered from a juridical perspective, which increasingly affected ecclesiological discussions with an overemphasized hierarchical tone. The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), one of the most dramatic and important events in the history of Catholicism,

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., 24.

³Dulles, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 22.

⁴It needs to be stressed that in spite of endorsing the ecumenical openness of the Second Vatican Council, Dulles intended to remain faithful to his Roman Catholic heritage.

⁵Dulles, “Helping the Kingdom Come,” 28.

provided new impetus for many progressive Roman Catholic theologians disenchanted with the static Neo-Scholastic mentality. They longed for a new era of freedom, accountability, and *ressourcement*, a retrieval of the early sources of Christian wisdom and self-understanding. During the first two decades following the Council, Avery Dulles was one of the most influential advocates of a renewed ecclesiology in contemporary American Roman Catholicism.¹ He attempted to rejuvenate ecclesiology by presenting a more comprehensive and dynamic view of the Church, while simultaneously attempting to address the needs and demands of a Church existing in a complex and rapidly changing world.

So intense was the hope for change in the Church's self-understanding, its structures, and mission that, soon after the Council Dulles felt impelled to write *Models of the Church*. Widely read in both Catholic and Protestant circles,² Dulles's volume stressed the dialectical tension existing between several models of the church and unsparingly criticized an ecclesiology that was primarily institutional, which, he stated, "Catholics today should not wish to defend."³

While his earliest views were shaped by Neo-Scholasticism, Dulles's post-Vatican II writings refuted the official view that revelation was mediated by a specially commissioned class of individuals, who alone were to be regarded as authoritative in the Church, and that the role of theologians was to reflect upon and defend authoritative statements. Dulles came to accept an open and dynamic view of revelation, which in turn affected his ecclesiology. Revelation had been given to humanity primarily in the event of

¹Few texts dealing with ecclesiology are published in the English language without giving credit to Dulles for his achievements in this area. Cf. John L. Allen, "Appointments Boost Latin American Bloc: Pope Names 37 New Cardinals, Promises More," *NCR*, February 2, 2001, 5.

²Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 8. Since the publication of the volume, many authors of Ph.D. dissertations have credited Dulles for providing them with a framework of models and have applied them to various situations.

³*Ibid.*

Christ and the ministry of the Holy Spirit, and was mediated through the whole Church. The Church itself was to be viewed primarily in terms of three images: the pilgrim People of God, a sacrament, and a community of disciples. He saw each of these models as capable of responding to the challenges of modernity.

Dulles's ecclesiology and epistemology led to his revolutionary proposal of two complementary magisteria within the Roman Catholic Church, the hierarchical and the theological. Both magisteria, in Dulles's view, were irreducibly necessary for the well-being and proclamation of the Church. The fundamental role of the hierarchical magisterium was to gather the light of God's self-revelation present within the Church of God and to officially endorse it. Theologians, on the other hand, were to continually seek a better understanding of God's word, propose a more meaningful formulation of the Church's doctrine, as well as review and endorse the episcopal statements. These two groups were to accept each other and to co-operate according to principles of mutual listening and respect. While Dulles was not the first to suggest the possibility of two co-existing magisteria, his prominence among Catholic theologians resulted in his being seen as the primary proponent of the view, which many saw as challenging the authority of the highest offices of the Roman Catholic Church.

Dulles's teaching on doctrinal authority during the period discussed in this chapter may be summarized in his own words. While he cautioned against theologians becoming involved in a power play with the Church's hierarchy, he nevertheless recognized that because of the

stern demands of intellectual integrity, theology must pursue truth for its own sake no matter who may be inconvenienced by the discovery. Unless we are true to this vocation, we shall not help the Church to live up to its calling to become, more than ever before, a zone of truth.¹

¹Dulles, "The Theologian and the Magisterium," 246.

CHAPTER 3

THE MAGISTERIUM AND THEOLOGIAN: RECENT VIEW, THE NINETIES ON

Introduction

As outlined in the previous chapter, until the mid-1980s Avery Dulles belonged to a group of progressive theologians espousing a historicist ecclesiology. At that time, Roman Catholic conservatives often suggested that his views undermined the nature of doctrinal authority in the Church, and contributed to doctrinal uncertainty and dissent.¹

It appears, however, that in the late eighties Dulles's ecclesiology began to shift towards a more conservative position, one more in line with the traditional teachings of the Roman Catholic Church.² His conservative inclinations became increasingly apparent as

¹Although in contrast with Hans Küng, Edward Schillebeeckx, and David Tracy, Dulles was considered a "moderate spokesman" for the historicist position, his views were considered as "lead[ing] in the same [Küng's] direction." Kelly, "Fr. Dulles' Church to Believe In," 21. During these years, Dulles's name often appeared in print alongside such Roman Catholic theologians as Richard A. McCormick, Richard P. McBrien, Raymond E. Brown, Charles E. Curran, Hans Küng, Edward Schillebeeckx, John L. McKenzie, and David Tracy. See Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1985), 445; Marty, 196; George Weigel, *Catholicism and the Renewal of American Democracy* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 39; Edward J. Berbusse, "A Do-Your-Own Thing Church," *HPR*, December 1984, 74. James Hitchcock claims that a conservative group of Catholic theologians, gathered under the banner of "The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars," would not welcome "moderates" such as Father Avery Dulles and Raymond Brown to its ranks "on the grounds that these men espouse unstable compromises which in the end also undermine Catholic belief." James Hitchcock, "The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars," in *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 192-93. Similar views were expressed by Dwyer, 4; Francis E. King, "Avery Dulles on the Magisterium," *HPR*, October 1977, 9-17; Julian Burt, "Contemporary Theological Pluralism," *HPR*, April 1980, 18-23; Anthony Padavano, "The Church Takes Time to Reform," *NCR*, August 27, 1982, 11.

²As with most labels, the designations "conservative" and "liberal" can be misleading and are, to some extent, inaccurate. Theologians, otherwise conservative, may hold some liberal views and vice versa. The lines of demarcation are often difficult to

the nineties progressed.¹ Several Roman Catholic scholars, some of whom I had the privilege of discussing Dulles's views, were aware of it, although they did not know the reasons for, nor the extent of, this change.² Some expressed satisfaction at Dulles's return to traditional Roman Catholic teachings regarding doctrinal authority. In Msgr. George A. Kelly's eyes, in the late eighties Dulles experienced nothing short of a re-conversion, returning to the views he had held before the Second Vatican Council.³ Similarly, John Mulloy "welcomed Fr. Dulles back to orthodoxy."⁴ Michael Downey, the current editor of

discern. George Weigel, speaking for *Our Sunday Visitor* about Father Dulles, put it aptly: "You don't describe Ken Griffey Jr. as a liberal or a conservative hitter. He's just good. And that's Avery. He is just a good theologian." George Weigel, quoted in William Bole "A Moderate in a Disputatious Age," *Our Sunday Visitor (OSV)*, May 25, 1997, 11.

As used in this dissertation, the term "conservative" identifies theologians or theological schools protective of the Roman Catholic heritage.

¹Bole notes that some theologians suggest that in the late eighties and throughout the nineties Dulles "wandered from the middle ground" towards more conservative positions. Bole, 11. Johannes Koopman writes: "Once regarded with distrust by conservatives, Father Dulles in recent years has proven himself to be an eloquent and moderate spokesman for papal authority and the best of Church tradition." A. Johannes Koopman, "The 'Theological Powerhouse'," *NCR*, September 29, 1996, 6. See also comments by Richard P. McBrien, *Report on the Church: Catholicism After Vatican II* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1992), 20.

²For example, in an email exchange, Sister Margaret Farley, the 1999/2000 president of the Catholic Theological Society of America (CTSA), expressed to me that although she shares "the somewhat general impression that there has been a shift" in Dulles's views, she is not able to provide any insight as to the reasons for it since she has not had the time "to trace [Dulles's] own writings." Regardless of Dulles's shift, Farley stated: "I have the highest respect for Fr. Dulles." Margaret Farley, email interview by author, August 9, 1999. Similarly, Charles Curran, while expressing the highest regard for Dulles's scholarship and churchmanship, agreed that he has indeed become more conservative. Curran was also unable to provide reasons for or the extent of this shift. He said: "There is no doubt that, on certain issues, he has been less open than he was in the past . . . He's even pulled back a little on the possibility of dissent." Charles Curran, quoted in Bole, 11.

³George A. Kelly, interview by author, July 28, 1999.

⁴William Doino, "John J. Mulloy, 1916-1995," *Sunsum Corda* 1 (Summer 1996): 50. John Mulloy, a conservative Catholic layman, published many articles in the seventies, where he was critical of Dulles's views. See for example "The Dulles Changes: Developments or Corruption?" 5. In a subsequent issue of *The Wanderer*, Dulles defended himself by claiming that Mulloy caricatured his views. Mulloy was not deterred, however, and together with William A. Marshner again denounced Dulles's positions. Marshner ended his critique with the following words: "I conclude with the hope that Fr. Dulles has not found in me yet another caricaturist. Poor man, he runs into so many." See Avery Dulles, letter to the editor, "My Views Were Caricatured," *The Wanderer*, December

The Proceedings of the Catholic Society of America Convention and a former student of Dulles, expressed perplexity.¹ Others speculate that, in essence, Dulles's views did not change in a substantial way. Rather, due to the changing environment in which the Roman Catholic Church has found itself in the eighties and nineties, Dulles's views only seem to be more conservative.²

In agreement with the latter view, Dulles seems to see himself as a moderate who "never strayed from orthodoxy,"³ and whose views, with minor adjustments, have remained the same. In a 1994 interview by Johannes Koopman, when asked about his alleged return to orthodoxy, Dulles responded that he continued to place himself "somewhere near the center," though he was still perceived by some conservatives as "a

21, 1972, 8; John J. Mulloy, "If So, It Was Fr. Dulles' Caricature," *The Wanderer*, December 21, 1972, 8; William A. Marshner, "Culture, Concept and Dogma in Avery Dulles," *The Wanderer*, December 21, 1972, 8.

Although writing from the opposite side of the theological spectrum, Richard P. McBrien agrees with the view that in recent years Dulles has "lurch[ed] to the right," for which he has been rewarded with a "red hat" (February 2001). McBrien writes: "Where once he was prepared to criticize certain formulations of church teaching and to raise questions about the teaching style of the hierarchical magisterium, he now defends almost all of the initiatives of the magisterium, and especially those of the current pope and Roman curia." Richard P. McBrien, "Red Hat after Lurch to Right," *NCR*, February 16, 2001, 17.

¹In a phone interview Michael Downey stated that he, along with other Catholic theologians, was intrigued by Father Dulles's change of views. He suggested that while he and others perceived a definite shift in Dulles's views, he did not think that Dulles himself would admit that there had been any significant change in his views. Michael Downey, telephone interview by author, April 12, 2000.

²Thus James Massa writes: "Dulles's [recent] writings display far more continuity than fundamental change. Often it is the theologian's environment itself that undergoes change, while the basic convictions of the theologian remain substantially the same." Massa, 18. Similar sentiments were expressed by R. Scott Appleby of Notre Dame, telephone interview by author, August 9, 1999; and by Dulles's personal assistant Anne-Marie Kirmse, in telephone interview by author, January 22, 2001; cf. Leo J. O'Donovan, review of *The Craft of Theology*, by Avery Dulles, *TS* 54 (1993): 759-61, and Joseph A. Komonchak, "All Dressed in Scarlet," *Commonweal*, February 23, 2001, 9.

³Avery Dulles, interview by author, March 5, 2001, Fordham University; idem, "Avery Dulles Replies," *Crisis*, November 1998, 3. Bole writes: "Father Dulles himself likes being called a moderate. . . . [And] he does not think his position [on doctrinal authority] has changed substantially." Bole, 11.

highly dangerous liberal.”¹ He argued that, while his views had not changed substantially, he now presents them differently than he had in the past.²

It is the purpose of this chapter to explore Dulles’s ecclesiology, particularly his views regarding the nature and role of the magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church as it relates to the nature and role of theology in the Church, from the late eighties to the present (2001). I intend to (1) briefly describe the disputed legacy of the Second Vatican Council; (2) explore Dulles’s recent theological journey and present his ecclesiology, starting with his views on revelation; and (3) discuss Dulles’s views regarding the official doctrinal magisterium, the theological enterprise, and the relationship between these two functions.

The Disputed Legacy of the Second Vatican Council

As outlined in the previous chapters, the Second Vatican Council was a momentous event in the history of the Roman Catholic Church. It opened up the Church to the modern world, changing in more than a few areas the way in which Catholics practiced their faith and related to non-Catholics. These reforms had a positive impact, not only upon Church life, but also upon the image of the Church in the world. Many Catholics, caught up in post-Vatican II euphoria, saw the Church entering a new era where they, the biblical people of God, would concern themselves with the proclamation of the gospel, justice and service to those in need. Neo-Scholastic institutional structures, with their emphasis upon the authority of the magisterium, as well as on the permanence of dogmas, were coming to be seen as marginal concepts on a renewed ecclesiastical horizon.

At the same time, a more open and tolerant attitude toward modern society and the apparent acceptance of pluralistic principles in the area of doctrinal authority resulted in an

¹Avery Dulles, “Dialogue,” interview by Johannes Koopman, *NCR*eg, July 24, 1994, 1.

²Dulles states that when speaking to people who have difficulty accepting the changes brought by the Second Vatican Council, he stresses the need for openness and change. On the other hand, with those who are reluctant to accept traditional Roman Catholic teachings, he stresses the need for continuity with the past. *Ibid.*

increased diversity of views. Richard McBrien comments that the post-Vatican II changes in the Roman Catholic Church “have prompted many observers inside and outside the Catholic Church to conclude that Catholicism as a distinctive form and expression of Christianity is in the process of such radical transformation, that little of its original core will survive.”¹ None of the reforms introduced by Vatican II were revolutionary in themselves, but the concept of “reform” came at a time of great societal unrest. This resulted in a powerful alteration of “the everyday self-consciousness of Catholics,” and strongly affected “the ordinary processes of the church’s internal activity and its action in the world”—much more than the word “reform” would suggest.²

Once the reforms were inaugurated, the Church leadership found it most difficult to contain the momentum within officially approved boundaries. As Martin Marty commented, “Sometime immediately after the Council, liberty did turn to license.” Finding this new era of democracy and freedom exhilarating, the laity, not to mention the more progressive theologians, began to draw their own conclusions regarding faith, morals, and Church life.³ This eventually led to Church-wide fragmentation and intra-denominational tensions. These developments have been decried by conservative commentators as the abandonment of traditional Roman Catholic values.⁴

One of the first expressions of rising tensions came with the publication of Pope Paul VI’s 1968 encyclical *Humanae vitae*, which resulted in widespread dissent and

¹Richard P. McBrien, “Roman Catholicism: *E Pluribus Unum*,” in *Religion and America*, ed. Mary Douglas and Steven Tipton (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983), 179.

²Joseph Komonchak, “Interpreting the Council: Catholic Attitudes Toward Vatican II,” in *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 18. Komonchak explains that “there are very few features of everyday Catholic life, from the central elements of its preaching and worship to the most peripheral of its etiquettes, that were not affected by the Council or at least by the changes said to have been introduced as a consequence or implementation of it” (ibid., 17).

³Marty, 184.

⁴Komonchak, “Interpreting the Council,” 18.

division among Catholics, persisting even to this day.¹ Several years later Catholic bishops initiated a nation-wide conference under the designation “Call to Action,” the fundamental purpose of which was to encourage lay Catholics to increase their participation in the life of the Church so that their voice might be heard. It was hoped that this conference would encourage American Catholics to participate in the implementation of the principles espoused by Vatican II. As it turned out, however, the conference was taken over by the progressive agenda, leading the bishops to halt the momentum, which resulted in much disappointment, criticism, and dissent.²

The repercussions of these events had a rippling effect upon American Roman Catholicism. The Church became polarized into two primary groups. Some wished to closely follow the Roman magisterium. The other group held that Vatican II’s reforms were being progressively stifled as the Church moved beyond the sixties. The polarization became evident within the episcopal body itself.³ These developments, coupled with a post-modern and increasingly secular culture, provided fertile ground for further dissent and increasing disregard for the authority of the official magisterium of the Church. The

¹Authors of a book published by *Our Sunday Visitor* designed to provide an accurate picture of American Catholicism in the nineties comment that “in spite of Pope Paul’s encyclical *Humanae Vitae*, a majority of American Catholics now disagree with the Church’s opposition to artificial means of birth control. . . . While Pope John Paul II continues to oppose artificial means of birth control on the grounds that their use is contrary to natural law, American Catholics are increasingly inclined to disagree. The same trend is occurring with regard to divorce and remarriage. Contrary to official Church teachings, Catholic lay people increasingly believe that remarriage after divorce is morally acceptable.” James D. Davidson et al., *The Search for Common Ground: What Unites and Divides Catholic Americans* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1997), 26-7.

²Bernard J. Cooke, “Call to Action,” in *What’s Left? Liberal American Catholics*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999), 147-48. Other relevant sources dealing with the “Call to Action” movement are Varacalli, *Toward the Establishment of Liberal Catholicism in America*, and George A. Kelly, *The Battle for the American Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1979), 379-87.

³See, for example, the remarks of the late archbishop of Chicago, Joseph Bernardin, “Archbishop Sees Mixed Results from Justice Conference,” *Origins* 6 (1976): 324, and idem, “Pastoral Sensitivity and Fidelity to the Gospel,” *Origins* 7 (1977): 29-32. Also note John Cardinal Dearden, “Family,” *Origins* 6 (1976): 317-23. *Origins* is the official publication of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

election of John Paul II, a Polish-born pope and a known conservative whose mission became to bring order and unity, seemed to further fuel intra-ecclesial discord.¹

John Paul II's strive for unity has brought results that have been highly satisfying to Catholic conservatives. The last two decades abound in examples of the pope exercising his magisterial authority in a variety of areas, bringing a measure of conformity unprecedented within the post-Vatican II Church.² Even the issue of collegiality, as expressed by Scott Appleby, "seems a distant rumor, even to the many bishops uncompromisingly loyal to John Paul II." Moreover, the stimulus to develop a progressive theology in the Church is all but gone, as

theologically, John Paul has attempted to lead the church away from the promise . . . of pluralism—the acceptance and further deepening of the plurality of the theological methods and sources recovered, developed, celebrated, and anticipated by the (mostly) white male European theologians who shaped Vatican II.³

The post-Vatican II turmoil that engulfed the Church, and intensified since the election of John Paul II, forms the backdrop to one's understanding of Dulles's "return to orthodoxy."

¹The literature documenting these developments is plentiful and available in most theological libraries. As examples of the dissatisfaction with John Paul II's pontificate, one may cite the works of Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler, eds., *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* and Eugene C. Bianchi and Rosemary R. Ruether, *A Democratic Catholic Church: The Reconstruction of Roman Catholicism* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1992). The conservative perspective is presented by Ralph M. McInerney in his *What Went Wrong with Vatican II* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 1998).

²It was during the first decade of John Paul II's pontificate that various leading progressive Roman Catholic theologians were censured and others even removed from their teaching positions. Most recently (1999), the U. S. bishops overwhelmingly approved the norms presented in the apostolic constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, pleasing the conservatives and causing dismay among many who feared repression. The norms provided for strict control of Catholic theologians by the hierarchy. See John Paul II, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, *Origins* 20 (1990): 265-76; also Pamela Schaeffer, "Bishops Approve Ex Corde Norms," *NCR*, December 3, 1999, 6.

³Appleby, "The Contested Legacy of Vatican II," 27.

Avery Dulles and the Hermeneutics of Continuity¹

Throughout his theological career Dulles never ceased to express an attitude of love and devotion to the Roman Catholic Church, ever arguing “for the preservation of the Catholic Church’s traditions in the modern world.”² The manner in which he held that this could occur, however, has varied over the years. As we noted in chapter 2, in the two decades following the Second Vatican Council he emphasized the innovative and progressive teachings of Vatican II. It could be said that he affirmed the hermeneutics of discontinuity.³ During the last ten to fourteen years,⁴ however, Dulles has gradually moved from moderate liberal views towards more traditional positions.⁵ This is evidenced, for example, by the fact that during this time most of his articles have appeared in conservative magazines and journals,⁶ where he has become increasingly critical of some of his more progressive colleagues. Moreover, his views have gradually converged with

¹The term “hermeneutics of continuity” refers to the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council in the light of the pre-Conciliar teachings of the Church. See chapter 2, pp. 61-2 above.

²Mary Stockwell, “In the Presence of Tradition: Speculative Catholic Theology in Modern America” (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1984), 204.

³It must be noted, however, that Dulles always argued against the excesses of those liberal Catholic theologians who, in his mind, pushed the theological boundaries too far. See, for example, Dulles, *The Resilient Church* (1977), 37-8.

⁴Note that the year 2000 is the terminus for this study.

⁵Those who attempt to describe Dulles's recent writings often identify him as “a leading conservative theologian in America” or “a staunch supporter of Pope John Paul II.” See, for example, Pamela Schaeffer, “Giants Dissent, Gently, Over Authority,” *NCR*, July 2, 1999, 3-4; Robert McClory, “So Much Common Ground, Debate Disappeared,” *NCR*, March 20, 1998, 10; Allen, 5.

⁶In 1990 Dulles noted that theologians who work for the benefit of the Church rather than their own “tend to write for periodicals such as *Communio* rather than *Concilium*.” Avery Dulles, review of *Paradigm Change in Theology*, by Hans Küng and David Tracy, *The Tablet*, July 7, 1990, 858. Thus, his articles began to appear in such magazines and journals as *New Oxford Review* (*NOR*), *Communio*, *First Things* (*FT*), and *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* (*FCSQ*). See Avery Dulles, “The Lure of Catholicism,” *NOR*, March 1995, 6-14; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” *Communio* 22 (1995): 303-15; idem, “The Challenge of Catechism,” *FT*, January 1995, 46-53; idem, “Catholics in the World of Mass Media,” *FCSQ* 22 (Summer 1999): 15-21.

those of John Paul II and other conservative Catholic scholars, including Joseph Ratzinger, Henri de Lubac, and Hans Urs von Balthasar, who emphasize ecclesial mediation, sacramentality, and obedience to ecclesiastical authorities.¹ It could be said, therefore, that Dulles's positions have become progressively aligned with the views of those Catholics who affirm the hermeneutics of continuity. The following analysis of two articles that appeared in the early nineties provides compelling evidence that such a shift has indeed occurred.

The Faces of American Catholicism

In the first piece published in 1990,² and then revised and republished in 1993,³ Dulles identifies four different modes of thinking theologically within post-Vatican II American Roman Catholicism: traditionalism, neo-conservatism, liberalism, and radicalism. In his view, traditionalism directly opposes liberalism, and neo-conservatism is set against radicalism. He evaluates each approach, weighing both positive and negative elements in each case. His theology, however, oscillates between the opposite poles of traditionalism and liberalism. Thus, in my attempt to survey Dulles's recent theological stance, these two strategies alone have been retained.⁴

¹Avery Dulles, "The Ignatian Charism and Contemporary Theology," *America*, April 26, 1997, 14-22; idem, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," 440.

²Avery Dulles, "Catholicism and American Culture: The Uneasy Dialogue," *America*, January 27, 1990, 54-9.

³Avery Dulles, "The Four Faces of American Catholicism," *LS* 18 (1993): 99-109. The difference between these two articles is evident. In each, Dulles attempts to steer the middle course which would, ideally, appropriate the best elements of each method. It seems that his endeavor is more successful in the former article, since in the latter he consistently leans towards a more traditional model.

⁴For Dulles's analysis and evaluation of the other strategies, refer to the aforementioned articles.

Traditionalism

Dulles equates traditionalism with “orthodoxy” or “conservatism.”¹ Those who advocate traditionalism generally view secular culture as harmful to the Catholic faith. They emphasize the transmission and preservation of traditional Catholic values and the creation of an environment “favorable to the transmission of Catholic faith and morals, so that younger Catholics can grow up with reverence for ecclesiastical authority and come to an appreciation of their religious heritage.” While concerned about ghettoization, they urge that to preserve its traditional values the Catholic community should become “somewhat segregated.” Only within such an environment can young Catholics be properly indoctrinated, develop reverence towards the teachings of the magisterium, and learn to appreciate their religious inheritance.²

In his evaluation of traditionalism, Dulles characterizes both positive and negative aspects. The main liability of the traditionalist stance, as he sees it, is the possibility of an overzealous clinging to the past, thus neglecting the reality of living and dealing with the present culture in a relevant way. Traditionalism tends to de-emphasize the teachings of the Second Vatican Council, which encouraged the renewal of the Catholic Church, thus bringing it “more fully into the modern world.”³

Liberalism

Catholic liberalism,⁴ according to Dulles, stands in opposition to traditionalism and is characterized by its attempt to introduce “the values of American democracy into the

¹Traditionalism, or “moderate” traditionalism, needs to be distinguished from extreme traditionalism, which rejects the teachings of Vatican II altogether and is espoused by the followers of Archbishop Lefebvre. Lefebvre’s uncompromising stand led to a schism and to his excommunication. Dulles places David Schindler, Thomas Molnar, James Hitchcock, and Ralph Martin among the scholars who espouse moderate traditionalism. Dulles, “The Four Faces of American Catholicism,” 102-03.

²Ibid., 103.

³Ibid.

⁴Richard P. McBrien, Dennis P. McCann, and Eugene Bianchi are, according to Dulles, representatives of liberalism (ibid., 105).

internal life of the Catholic Church.” It tends to view the Church as a free and voluntary society, rejecting any form of authoritarianism. Church organization, some liberals advocate, should be patterned after a parliamentary democracy, in which all members have constitutionally protected rights. In such a Church, the bishops and the pope could be elected by representative bodies to which they would be accountable. This authority would be constitutionally restricted. Such an organization, Dulles explains, would successfully utilize the principles of subsidiarity, decentralization, and the separation of powers. In that context Catholics would have the freedom to dissent from official Church teachings on a variety of social issues. The advocates of Catholic liberalism sincerely claim that their views reflect the teachings of Vatican II, and adhere to the notion that “the American traditions of freedom, personal initiative, and active participation can be valuable resources for the inner renewal of Catholicism, especially in an age when authoritarian structures and passive conformity are in general disrepute.”¹

While some aspects of the movement are considered commendable, Dulles believes that liberalism offers too many liabilities to be adopted as the leading strategy for the Roman Catholic Church. To begin with, implementing democratic principles within Church governance would result in the obfuscation of the traditional features of Roman Catholicism.² Such an action would result in a loss of membership and effectiveness.³ Next, the unity of the community of faith is seriously affected when public dissent is allowed. Third, liberals tend to de-emphasize Christian values such as reverence for the sacred, submission to authority, and spiritual growth. Finally, liberalism promotes

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., 105-07. Dulles states that for the well-being of the Church, it cannot possibly accept democracy as a governing principle since it “undermine[s] the very essence of Catholic Christianity, which authoritatively proclaims a religion founded on divine revelation and intended for all humankind. The Church has a public faith that is not subject to debate.” Idem, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” *NCR*, December 8-14, 1996, 7.

³Dulles, “The Four Faces of American Catholicism,” 105-07.

accommodation to culture and, thus, a loss of Catholic identity. In the long run such accommodation would destroy the mission of the Church by playing down the call for true conversion. Taking its cue from Christ, whose “hard sayings” offended many people, Dulles insists that the Church cannot afford to soft-pedal its message by taking the “line of least resistance.”¹

Dulles as a Traditionalist

In “The Four Faces of American Catholicism” (1993), the revised edition of the 1990 article, Dulles is more sympathetic toward the traditional stance than three years earlier. While in his usual manner he attempts to maintain a centrist position, insisting that none of the strategies is sufficient in itself and pleading for openness, he considers traditionalism as the superior approach which, if adopted, could eliminate the current problems facing the Church.²

One of the first indications of Dulles’s movement away from “progressive” to “conservative” seems to have occurred in the mid-eighties. In an article dealing with the Church as a community of disciples, referring to his *Models of the Church*, he states that “writing in a moment in our history when institutions of all kinds were under hostile scrutiny, I may have been somewhat too severe on the institutional model.”³

Dulles’s traditionalism found further expressions as time progressed. Reading a pivotal article published in 1998, in which he states his vision for the Roman Catholic Church in the new millennium, strengthens the conclusion that, in spite of his attempts to

¹Ibid. Dulles claims that such was the general trend during the “Call to Action” conference, which, he suggests, “was a triumph for liberal Catholicism” (ibid., 105).

²Dulles identifies the main problem facing the Catholic Church as lack of commitment to the doctrines and structures of the Church on the part of many “communal Catholics” (ibid., 107).

³Dulles, “Community of Disciples as a Model of the Church,” 101. This article was later included in the 1987 edition of *Models of the Church*. While it is a systematic development of Dulles’s earlier writings dealing with this model, his apology for dealing too harshly with the institutional model did not appear until 1986. For Dulles’s early views on the Church as a community of disciples, see “Imaging the Church for the 1980s,” *Thought* 56 (June 1981): 121-38, and idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 7-15.

be viewed as a moderate Catholic theologian, Dulles clearly favors a traditional approach. He classifies modern American Catholics into two primary groups: progressivist or cultural Christians, and orthodox or countercultural, Christians. The reader is left with little doubt as to which side the author favors. In this article, Dulles presents the orthodox, or traditional approach, as the only viable program for the Church.¹

Avery Dulles's Ecclesiology from the Late Eighties Onward

Dulles's traditionalism, as well as his desire to protect the Roman Catholic heritage of faith, became particularly evident in the area of ecclesiology. To this examination we now turn. As suggested in chapter 2 of this dissertation, Dulles's ecclesiology, and more particularly his conception of the nature of doctrinal authority, can hardly be discussed without addressing his epistemological presuppositions.² Before reviewing Dulles's ecclesiology, let us therefore briefly consider how his views regarding revelation have developed in recent years.

The Nature of Revelation³

Models of Revelation (1983) is Dulles's last major systematic work dealing with the issue of revelation.⁴ Much like *Models of the Church*, the volume was warmly received and widely acclaimed in both Catholic and Protestant theological circles.⁵ In the first part

¹See Avery Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," *America*, June 20, 1998, 8-17. Several readers of the above article whose responses were published in subsequent issues of *America* reached similar conclusions. See Letters to Editor sections in *America*, July 4, 1998, 27-9, and July 18, 1998, 27-30.

²Cf. p. 67 above. Also Avery Dulles, review of *Method in Theology*, by Bernard Lonergan, *TS* 33 (1972): 555; idem, review of *A Question of Conscience*, 568.

³As mentioned in chapter 2, the doctrine of revelation is not a primary concern of this dissertation. Only the broad lines that suit the purposes of this work will be discussed here.

⁴This does not mean that the doctrine of revelation has not concerned Dulles since the time he published *Models of Revelation*. His current views can be gathered from a variety of his writings.

⁵The following book reviews are examples of the positive reception that Dulles's book received soon after it was published. Richard P. McBrien, review of *Models of the*

of the book, Dulles examines five different models of revelation: revelation as doctrine, history, inner experience, dialectic presence, and new awareness.¹ In the second part, he develops his own model, i.e., revelation as “symbolic mediation.”² It appears, however, that since 1983 when the volume was first published, and especially in the decade of the nineties, Dulles’s preferences have been increasingly shifting towards the propositional view of revelation.³ A brief review of this position, as presented by Dulles in *Models*, may help to clarify his current stand.

The Nature of Propositional Revelation

Revelation as doctrine, or propositional revelation, is the first model that Dulles discusses in *Models*. Within Roman Catholicism, he explains, this view of revelation is generally espoused by Neo-Scholastic theologians.⁴ It holds that revelation is primarily contained within the distinct propositional statements attributed to God and is authoritative for all Christians. Within the Roman Catholic communion, revelation is found in the official teachings of the Church, “viewed as God’s infallible oracle.” The magisterium, in its teaching, is constrained by the completed deposit of faith contained within the Scriptures

Church, by Avery Dulles, *Spirituality Today* 36 (1984): 76-8; Gerald O’Collins, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Gregorianum* 65 (1984): 181; Dermot A. Lane, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *The Living Light* 21 (October 1984): 74-7.

¹In much the same manner as in *Models of the Church*, he sets forth each model and presents its strengths and weaknesses.

²This position, he claims, utilizes and integrates the positive elements of each model. According to this approach, revelation never happens as a purely interior experience and should never be understood as an unmediated encounter with God. “It is always mediated through symbol—that is to say, through an externally perceived sign that works mysteriously on the human consciousness so as to suggest more than it can clearly describe or define. Revelatory symbols are those which express and mediate God’s self-communication.” Dulles, *Models of Revelation*, 131.

³As will become evident, his present understanding of revelation bears much similarity to his presentation of “revelation as doctrine” in *Models of Revelation*. See especially Avery Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” *CTSA* 54 (1999): 84-5; idem, “Evangelizing Theology,” *FT*, March 1996, 28-31.

⁴See p. 68 above.

and tradition, so “there is normally no need to verify whether the magisterium has correctly understood the deposit. Scholars themselves must defer to the official magisterium.”¹

The strengths of this model are evident. “It encourages loyalty to the foundational documents and traditions of the Church and thus gives the members a clear sense of identity.” It fosters solidarity and a sense of belonging to a divinely guided and protected religion. Denominations which adhere to propositional revelation, Dulles notes, have the ability to promote and maintain orthodox teaching, which is believed to have a divine origin and is thus free of human imperfections. It also makes it easier to identify and exclude dissenters. Lastly, the model promotes a vigorous sense of mission, as believers assume they are proclaiming God’s rather than man’s word. “For those who accept it, the propositional model facilitates full commitment to biblical and ecclesiastical teaching and makes it relatively easy to give a clear account of one’s faith.”² Because of its serious liabilities, however, Dulles suggests in *Models* that the propositional model is “waning in popularity” and no longer represents the mainstream of Catholic thinking.³ While he does not deny the usefulness of this model, he states that

theology should be open to the possibility that certain teachings of the modern Church are not propositionally in the sources, “in that very sense in which they are defined.” Theology has a critical task to expose deficiencies in past and present formulations, and a creative task in seeking better ways of expressing the ancient revelation for a new age. In seeking to perform these functions, theologian must

¹Dulles, *Models of Revelation*, 27, 44. Dulles’s main sources for the Neo-Scholastic propositional model of revelation are the documents of Vatican I and Pius XII’s *Humani generis*. For detailed references, see footnotes to chapter 3 of *Models of Revelation*, 291-92.

²*Ibid.*, 47-8.

³The main liabilities of the propositional model, as presented in *Models*, are that: (1) it is not fully clear whether or not it is supported by Scripture; (2) the view does not square up with modern critical thinking; (3) it rests on “an objectifying theory of knowledge that is widely questioned in our time”; and (4) promotes authoritarianism. “For reasons such as these,” he writes, “the propositional model . . . fails to satisfy the quest for religious understanding. It gives theology an assignment and a scope that some regard as far too narrow. The theologian is required to operate within a set of verbal-conceptual formulations that are regarded as divinely revealed. This leads to the kind of theology described by Pius XII in *Humani generis*” (*ibid.*, 48-51).

give closer consideration to the experience of contemporary Christians than the propositional model encourages them to do.¹

This was also why Dulles develops his own model of revelation, “symbolic mediation,” which, in his mind, meets the above mentioned aspirations.

Revelation in Dulles's Recent Writings

Dulles claims he still espouses the views he presented in *Models*.² My research indicates, however, that in recent years he has begun to emphasize the propositional character of revelation and to consider this model as most suited to Roman Catholic theology.³

Revelation as an objective reality

God, explains Dulles, provided humans with minds able to gain some knowledge

¹Ibid., 51.

²Avery Dulles, “La théologie catholique nord-américaine depuis 1965,” *Revue de l'Institut catholique de Paris* 68, October-December 1998, 26; idem, “Donald Bloesh on Revelation,” in *Evangelical Theology in Transition: Theologians in Dialogue with Donald Bloesh*, ed. Elmer M. Coyler (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 62. In a book review Dulles commends the author for presenting a balanced view of revelation where the historical, symbolic, and experiential dimensions of revelation are complemented by the need for apostolic tradition and authoritative presentation of God's message. Avery Dulles, review of *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*, by Gerald O'Collins, *Commonweal*, March 11, 1994, 21.

³It would be an oversimplification to argue that Dulles has abandoned “symbolic realism.” At times, in his writings, he argues that reducing revelation to a propositional mode only is unwarranted, since God also “uses symbols, both physical and verbal, precisely to evoke meanings so rich that they cannot be encapsulated in explicit doctrinal statements.” Dulles, “Donald Bloesh on Revelation,” 75. See also his “The Dogma of the Assumption,” in *The One Mediator, the Saints and Mary*, ed. Joseph Burgess (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1992), 291. It is to be noted that although it was published in 1992 this article was written in 1987. A review of Dulles's entire literary output of the last several years, however, conveys the impression that there is an increasing emphasis upon the propositional character of revelation. See, for example, idem, review of *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*, 21. While appreciating O'Collins's balanced presentation he chides him for not placing more emphasis upon the propositional view of revelation. He himself leans towards the view that equates the content of the Scriptures with revelation. This is especially evident in his presentation at the 1999 CTSA Convention, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 83-91.

of spiritual realities,¹ to grasp and comprehend revealed truth.² Unfortunately, many present-day believers are affected by Kantian rationalism, which does not allow for the possibility of knowing any objective reality beyond human experience. Metaphysical and thus theological knowledge, they claim, involves contradictions that the human mind is not equipped to address. All religious language attempting to describe God is reduced to paradoxes and metaphors. In contrast, Dulles asserts, Catholicism insists on the existence of an objective revelation, which brings genuine knowledge and, thus, can be formulated into meaningful propositions.³ Revelation does not deserve to be labeled revelation “unless it communicates true and divinely certified knowledge” which can be submitted to human inquiry.⁴ Dulles has not entirely abandoned the personalistic aspect of revelation, however. While recently he has tended to emphasize the fact that “there’s an objective thing that can be called the ‘deposit of faith’,”⁵ he allows, notwithstanding with caution, that to some extent it is also experiential. Still, rather than accepting the enthusiastic view that everyone experiences revelation in an immediate, direct, and undeniable manner, he would rather conclude that “whatever experience of God we normally have is mediated and

¹Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 87.

²Avery Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 80.

³Ibid., 76; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, by Richard Gaillardetz, *The Tablet*, June 28, 1997, 836; idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 10; idem, “Evangelizing Theology,” 29; idem, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 84.

Dulles criticizes the view of revelation, taught by some of his colleagues, which presents religious truth as an ineffable mystery, an encounter with the divine, that can be conveyed only by means of symbols and metaphors, “but it cannot be communicated by propositional language, since it utterly surpasses the reach of human concepts.” Furthermore, he argues against the view that all statements claiming to be divine revelation are culturally conditioned and “cannot be transferred from one age or one cultural region to another.” Idem, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 46; idem, “Dialogue,” 9.

⁴Dulles, review of *Religion and Revelation: A Theology of the World's Religions*, by Keith Ward, *TT* 52 (1995): 399.

⁵Dulles, “Dialogue,” 9; idem, “The New Catechism: A Feast of Faith,” *TT* 53 (July 1996): 149.

elusive.”¹ The objective reality of revelation allows for it to be presented as meaningful propositions.

Revelation propositionally encased as dogmas

From its beginning, Dulles states, the Church has received divine truth in the form of propositions known as dogmas. If this were not so, it might have been “on the wrong course ever since its foundation.”² Every dogma taught by the Church would have to be reclassified as a mere theological opinion, subject to discussion and possible rejection. Such view is to be disallowed, for God has provided humanity with clear answers regarding its origins, its redemption, and its future. Dogmatic propositions, he states, “are not mere human opinions but articles of divine and Catholic faith,”³ “proposed for the faith of the believers,”⁴ and, thus, can be equated with divine revelation.⁵ Furthermore, the teachings of the Church, like all genuine truths, have permanent and universal validity.

¹Dulles, review of *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*, 21; cf. idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 310.

²Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 85.

³Ibid. As an example of an erroneous view Dulles quotes Roger Haight, a Catholic author, who states that “beliefs, doctrines and dogmas are theological statements and as such cannot be simply identified with revelation.” Ibid., 84; idem, “Evangelizing Theology,” 29. Cf. Roger Haight, *Dynamics of Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 35.

⁴Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 30.

⁵Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 10. While Dulles is as careful as ever in enunciating his views, perusing his recent writings leaves one with the strong impression that, in his mind, revelation may be equated with dogmas, or the deposit of faith. He often uses these terms interchangeably. See ibid. 10-2; idem, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 51. Statements such as the following strongly support such a conclusion: (1) the “traditional view that a dogma is a divinely revealed truth is no longer taken seriously”; (2) “revelation was initially given to the Twelve”; and (3) “faith rests on a divine revelation with a definite content” (ibid., 46); idem, review of *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church*, 836; idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 14; idem, “From the Heart of Priestly Formation: The Future of Seminary Theology,” *Catholic International* 8 (1997): 41; idem, *John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church: Like a Sentinel* (Regina: Campion College, University of Regina, 1997), 13; idem, “John Paul II: Theologian,” *Communio* 24 (1997): 727; idem, “Revelation as the Basis for Scripture and Tradition,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 21 (1997): 111; idem, “The Ecclesial Dimension of Faith,” *Communio* 22 (1995): 424-25.

“Truth transcends all cultural barriers. Any true statement, properly understood, is true everywhere and always. . . . Biblical and traditional Christianity has never been bound to a particular culture.”¹ If fully accepted, Dulles writes, this view of truth would expose the fallacy of the speculations of those who argue for “novel formulations.”² Christians must have confidence in the objective validity of the revelation that comes to them through divinely established channels.³ Permanently valid, Church teachings cannot be subject to discussion or change “without impairing the authentic Christian understanding of God, of Christ, and of the Church.”⁴

Revelation completed during apostolic times

God, who constitutes the fullness of truth, faithfully transmitted all that humans need to know about him through his Son. Through Christ, God “says all that he has to say,” presenting the Church with the “fullness of revelation” and bidding it to preserve and transmit it.⁵ The truths of revelation were given to believers “once and for all.”⁶ Thus, Christians should be encouraged to measure their beliefs and lifestyle by “a revelation that became complete in the apostolic age and is authoritatively transmitted through the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and through apostolic tradition.”⁷

¹Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 30.

²Dulles, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 51.

³Avery Dulles, “Faith and Reason, a Note on the New Encyclical,” *America*, October 31, 1998, 8.

⁴Avery Dulles, “Women Priests: The Case Against,” *Dublin Studies* 87 (1998): 43.

⁵Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 74, 79; idem, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 51.

⁶Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 80. Dulles argues that the very idea of a deposit of faith, which he often equates with revelation, seems incongruous in a modern age, where freedom to make one’s own decisions regarding religious matters, coupled with skepticism and relativism, is primary values. Facing the opposition of such an environment, Catholicism “must have the courage to assert a definite claim of truth” (ibid.).

⁷Avery Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference* (New York: Crossroads

The principle of mediation and the 'sensus fidelium'

While it is true that no human language can perfectly express the truths of divine revelation,¹ God provided "sacred" channels through which revelation could be transmitted and taught in an authentic way.² It was first given in a discernible form to the twelve disciples who subsequently passed it on to other believers.³ Truth, therefore, is seen as descending from above and mediated by a chosen class of ecclesiastical officers. This concept of mediation, Dulles asserts, is fundamental to Christianity. Just as Christ is the designated Mediator between God and humanity, believers are to accept that Church structures are instruments through which Christ is mediated to them.⁴ While the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon all believers to enable them to assimilate truth, as far as the content of the message is concerned they must "remain dependent on an ecclesial authority that speaks in the name of Christ the Lord."⁵

At the same time, when defining the doctrines of the Church, the ecclesiastical authority does not necessarily depend upon believers.⁶ This is not to say that, in recent

Publishing Company, 1999), 22; idem, "The Ways We Worship," *FT*, March 1998, 32.

¹Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 10; idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 22.

²Dulles, "The Principles of Catholic Theology," 78-9. Dulles writes: "Truth and grace are seen as descending from above and being mediated by sacred persons and rites." Idem, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," *The Priest*, June 1998, 33.

³Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836. Dulles severely criticizes Gaillardetz for adhering to the view that revelation is given first to the entire Christian community, following which the hierarchy gathers the insights present within the community and expresses them in an official manner. He writes: "While he [Gaillardetz] is correct in emphasizing the ecclesial character of revelation, the New Testament indicates that Christ established the community through Peter and the apostles" (ibid.); cf. idem, "The Ecclesial Dimension of Faith," 427.

⁴Dulles, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," 33. While Dulles agrees that the use of Neo-Platonistic philosophy, which is behind the idea of mediation, is rather dubious, he claims that "the basic idea of mediation is sound and is necessarily implied in the doctrine of the Incarnation, which lies at the basis of Christianity itself" (ibid.); idem, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 310-11.

⁵Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836.

⁶Ibid.; idem, review of *The Doctrine of Revelation: A Narrative Interpretation*, by

years, Dulles has entirely discarded the concept of the *sensus fidelium*.¹ But, in order to be an authoritative doctrinal source within the Church, the sense of the faithful has to be in agreement with the teaching magisterium.²

Nature of faith

Emphasis upon the propositional nature of revelation and the manner in which it is mediated significantly impacts the way in which Dulles views the nature of faith. Faith, he agrees, should primarily be understood in terms of accepting the revealed dogmas of the Church. Since its inception, the Church has required believers to assent to the revelatory deposit proclaimed in professions and creeds.³ Faith is “submission to the word of another—that is to say, the word of God as spoken to the community through divinely commissioned and assisted representatives.”⁴ It comes down to trusting and accepting the divinely instituted authority of the Church. When believers no longer accept the authority of the leaders of the Church, they can no longer consider themselves Catholics,⁵ since being a Catholic means accepting a definite body of truths, transmitted and certified by the

Gabriel Fackre, *TS* 59 (1998): 527.

¹Dulles’s attitude towards the *sensus fidelium* is discussed below. See pp. 188-89.

²Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 81; idem, “Second General Discussion,” in *Church Authority in American Culture*, 119; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 311. Dulles’s recent attitude towards the *sensus fidelium* and its relationship to the authoritative teaching of the magisterium might imply the classic division between *Ecclesia docens* and *Ecclesia discens*.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 84-5.

⁴Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 24. See also a report on Dulles’s views by Robert McClory, “Four Speakers, Four Views on Authority,” *NCR*, March 20, 1998, 10.

⁵Avery Dulles, “Panel Discussion,” in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 87; Catholic News Service, “Father Avery Dulles Urges Defense of Catholic Orthodoxy,” *NCR*, April 19-25, 1998, 2.

ecclesiastical authorities as authentic.¹ God made provision for an authoritative and perpetual teaching office, whose fundamental role is to provide “assurance about matters which would otherwise be debatable.”² The contents of revelation “are to be believed, in the terminology of Vatican I, ‘on account of the authority of God himself who reveals’.”³

In summary, a review of the writings of Dulles which, directly or indirectly, deal with the nature of revelation suggests that in recent years Dulles has begun to emphasize the propositional nature of revelation and its hierarchical mediation. This conclusion is strengthened by an evaluation of Dulles’s writings in the light of his own presentation of the strengths of the propositional model of revelation presented in his *Models of Revelation*.⁴ Within the last decade, more than ever, he emphasizes the unity of the Church and orthodoxy understood as solidarity with its past heritage.⁵

It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that Dulles’s more recent understanding of revelation, with its propositional and mediatory emphases, stands in tension with his early post-Vatican II beliefs. How does this concept impact his more recent ecclesiological views?

The Nature of the Church

As outlined in chapter 2, the decades immediately following the Second Vatican Council were marked by Dulles’s enthusiasm towards the new and innovative teachings of the Council.⁶ In those years he argued that Catholic theologians should move beyond the

¹Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 10; idem, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* by John Redford (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 1996), 12; idem, “Seven Essentials of Evangelization,” *Origins* 25 (1995): 400.

²Dulles, *John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church: Like a Sentinel*, 13.

³Dulles, “The Ecclesial Dimension of Faith,” 426.

⁴Dulles, *Models of Revelation*, 46-8. See the summary of Dulles’s presentation of the strengths of the propositional model of revelation earlier in this section.

⁵See Avery Dulles, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic’,” *One in Christ* (OC) 35 (1999): 12-26; idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 8-17.

⁶See pp. 61-7 above.

Council's teachings and work towards developing new and original approaches to Catholic ecclesiology.¹ More recently, however, he no longer emphasizes the novelty of the Council's teachings but asserts that moving beyond the teachings of Vatican I and Vatican II is not warranted.² It might be unfair in the eyes of some to assert that his current ecclesiology radically contradicts his previous positions, yet it seems amply justified to state that, over against his earlier principle of discontinuity,³ his teachings in recent years conform to the principle of continuity.⁴ Such a stance may be the reason why the model approach is no longer prominent in his writings.

The Models' Method: A Re-evaluation

In the seventies, as a moderate ecclesiologist, Dulles popularized the method of models as the chief theological approach towards understanding the nature of the Church.⁵ At that time, he regarded the model theory as an appropriate tool to describe the Church, which was a mystery and, as such, defied exact description. The Church had to be described "indirectly," through the use of analogies drawn from human experiences of the world. These analogies provided a platform upon which believers could build their understanding of the Church. Besides, "in order to do justice to the various aspects of the Church" it was essential to "work simultaneously with different models." The inherent

¹Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 6; idem, *Survival of Dogma*, 94; idem, "The Open Church," 26. See also Dulles's contribution to a volume which advocated the calling of a new, Vatican III Council, that was to clarify the issues which were not fully resolved by Vatican II. Idem, "Ecumenism: Problems and Opportunities for the Future," in *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done*, ed. David Tracy, Hans Küng and Johann B. Metz (New York: Seabury Press, 1978), 91-101.

²Dulles, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," 32; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; idem, foreword to *What Is Catholicism? Hard Questions—Straight Answers*, 10-1; idem, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 86-7.

³See p. 62 above.

⁴For an explanation on the principle of continuity and discontinuity, see pp. 61-2 above.

⁵See pp. 74-5 above. Dulles attempted to utilize this method in other areas of theological enterprise. See, for example, his *Models of Revelation*.

characteristic of the model method was that it required diverse models that complemented each other.¹

While many applauded Dulles's model approach,² there were voices warning that the method "seem[ed] to lead to a pure pluralism," and a functional understanding of the Church.³ In more recent years, Dulles tends to have moved away from the multiple models theory. It no longer plays an important role in his ecclesiology and is rarely implemented.⁴ Instead, one perceives an increasing emphasis upon a single image of the Church, the body of Christ,⁵ and an "ecclesiology from above," which is concomitant with this model.⁶

¹Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 8.

²See p. 75 above. See also Patrick J. Burns, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *TS* 35 (1974): 563-65; H. Benedict Green, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Expository Times* 88 (1977): 220.

³Herwi Rikhof, *The Concept of Church: A Methodological Inquiry into the Use of Metaphors in Ecclesiology* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1981), 221; J. R. Sheets, "Church and Government: Theory and Practice," *America*, March 23, 1974, 224; Kenneth Baker, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *HPR*, October 1974, 74-6; Donald G. Bloesh, review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles, *Christian Century*, January 29, 1975, 89-91.

⁴In the interview at Fordham University Dulles unequivocally stated: "I am beyond models. Models are only the beginning of ecclesiology." At times, however, he continues to insist that he still adheres to the method of models. Thus, in 1998 he wrote: "Les modèles, à mon avis, constituent un point de départ, confrontant le théologien à la nécessité de faire des choix responsables prenant en compte le point de vue des autres." Dulles, "La théologie catholique nord-américaine depuis 1965," 26. See also Dulles, "The Church as 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic'," 14, and idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and Crisis of Dissent," *Origins* 22 (1993): 776, where Dulles elaborates on the theme of the Church as a sacrament. Note, however, that in both articles, while dealing with the Church as a sacrament, Dulles spends considerable time emphasizing the visible, institutional aspects of the ecclesial reality. Dulles supports his conclusions by pointing to those sections of the Vatican II documents which emphasize the hierarchical structure of the Church. Conspicuously absent in the recent Dulles is the view of the Church as a community of disciples. In an interview at Fordham University Dulles specifically stated that he now adheres to the model of the Church as sacrament. This in spite of the fact that both Joseph A. Komonchak and Richard P. McBrien maintain that Dulles still accepts the community of disciples as the primary model for the Church. See Komonchak, "All Dressed in Scarlet," 9, and Richard P. McBrien, email interview by author, February 19, 2001.

⁵See, for example, Dulles's recent book, *The Priestly Office* (New York: Paulist Press, 1997). The image of the Church as the body of Christ is clearly dominant in the entire work. See particularly pp. 12-5, 36-7, 41.

⁶One of the main achievements of the Second Vatican Council, Dulles explains, was a "new way of expressing the church's identity as the body and the bride of Christ."

The Church as the Body of Christ

There may be several reasons why Dulles favors the image of the Church as the body of Christ, a view popularized by Pius XII.¹ Viewing the Church as such means a return to the original terminology of the Church used by the apostles and is thus normative.² Besides, such an understanding of the Church most aptly accommodates the mediatory aspect of the Church. Just like Christ is the Mediator between God and humanity, so the Church is “the mediator, under Christ, of grace and salvation.”³ The relationship between the respective mediatory roles of Christ and the Church is so close, Dulles contends, that it may be said that “Christ and the Church make up one mystical person.”⁴ Thus, “no sharp distinction can be made between the activities of Christ and of the church.”⁵ Accepting Christ as Mediator goes hand in hand with the notion that his

Avery Dulles, “The Catholic Press and the New Evangelization,” *Origins* 27 (1997): 63. The Church as the body of Christ was discussed by Dulles in *Models* in the chapter dealing with the model of the Church as mystical communion. See *Models of the Church* (1974), 43-57.

¹In agreement with his recent emphasis, Dulles praises the work of Pius XII, and stresses the continuity of thought between that pope and John Paul II. He credits Pius XII for stimulating the inner renewal of the Church through his “great encyclicals on the Mystical Body, biblical studies, and the liturgy.” Avery Dulles, review of *Witness to Hope: The Biography of Pope John Paul II*, by George Weigel, *FT*, November 1999, 55.

²Avery Dulles, review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, by Carl E. Braaten, *FT*, January 1999, 45, and idem, “Jubilee 2000: Reform and Renewal in the Church,” March 26, 2000, Dominican Ecclesial Institute Public Lectures; available from <http://www.op.org/dei/texts/Dulles.htm>; 2 May 2000, pp. 4, 8 of 9 pages.

³Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 16; idem, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 81.

⁴Dulles, “The Priest and the Great Jubilee,” 37; idem, “The New Evangelization: Challenge for Religious Missionary Institutes,” in *Word Remembered, Word Proclaimed: Selected Papers from Symposia Celebrating the SVD Centennial in North America*, ed. Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroder (Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1997), 28-9.

⁵Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 15. Dulles's identification of Christ with the Church was also noticed by one of his reviewers, Lucien Richard. See Lucien Richard, review of *The Priestly Office*, by Avery Dulles, *The Catholic Library World* 68 (1997): 38. On another occasion Dulles writes: “Christ as head does not act apart from the Body (or the Bride) to which he has everlastingly united himself.” Idem, “Principles of Catholic Ecclesiology,” 79.

mediation must be “visibly perpetuated through the Church, which is essentially a system of mediation deriving its whole meaning from Christ.”¹

In addition, the image of the body of Christ affirms the view that the true Church of Christ, while still at times referred to by Dulles as a mystery,² is a “visible structured society, subsisting in the Roman Catholic Church of today.”³ Since the hierarchical principle established by Christ is faithfully preserved within the Roman Catholic Church, the heritage of faith can be protected and the pope and the bishops can authoritatively transmit and teach Christ’s revelation.⁴

The image of the Church as the body of Christ also promotes unity within the believing community. “As fellow members of the one Body of Christ,” Dulles writes, “we are bound together in a single organic whole.”⁵ As the unified body of Christ, the Church is a sacrament of unity. Its members maintain their faith by common convictions, under the guidance of the pope and the bishops.⁶ All Catholics must strive to preserve unity within the body of Christ.⁷

An Ecclesiology from Above

In a 1996 article dealing with the nature of the Church, Dulles differentiates between two ecclesiologies in the post-Vatican II Church. They may be broadly characterized as a personalist or ascending approach on the one hand, and a juridico-

¹Dulles, “The Priest and the Great Jubilee,” 33.

²Avery Dulles, “The Unity for Which We Hope,” in *Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Toward a Common Mission*, ed. Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1995), 130.

³Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 16.

⁴Dulles, “Panel Discussion,” 75; idem, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 81.

⁵Avery Dulles, “Should the Church Repent?” *FT*, December 1998, 39; Bole, “A Moderate in a Disputatious Age,” 11.

⁶Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent,” 776.

⁷Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 309.

mystical or descending approach on the other. Dulles finds both in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.¹ An ascending ecclesiology, sometimes termed an “ecclesiology from below,” is based on early patristic writings. A descending ecclesiology, or an “ecclesiology from above,” has its roots in medieval Scholasticism and was fine-tuned during the Neo-Scholastic era. As usual, Dulles endeavors to objectively assess both tendencies and to create a workable synthesis.² In spite of his desire to remain unbiased, however, a careful perusal of this and other articles of the last decade shows his sympathy for the descending or universalist approach.³

The universalist stance argues that the Church, originally founded by Christ on Peter and the other apostles as a universal community, was later partitioned into local congregations. The particularist position, on the other hand, tends to emphasize that the universal Church is the result of a union of local churches.⁴ As Dulles sees it, the universal Church has priority over the local church. The universal Church, he argues, is not the result of a communion of local churches but, rather, its source. It exists as an ontological reality antecedent to any particular church.⁵ “It is a concretely existing whole apart from

¹Avery Dulles, “The Church as Communion,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, ed. Bradley Nassif (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996), 132. Dulles suggests that while the Second Vatican Council attempted to blend both types of ecclesiology into a workable paradigm, the result was unsatisfactory to theologians committed to either view (*ibid.*).

²Dulles also classifies these approaches as “particularist” and “universalist” tendencies, respectively. He identifies theologians such as Henri de Lubac and Joseph Ratzinger as representatives of the universalists view and Leonardo Boff and Jean-Marie Tillard as adhering to the particularist view. Dulles, “The Church as Communion,” 133.

³See, for example, Avery Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” *America*, July 15-22, 2000, 8.

⁴Dulles, “The Church as Communion,” 134.

⁵Arguing here against Hermann Pottmeyer’s views, Dulles approvingly refers to a document issued in 1992 by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which defined the universal Church as a separate ontological reality existing apart from local churches. Avery Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I and II*, by Hermann Pottmeyer, in *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 312; cf. Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” 8. Dulles’s views on this point were strongly criticized by Ladislav Orsy who states that “the council . . . never used the term ‘antecedent.’ Father Dulles’s translation of the Latin original (*ad imaginem ecclesiae universalis formatis*) is

which particular churches have no rightful existence.”¹ Thus, no ecclesial community can identify itself as a “church” unless it is first “received as such by the universal church.”² Such was the understanding of the nature of the Church, he claims, during New Testament times. The powers of teaching, sanctifying, and governing were conferred first upon Peter and then upon the twelve apostles who “were only later apportioned to particular or local sees.” In other words, the universal Church does not rise from below.³ It is a reality that is “given from above.”⁴

Viewing the Church as rising from below is, in Dulles’s opinion, impractical and dangerous. Historical evidence suggests that the patristic model eventually resulted in squabbling between particular churches, contributed to the rise of nationalism, and, in

questionable, if not misleading. . . . The council gives a straightforward answer. . . . There is no universal church (not even conceptually) apart from the particular churches.” “The Papacy for an Ecumenical Age,” *America*, October 21, 2000, 11.

¹Dulles, “The Church as Communion,” 135.

²Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 36; idem, “The Church as a Communion,” 136; idem, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic’,” 17. Once again, Dulles does not entirely renounce his previous view. In the early nineties, he criticized the universalistic, or “descending,” ecclesiology which permeated the original draft of the *Catechism for the Universal Church*. A short time later, when the final version of the *Catechism* was published in English (1993), Dulles welcomed it with open arms, even though the emphasis on a “descending” ecclesiology is still clearly present. See Avery Dulles, “The Church and the Universal Catechism,” *America*, March 3, 1990, 201; cf. “The Challenge of Catechism,” 46-53; also “The New Catechism: A Feast of Faith,” 148-51. Although universalism is more visible in Dulles’s recent writings, he remains cautious when expressing his views. He writes, “I in no way deny the entirely valid point that particular Churches should enjoy an appropriate measure of autonomy in their own jurisdictions. They are not mere administrative districts but realizations of the universal Church in a particular place. Bishops acquire their ordinary powers by episcopal ordination, not simply by delegation from the See of Rome.” Idem, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 312-13.

³Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 312; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836. During the discussion following the presentation of papers at the Second Common Ground Conference (1998), Joseph Komonchak stated that, according to his understanding of Dulles’s presentation, the latter clearly subscribed to the universalistic vision of the Church. See Komonchak, “First General Discussion,” in *Church Authority in American Culture*, 105-07.

⁴Avery Dulles, “The Church and the Kingdom,” in *A Church for All Peoples*, ed. Eugene LaVerdiere (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 16.

several cases, produced schisms. Such problems, Dulles contends, “exhibit the need for a strong universal authority.”¹ Most importantly, a universalist ecclesiology finds strong support in the documents of the First and Second Vatican Councils.²

The Nature of Ecclesiastical Authority

Dulles’s emphasis upon the image of the Church as the body of Christ, as well as his evident sympathy for an “ecclesiology from above,” must have influenced the way in which he views the nature of ecclesiastical authority. The Church, he claims, operates within a hostile environment that is seeking to destroy it through secular and relativistic influences. In such an environment the Roman Catholic Church, and particularly the leadership of the Church, must be seen as the foremost protector of universality and orthodoxy. While Dulles understands that an increased emphasis upon the authority of the popes and bishops may be seen as an unpopular return to pre-Vatican II authoritarianism, he is convinced that “a major shift toward greater tentativeness, flexibility, and local autonomy could undermine the specific strengths of Roman Catholicism. Far from making the Church more appealing,” he adds, “such measures might undercut the whole program of Catholic evangelization.”³ Furthermore, using the terminology of John Paul II, Dulles states that if the Church is to be a sign of contradiction, it must measure success by its faithfulness to the word of God, rather than by loyalty to the criteria of the world.⁴ If the Church is to maintain its countercultural attitude and influence the world, it must sustain its authoritative structures.⁵

¹Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 312.

²Dulles, “The Church as a Communion,” 136.

³Avery Dulles, review of *Imaginer l’Église catholique*, by Ghislain Lafont, *TS* 57 (1996): 769. Dulles admits that authoritative pronouncements and the strong exercise of Church government, which are necessary and proper, may seem authoritarian to those who are not “favorably disposed” towards the proposed message or action. Misunderstandings, therefore, are inevitable. Idem, review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, 46.

⁴Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 25.

⁵Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836. One way to achieve this,

Dulles rejects the notion that, in order to exercise their power, ecclesiastical authorities must be endorsed “from below.” The voice of the leadership of the Church is not “simply another wing,” one among other authoritative voices in the Church.¹ It is a divinely established institution, whose authority flows directly from Christ. This authority is hierarchical by the nature of the Church’s origin.² Dulles, therefore, strongly criticizes proposals that seek to reform ecclesiastical authorities according to democratic principles. By its very nature, democracy “tends to subvert” the divinely instituted teaching powers of the hierarchy.³ Besides, a close examination of any state operating according to democratic principles reveals that democracy does not offer “adequate foundations for a healthy self-governing society,” and often leads to the creation of a moral void.⁴ A Church operating according to democratic principles, he claims, would be unable to offer an efficient antidote to a secular and relativistic culture. Just like God sent Christ with a specific message, the latter authoritatively endowed his apostles with a mission to the world, expecting their hearers to receive his message through them. On the basis of New Testament evidence one may successfully argue for the permanence and enduring necessity of the divinely established hierarchical principle in the Church.⁵ Dulles writes:

according to Dulles, is to increase the centralization of the Church. Idem, “Dialogue,” 9.

¹Bole, “A Moderate in a Disputatious Age,” 11.

²Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 79-80.

³Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 12-3.

⁴Dulles, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7.

⁵Avery Dulles quoted in Catherine Odell, “Jubilee 2000 Should Be ‘New Springtime for Church’,” *NCR*, June 28-July 4, 1998, 1. Dulles warns Catholics against the false teachings of coalitions “that would subvert the authority of scripture and the nature of the church as a divinely established hierarchical society.” Tom Roberts, “Dulles Urges Bishops to Enforce Papal ‘No’,” *NCR*, July 26, 1996, 6; Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 12-3; idem, “Pastoral Response to the Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” *Origins* 26 (1996): 179; idem, “Jubilee 2000: Reform and Renewal in the Church,” 6; idem, *The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II*, 59; idem, *The Priestly Office*, 51.

The hierarchical structures of the church must be maintained and even strengthened so as to protect the teaching body from being unduly pressured by public opinion. Only the hierarchical form of government gives the official leadership the apostolic freedom that it needs to make decisions prayerfully in light of the Gospel and tradition.¹

To the twofold objection that emphasizing the authority of office devalues the faculty of reason and impacts Christian freedom, Dulles counters that only a few, if any, teachings of the Roman Catholic Church can be demonstrated by reason and, therefore, one cannot expect rational proofs in every instance. Relying on the authority of the magisterium is, in most cases, necessary.² Though Church leaders may provide explanations for the message contained in official documents, “to appeal to reason is to abandon the mode of authoritative teaching.”³ While Christians should exercise their God-given faculty of reason, if they want to remain Catholic they must accept “that submission and obedience are evangelical virtues recommended by reason itself.”⁴ As far as Christian freedom is concerned Dulles states that it is compatible with the authority of the Church “provided it [freedom] is really Christian.” When Jesus and Paul spoke of freedom, they did not mean “self-determination.”⁵ Being members of a divinely established society, Catholics are not free to maintain beliefs that are not in agreement with the official teaching of the Church.⁶ Dulles’s emphasis upon an ecclesiology from above and, consequently,

¹Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 16.

²Avery Dulles, “Sense of the Faithful,” *NCR*, May 1, 1998, 21; idem, “John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church,” 11.

³Dulles, “Sense of the Faithful,” 21; idem, “Women’s Ordination,” *Commonweal*, July 15, 1994, 10-1. Elsewhere, Dulles argues against the views that authority must always provide reasons for its actions. He writes that “in many cases it’s better not to give reasons. . . . [There are] reasons that you cannot articulate and that the tradition really is the bearer of these unarticulated reasons. . . . When you do try to give reasons, often you raise more questions because reasons call for counter reasons and you immediately think of all the reasons on the other side.” Idem, “Panel Discussion,” 87; cf. “Four Speakers, Four Views on Authority,” *NCR*, March 20, 1998, 11.

⁴Dulles, review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, 46.

⁵Dulles, “Panel Discussion,” 94.

⁶Dulles, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7.

his attribution of a greater share of doctrinal authority to the pope and the bishops affected the way in which he envisioned the task of the Church.

The Task of the Church

Following the lead of Paul VI and John Paul II, Dulles perceives evangelization as the most important task of the Church,¹ and this for two main reasons. On the one hand, he asserts that Paul VI and John Paul II have accurately appreciated the problems facing the modern Church and have identified an appropriate antidote. "The church has become too introverted. If Catholics today are sometimes weak in their faith, this is partly because of their reluctance to share it," Dulles notes. A preoccupation with the pastoral care of its own members is at least partly to blame for these developments.²

Dulles often refers to the task facing the body of Christ as the "new evangelization."³ He does not imply a new program, in some way contrary to the precepts of the Second Vatican Council, but rather a "bold and consistent implementation" of the Council's teachings. Modern life is marked by increasing secularization, consumerism, glorification of violence, pornography and hedonism, as well as a departure from

¹Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology," 32. These two popes, according to Dulles, made evangelization one of the main themes of their pontificates. This, he believes, has been "one of the most surprising and important developments in the Catholic Church since Vatican II." Idem, "John Paul II and the New Evangelization," *America*, February 1, 1992, 70. Dulles states that Paul VI, in his 1975 apostolic exhortation *Evangelii nuntiandi*, presented a new understanding of the Second Vatican Council. The document declared that the fundamental purpose of the Council was to prepare and equip the Church with tools that would allow it to proclaim the gospel, in a more effective way, to people living in the twentieth century. John Paul II, in his 1990 encyclical *Redemptoris missio*, followed in the footsteps of his predecessors, in emphasizing the evangelical mission of the Church. Cf. Paul VI, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, in *Proclaiming Justice and Peace*, ed. Michael Walsh and Brian Davies (Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1984), 207-42, and John Paul II, *Redemptoris missio*, in *The Encyclicals of John Paul II*, ed. J. Michael Miller (Nuntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1996), 494-570.

²Dulles, "John Paul II and the New Evangelization," 71.

³This term seems to be borrowed from John Paul II's "The Task of the Latin American Bishop," *Origins* 12 (1983): 661-62; cf. Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology," 28. It is important to note that in recent years Dulles has become a primary American expositor of the papal missionary vision. See his "Seven Essentials of Evangelization," 397-400; and idem, "Evangelizing Theology," 27-32.

traditional family values. In such an atmosphere, traditional methods of evangelization are no longer effective. The “new evangelization” emphasizes a renewed reliance on the Holy Spirit and implies that, in order to facilitate the task of the Church, Catholics must enter into an intimate relationship with God.¹ This is much more than mere assent to the truths presented by the Church. It means “a complex act involving the whole person—mind, will, and emotions.”²

This “new evangelization,” Dulles asserts, is not just the concern of select individuals, but the work of the entire Church.³ To be effective in transforming the lives of individuals and communities the work of evangelization needs to be performed in submission to the leadership and under the guidance of the bishops and the Roman See.⁴ Through their ministry, Catholics “have continually new access to the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the living Christ.”⁵ Respect and submission to ecclesiastical authority are thus essential if the Church is to proceed with the successful evangelization of the world.⁶ A united Church alone can present significant countermeasures against cultural influences.⁷ Let Church members distance themselves from the various theological crosscurrents affecting the modern Roman Catholic Church and, under the guidance of the bishops, be on guard “against certain deviations that inhibit a vigorous program of evangelization.”⁸

¹Avery Dulles, “What the New Evangelization Demands of Us,” interview by Thomas P. O’Connor, in *New Covenant* 24 (June 1995): 9; idem, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 14.

²Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 28.

³Dulles, “What the New Evangelization Demands of Us,” 9; idem, “The Church and the Kingdom,” 26.

⁴Dulles, “What the New Evangelization Demands of Us,” 9.

⁵Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 32.

⁶Avery Dulles, “Travails of Dialogue,” *Crisis*, February 1997, 16.

⁷Avery Dulles, “Narrowing the Gap: Gospel and Culture,” *Origins* 23 (1994): 679.

⁸Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 28-9.

The Nature and Task of the Doctrinal Magisterium

That in recent years Avery Dulles has begun to espouse views consistent with an “ecclesiology from above” approach and has explicitly supported John Paul II’s call for a “new evangelization” raises further questions regarding his view of the nature and task of the doctrinal magisterium itself.

As noted in chapter 2, in the early eighties Dulles suggested the existence and ministry of two magisteria.¹ Lately, however, he has increasingly moved away from such recommendation. In an article published in 1995, where he set forth criteria for Catholic theology, he unequivocally states that “theologians [will not] attempt to preempt the official teaching role of the hierarchy by constituting themselves as a ‘parallel magisterium’.”² Dulles’s apparent departure from his original proposal of two magisteria also seems to be influenced by his current views regarding the nature, structure, and task of the hierarchical magisterium.

The Nature and Structure of the Roman Catholic Magisterium

For Dulles, the Church needs a doctrinal magisterium. Without it, the Church “would very soon become unrecognizable as a community of faith. Lacking any definite teachings, it would have no message to proclaim to the world.”³ The New Testament, Dulles continues, attests that from the very beginning the Christian Church was sustained by authoritative teaching.⁴ Through the influence of modern philosophy and democratic

¹See p. 93 above.

²Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313; cf. idem, “John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church,” 13; idem, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89; idem, “The Gospel of Life: A Symposium,” *FT*, October 1995, 33; idem, “Travails of Dialogue,” 17; idem, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7; idem, review of *Church Teaching Authority: Historical and Theological Studies*, by John P. Boyle, *FT*, August-September 1996, 58.

³Avery Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” unpublished paper presented at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, April 3, 2000, 2; in my possession.

⁴Dulles, “The Unity for Which We Hope,” 133.

ideologies, some theologians have gone as far as to deny the special status ascribed to the hierarchical ministry and consider it a “relic of the Middle Ages.” They suggest that the ecclesiastical offices of the Church, like all earthly institutions, are of human origin and, therefore, “subject to change as the needs of the times may dictate.”¹ In fact, the hierarchical ministry has a divine origin and “[is] not subject to human manipulation” or further developments.²

Apostolic Succession and Charisms of the Episcopal Office

The origin of ecclesiastical offices is closely related to the doctrine of apostolic succession.³ The concept proved to be a powerful tool that protected the unity of the early Church.⁴ It allowed the Church to maintain faithfulness to the apostolic tradition, through which believers could learn about Christ’s teaching regarding the sacraments and the mission of the Church. Hence, the presence of leaders standing in apostolic succession is requisite to the health and unity of the Christian community.⁵ The concept also militates

¹Dulles, “The Priest and the Great Jubilee,” 32. This is in contrast with Dulles’s earlier writings, where he stated that “to admit the necessity of the magisterium is one thing; to endorse the particular form which the magisterium has taken at any given moment in history is quite another. . . . Unless the style of the magisterium is reshaped to meet the demands of our time as effectively as it has met the demands of other times, we may expect the present loss of credibility to intensify.” Idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 300, 304; idem, “The Theologian and the Magisterium,” 240-42; idem, *A Church to Believe In*, 103-07.

²Ibid., 39; cf. “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 16-7, and idem, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,’” 23-4. Ladislav Orsy reaches the same conclusion in his “The Papacy for an Ecumenical Age,” 13.

³For a proper Catholic understanding of the doctrine of apostolic succession, see F. A. Sullivan, “Apostolic Succession,” *NCE* (1967), 1:695-96; cf. Steger, *Apostolic Succession in the Writings of Yves Congar and Oscar Cullmann*. Dulles defines apostolic succession as essentially an “aggregation into the presently existing and living apostolic body” through the sacrament of ordination. Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 34.

⁴Dulles, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,’” 23; idem, *The Priestly Office*, 8-9.

⁵Dulles, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,’” 23.

against the opinion that bishops be elected by the constituency rather than co-opted by the episcopal body.¹

Along with their right of succession in the episcopate the bishops receive “sure charism of truth” that in the recent Dulles looks like an amalgamation of the three New Testament charisms of apostles, prophets, and teachers.² Thanks to this charism, bishops are able to authoritatively mediate revealed doctrines in the name of Christ.³ Already held forth in the New Testament, the concept was theologically developed in the writings of Irenaeus, the first to use the phrase *charisma veritatis certum*.⁴ Both Vatican Councils, Dulles insists, proclaimed the traditional understanding of episcopal charism.⁵

¹Avery Dulles, review of *The Exercise of the Primacy: Continuing the Dialogue*, by Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 309.

²Avery Dulles, “Charism of the New Evangelizer,” in *Retrieving Charisms for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Doris Donnelly (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 35; idem, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,’” 23; idem, “The New Evangelization: Challenge for Religious Missionary Institutes,” 29. Elsewhere, Dulles speaks of the “fullness of hierarchical ministry,” possessed by the episcopal order. Idem, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 80-1; idem, “Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching,” *Origins* 25 (1996): 783.

This view has evolved in Dulles's recent writings. In the early nineties he still viewed these three charisms as the possession of the entire Church. “The church as a whole participates in the threefold office of Christ. . . . Teaching may be attributed to the church as a whole.” Idem, “The Teaching Mission of the Church and Academic Freedom,” in *Issues in Academic Freedom*, ed. George S. Worgul (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1992), 43. As the nineties progressed, however, he increasingly associated the teaching charism with the papal and episcopal office.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89; idem, “Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching,” 783; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 312. The episcopal charisms need to be clearly distinguished from the charisms available to all members of the Church. Idem, “The Charism of the New Evangelizer,” 35-6; idem, *The Priestly Office*, 46.

⁴Dulles, “The Charism of the New Evangelizer,” 35; idem, *The Priestly Office*, 35; cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.26.2 (ANF, 1:497).

⁵Dulles, “The Charism of the New Evangelizer,” 35.

Papal Primacy and Collegiality

Besides affirming the divine origin of the hierarchical ministry within a traditional understanding of apostolic succession, Dulles also discusses the twin issues of papal primacy and collegiality. In his view the Scriptural evidence points to the fact that the “keys” of leadership were conferred upon Peter alone, rather than “a gift entrusted to all the apostles.”¹ In keeping with the declarations of the First Vatican Council, Dulles stresses that Christ “instituted in him [Peter] a permanent principle of unity,” which was to protect the oneness of the episcopal office.² The pope is not merely the spokesman for the episcopate but its “effective head.” As Peter exercised leadership over the apostles, so the pope is empowered to exercise primacy, “even when he speaks for the college of bishops.”³

Dulles assigns a special charism to the office of the papacy, which distinguishes it from the rest of the episcopate, enabling the pope to oversee the body of bishops as well as to safeguard Church unity.⁴ This charism assists the pope in explaining and protecting the

¹Avery Dulles, “An Important Bridge Must Yet Be Crossed,” *The Globe*, May 27, 1999, 5. Dulles wrote these words following the issuance of a common statement by The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission entitled “The Gift of Authority,” issued in 1999. In this document, Anglican and Roman Catholic scholars grappled with the issue of papal authority and leaned towards the view that the “keys” of Matt 16 were conferred upon the twelve disciples. Quoting the documents of Vatican I, Dulles strongly objected to the conclusions of this statement. In his mind it “registers a convergence, not a true consensus. It doesn’t come to terms with the teaching of the two Vatican councils, which remain authoritative for Catholics” (ibid.); cf. Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, “The Gift of Authority,” *Origins* 29 (1999): 17-29. Elsewhere, Dulles comments: “It is hard to see how Catholics could consider themselves to be fully reconciled with churches that did not acknowledge the papacy as the bearer of a divinely instituted ‘Petrine ministry’ within the universal Church.” Idem, “The Unity for Which We Hope,” 122-23.

²Dulles, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,’” 17; idem, “Pastoral Response to the Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” 179.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 91; idem, “Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching,” 782.

⁴Dulles, review of *The Exercise of the Primacy*, 309; idem, “The Basic Teaching of Vatican II,” in *Sacred Adventure*, ed. William C. Graham (New York: University Press of America, 1999), 133; idem, “Women Priests: the Case Against,” 44; idem, “The New Evangelization: Challenge for Religious Missionary Institutes,” 29; Dulles writes that the hierarchical leadership has special grace that is “proportioned to their hierarchical office.”

content of revelation, as well as in proclaiming Christ's message for the universal Church.¹ For this reason, all Catholics, including bishops, are expected to give unqualified assent to papal teachings.²

Dulles's view on papal authority impacts his understanding of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality. While in his recent writings collegiality is not one of Dulles's chief concerns, what he has been saying on the issue is at times ambivalent. On the one hand he praises the Council for instituting the principle of collegiality, which, he asserts, "runs through the documents of Vatican II like a golden thread"³ and has resulted in greater collaboration among bishops.⁴ On the other hand, one cannot help but note Dulles's wariness with the confusion collegiality has brought about. As he sees it, in the years following the Council the Church has been unable to create the proper "mechanisms of decision making" which would "respect both the traditional principle of pastoral authority and the nature of the Church as a Spirit-filled community."⁵

In the absence of such "mechanisms," Dulles advocates a return to a more traditional understanding of pastoral and episcopal authority. In so doing he stresses those various statements of the Second Vatican Council which emphasize the pope's role in the exercise of pastoral authority. He frequently refers to the *Nota Praevia*, which was

See also idem, "Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching," 782.

Dulles admits that his idea of special "charism of truth and unfailing faith" has its origin in the documents of Vatican I. He criticizes Michael Buckley for overlooking this important fact and for minimizing the "importance of papal primacy in offsetting recurrent threats to ecclesial unity." Idem, review of *Papal Primacy and the Episcopate*, by Michael J. Buckley, *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 311.

¹Dulles, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 86; idem, "Women Priests: The Case Against," 43-4.

²Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 16.

³Dulles, "The Basic Teaching of Vatican II," 129.

⁴Dulles mentions structures such as the worldwide synod of bishops, national and regional episcopal conferences, national and diocesan pastoral councils, parish councils, priests' senates, etc. (ibid., 130).

⁵Ibid.

appended to *Lumen gentium* at the request of Paul VI,¹ a note which intended to clarify the Council's teaching on collegiality, and to emphasize "the right of the pope to reserve doctrinal questions to himself when he judges fit."² The pope, Dulles insists, "is charged with the responsibility of deciding whether it is more desirable to act personally or collegially in the particular case."³

Besides, the process of consultation meant to lead to collegial consensus is increasingly strenuous in a modern socio-cultural environment. Modern challenges call for prompt action.⁴ Though worthy of consideration the idea of consensus is often impractical given the size of the Church.⁵ Moreover, attempts to reach consensus may backfire and create Church-wide confusion. Such was the case with two of the most controversial decrees issued by the Roman See since Vatican II, *Humanae Vitae* (1968) and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (1994), where even the bishops themselves had not unanimously accepted these Roman teachings.⁶

¹See for example Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19; idem, "Panel Discussion," 80; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church*, 836; idem, "The Church as 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic'," 23-4.

²Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19.

³Ibid.; idem, "Panel Discussion," 80; idem, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 90.

⁴Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordination Sacerdotalis*," 26; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836. Dulles suggests that the main reason for the Church-wide confusion following the publication of *Humanae Vitae* was magisterial indecision, which allowed too much discussion prior to issuing the document. Idem, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 313; cf. idem, "Women's Ordination," 10-1. Besides, in the modern age, where information spreads much faster than in the past, Rome must deal with arising doctrinal issues immediately. In stating this, Dulles does not want to be perceived as one who calls for the return of the pre-Vatican II situation. He suggests, however, that although the "structures erected since the council have served well . . . further experience and adjustments will be needed for them to function as smoothly as might be desired." Idem, "The Papacy for a Global Church," 9.

⁵Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 313.

⁶Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19-20. As a solution to future problems, Dulles suggests that a "very careful screening of future bishops is needed to make sure that they adhere staunchly to the deposit of faith as officially interpreted." Idem, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 16. In this article Dulles does not specifically

It seems indeed that Dulles assumes that the primary condition for effective episcopal leadership is the bishops' subordination to the head of the episcopal college, the pope. To borrow Alexandre Ganoczy's terminology, it could be stated that rather than operating *cum* and *sub* with the head, Dulles suggests that the members of the collegium work "with" each other to form a unified front "under" the head. The *sub*, thus, wins over the *cum*, i.e., the aspect of "with" the head is de-emphasized.¹

The Task of the Magisterium

Established by Christ, the papal-episcopal magisterium is assured of his presence so that evil will not prevail against the Church. As "the pillar and bulwark of truth,"² the magisterium is called to fulfill several functions.

The Transmission and Preservation of the Deposit of Faith

The transmission and preservation of the deposit of faith are essential functions of the magisterium. Preservation is particularly important. The certainty of Christ's message allows the Church to confront the world with God's word, and prevents the Catholic

mention which body is to perform the screening. Logic suggests, however, that the only body capable of such a screening would be the one that supervises episcopal affairs, i.e., the Roman curia under the supervision of the pope.

¹Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19; Alexandre Ganoczy, "How Can One Evaluate Collegiality Vis-à-vis Papal Primacy?" in *Papal Ministry in the Church*, ed. Hans Küng (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971), 85. See also Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 69. Such a conclusion is reflected in Dulles's defense of the decision reached by the episcopal synod of 1969, when most bishops "rejected Suenens' doctrine of collegiality." The Belgian cardinal's understanding of collegiality contained inherent criticism of the authoritative style of the papal pronouncements. "[The bishops] preferred," comments Dulles, "the papally centered view of collegiality propounded by Cardinal Wojtyla—a view that casts an important light on the exercise of magisterial authority by both Paul VI and John Paul II." Idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; cf. idem, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," where Dulles applies the principle of collegiality to the college of presbyters. In this article, he states that "to be effective members of the collegium gathered about the bishop, presbyters must always work in solidarity with their colleagues and in subordination to the bishop, whom they in some sort represent" (ibid., 37).

²Dulles, "The Magisterium, the University and the Catholic," 5-6.

community from yielding to the pressures of a secular culture.¹ A Church that compromises its heritage “for the sake of accommodating to current trends quickly discredits itself.” At the same time, the only way the Church can forward the message of Christ to the world is by accepting and upholding the deposit of faith as found in the Scriptures, tradition, and the teaching of the magisterium.² Only then will the Church be able to “dispel the thick clouds of agnosticism, relativism, historicism and pragmatism.”³

Hierarchical Mediation

The transmission, preservation, and proclamation of Catholic faith is possible because the Church, according to Dulles, is a supernaturally empowered medium through which Christ continues his mission on earth and through which believers have access to God. This mediation task takes several forms: dogmatic, sacramental, and hierarchical. The three are so closely interrelated, Dulles claims, that they may be considered inseparable. The first mode calls believers to give assent to the revelatory truths transmitted via apostolic tradition, as scandalous as the deposit of faith may seem to the contemporary mind.⁴ The second points to the fact that through the sacraments Christ is continuously present within the Church, and that his grace has salvific power. Participation in the Catholic sacraments and a belief in their efficacy, is an essential element of one's

¹Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 14; idem, “Panel Discussion,” 75.

²Dulles, “Women Priests: The Case Against,” 49. As an example of the faithful transmission of the deposit of faith, Dulles cites the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, a publication which he believes filled a great need within the Church. Idem, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7.

Dulles maintains that the recent conversion of committed Protestants and Anglicans to Catholicism is due to the belief that apostolic tradition is faithfully preserved within the Roman Catholic Church. Seeing their churches torn apart by relativism and secularism, they “turn to the Catholic Church as the faithful custodian of the apostolic heritage of faith.” Idem, “Seven Essentials of Evangelization,” 400; cf. idem, “The Lure of Catholicism,” 6-14.

³Dulles, “Seven Essentials of Evangelization,” 400.

⁴Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 79-80; idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 14.

salvation.¹ The third mode, hierarchical mediation, closely intertwined with the former two, poses the greatest challenge to those who exhibit a secular mentality. Bishops are not just another humanly established authority. "Christ himself is at work" in the Church, through the teaching and the governing ministry of bishops.² "The entire apparatus of Catholicism, including the hierarchical ministry, the proclaimed word, and the sacraments, has value because and insofar as it gives more adequate and authentic access to the God who comes to us in Jesus Christ."³

Doctrinal Teaching

The message that is transmitted and preserved needs to be taught to the believers. This is the role of the bishops, and their teaching is the highest criterion of Catholic orthodoxy.⁴ Papal and episcopal pronouncements are more than the opinion of a human organization. They constitute the voice of God on earth.⁵ Catholics, therefore, need to heed the teaching of the magisterium, a ministry which is exercised in a variety of ways.

Proclamation

To teach effectively, the magisterium itself must "adhere constantly" to the deposit of faith and proclaim its implications for modern day believers.⁶ Such a task cannot be accomplished by persuasion. The early post-Vatican II years demonstrated that when the

¹Dulles, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 80. The issue of the efficacy of the sacraments is one of the fundamental elements in Dulles's ecclesiology. He states that if their efficacy is questioned, "as though the subjective attitude of faith were all that mattered," the entire system of mediation, with the doctrine of the incarnation, begins to fall apart (ibid., 83).

²Ibid., 80-1; idem, "Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching," 783; idem, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 12.

³Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology," 32.

⁴Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 10.

⁵Dulles, "Panel Discussion," 133; idem, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 89.

⁶Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 16.

magisterium used persuasion to gain believers' assent, success was limited and its authority undermined. The magisterium needs not resort to persuasion since its credibility does not depend upon the believers' approval, but, rather, flows directly from its divine commission. The pope and bishops, confident of divine assistance, should stand firmly by the truth and proclaim it "confidently [and] insistently." As "a sign of contradiction," the Church should not measure its success by worldly standards, such as popularity.¹

Teaching doctrine

As proclaimers of the deposit of faith, bishops must be constantly watchful for doctrinal errors, which, when detected, need to be rectified immediately.² It is the magisterium's task to "innerantly distinguish" between concepts that are part of the divine revelation and others that are in conflict with it.³ It is also its direct responsibility to definitely settle contentious debates within the Church. Endless discussion and a lack of definite action can bring only confusion and chaos.⁴ Dulles values that, under the pontificate of John Paul II, the magisterium has fulfilled these expectations and provided strong doctrinal leadership. While the actions of the hierarchical magisterium may, at

¹Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 24-5; idem, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 16. For this reason, Dulles maintains that "the Catholic Church in our time is blessed by having courageous teachers who do not tailor their message to suit the preferences of their audiences. A church that trims its doctrine to the tastes and opinions of the public is a useless encumbrance, as Jesus implied when he spoke of the salt that had lost its savor (Mt 5:13)." Idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 25.

²Dulles, "The Travails of Dialogue," 20.

³Dulles, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 85.

⁴An example of such a situation, according to Dulles, occurred in the sixties. Between the time when John XXIII established the Commissions for the Study of Problems of Population, the Family, and Birth, in 1963, and the issuance of *Humanae vitae*, in 1968, many theologians, "lacking magisterial direction," made up their own minds regarding the matter of contraception. A similar situation surrounded Paul VI's statements on the ordination of women. While he issued several, "none of these was considered sufficiently authoritative to bind the assent of the faithful." The result, in each case, was confusion and dissent, which would have been minimized if definitive magisterial action had occurred sooner. Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 23; idem, "Pastoral Response to Teaching on Women's Ordination," 179.

times, cause bitterness or resignations, believers must concede that endless discussion only brings harm to the Church. The Catholic Church is especially blessed to have “a divinely instituted authority that can settle contentious issues and dispel false expectations.”¹

In order to meet the requirements of the times the magisterium has also the responsibility of adapting the mutable teachings and structures of the Church.² It must affirm “the meaning of revealed truth in response to new questions.”³ It is true that according to *Gaudium et spes* the task of discerning the “signs of the times” belongs to the whole people of God. Other statements of the Vatican II documents, however, balance such assertions by laying the final responsibility on the shoulders of the bishops alone.⁴ Assisted by “the charism of truth and unfailing faith,”⁵ the episcopal magisterium possesses an authority “that is not given to others.”⁶

Levels of authoritative teachings

What about the teachings themselves? Dulles recognizes three categories of authoritative teachings in the Church:⁷ (1) Infallibly taught doctrines that have their origin in revelation from God; (2) doctrines that are taught infallibly and are inseparably linked

¹Dulles, “Women’s Ordination,” 11. Similar sentiments are found in idem, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 91, and idem, “Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching,” 782.

²Dulles, “Jubilee 2000: Reform and Renewal in the Church,” 6.

³Avery Dulles, “How to Read the Pope,” *The Tablet*, July 25, 1998, 968.

⁴Dulles, “Charisms of the New Evangelizer,” 36; idem, “Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching,” 783.

⁵Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 85.

⁶Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 29.

⁷In setting forth the three levels of magisterial teaching, Dulles follows John Paul II’s teaching, presented in the apostolic letter *Ad tuendam fidem* published in *Origins* 28 (1998): 113-16; cf. idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 312-13.

with revelation, but not necessarily part of the deposit of faith; and (3) non-infallible teachings that are “more or less loosely connected with revelation.”¹

Pronouncements that belong to the first category are usually expressed in the name of the entire Church and find their foundation in Scripture and in tradition. They belong to the deposit of faith and must, therefore, be accepted unconditionally by all who claim to be Christians. No Church member is allowed to dissent from these teachings. Christ’s promise to be present with the leaders of the Church “to the very end of the age” protects the Church from error. If the Church could err in such pronouncements, Dulles asserts, “the powers of death would have triumphed over it.”²

The second category embraces teachings which are not identified with revelation, but without which revelation would not be faithfully taught or preserved and expounded. Some, Dulles deplores, object to this category, claiming that it is an unfounded extension of infallibility towards non-revealed doctrines. He himself retorts that “if the church could not infallibly vouch for the authority of its Scriptures, popes, and councils, her capacity to teach revealed doctrine infallibly would be vacuous.” Here too a firm acceptance of such teachings is essential.³

The third category of doctrinal teachings is probably the most contentious. It involves the ordinary exercise of the papal or episcopal magisterium and includes teachings that are taught without claim to infallibility. These consist of practical teachings and various doctrinal judgments.⁴ They call for neither “Catholic faith” nor “definitive assent,”

¹Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 83.

²Dulles, “The Magisterium, The University and the Catholic,” 5, 6. This category of teaching, Dulles notes, is not usually questioned by Catholics. Unfortunately, he laments, the number of theologians who consider revelation to be an ecstatic encounter with God, devoid of doctrinal content, is increasing. Idem, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 83-5.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 88; idem, “How to Read the Pope,” 967.

⁴Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University and the Catholic,” 6, 8.

but rather for what Vatican II called “religious submission of will and intellect.” Dulles recognizes that the word “submission” (*obsequium*) has been variously interpreted since the Council. He disagrees with Ladislav Örsy and James Coriden, who translate the term *obsequium* as “respect” toward a given teaching. For Dulles the term represents more than “respect.”¹ Its most relevant interpretation occurs in the document issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine and Faith, “Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian,” which states that *obsequium* is “the willingness to submit loyally to the teaching of the magisterium” and that “this kind of response cannot be simply exterior and disciplinary, but must be understood within the logic of faith and under the impulse of obedience to the faith.”² If believers cannot conscientiously accept a given teaching, they must still accept the presupposition that the teaching is correct and set aside time to examine it more deeply, with “a view to arriving at assent.” Such an attitude, Dulles suggests, would avert “the dismissal of noninfallible authentic teaching as if it were a mere opinion favored by ecclesiastical bureaucrats.” Teachings belonging to the third category, though not formally revealed or officially recognized as infallible, belongs to Catholic doctrine, and “to depart from it is true dissent.”³

Dulles is convinced that “to contend that the magisterium is not to be trusted because the arguments from Scripture, tradition, and theological reasoning do not

¹Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 88; cf. James A. Coriden, “Commentary,” in *The Code of Canon Law: Text and Commentary*, ed. James A. Coriden, Thomas J. Green, and Donald E. Heintschel (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 548; Ladislav Örsy, *The Church: Learning and Teaching* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 82-9.

²Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 88; cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian,” *Origins* 20 (1990): 117-26.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 88-9. At times, however, Dulles shows more flexibility toward dissent. The news editor of *America* magazine reports that in a yet unpublished lecture presented on October 17, 2000, Dulles, referring to the pope’s and bishops’ position on the death penalty, said that although he supported the official position, “Catholics were not bound in conscience to agree with it. They should, however, be ‘attentive to the guidance of the pope and bishops’.” “News: Signs of the Times,” *America*, November 4, 2000, 5.

apodictically prove its case is to misunderstand the function of the magisterium and to undermine the faith of Catholics on a multitude of questions.”¹ The acceptance of all teaching emanating from the episcopate and the Roman see is, therefore, essential for the internal well-being of the Church, as well as for the advancement of its mission.²

The Preservation of Unity Through Jurisdiction

The pastoral functions of the bishops, as outlined above, are to be supplemented by the task of preserving unity. The unity of the Church is achieved when the Church is governed by the bishops under the guidance of the Roman See. Christ “set Peter over the rest of the apostles” as the “permanent principle of unity.” United with their head, the bishops are to oversee the entire community of believers, so it might be maintained “in the unity of faith and communion.”³

Dulles deplores the fact that too many modern authors minimize the jurisdictional powers of the episcopate,⁴ contrasting the first millennium of Christian history, marked by communion, with the second, characterized by sovereignty and jurisdiction. These two approaches are not in opposition. The jurisdictional developments of the second millennium were necessary and beneficial developments within the Church. Jurisdiction is simply “a modality of pastoral government” and, as such, a guarantor of communion.⁵

¹Dulles, “John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church,” 13.

²Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 23; idem, “Evangelizing Theology,” 31-2.

³Dulles, “The Church as ‘One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic’,” 17.

⁴Jurisdiction may be defined as the right to exercise official and public authority in some capacity. It comes from the Latin *ius*, the right, and *dicere*, to say, thus *iurisdictio*, official authority. O'Donnell, 237.

⁵Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion*, 311. Dulles comments that “although legalism can be pressed too far, the Church as an enduring visible society surely needs legislation and jurisdiction. Pottmeyer, like many other authors since Yves Congar, seems overinclined to idealize the first millennium and to dismiss the second as a regression” (ibid.).

Even so, the emphasis upon the jurisdictional powers of the papacy and the episcopacy should not eclipse other dimensions of their episcopal ministry. *Lumen gentium*, he observes, emphasized that one of the bishop's tasks is to serve the "flock of Christ," which is achieved through preaching and the provision of Christian guidance.¹ The fact that bishops are sometimes portrayed as "servants" does not mean, however, that the believers whom they serve may control their actions. Rather, Dulles leans towards the view that a scriptural understanding of service generates a "genuine power of obligation" on the part of believers.²

In synthesis, Dulles recognizes the hierarchical magisterium as a divinely established institution. As a permanent feature of the Church, it is not subject to human tampering. Any attempt to interfere with divine design, therefore, could result in serious consequences for the unity and well-being of the Church. The magisterium is endowed with special charisms that allow it to authoritatively mediate Christ's revelation to the faithful, transmit and preserve the deposit of faith, offer final judgment in matters of faith and morals, and preserve the unity of the Church. The faithful are expected to loyally accede to the teachings emanating from the episcopate and the Roman see.

Theologians in the Church

Dulles's grasp of the magisterium's task impinges rather significantly on his understanding of the nature of Catholic theology and the role of theologians in the Church, especially in comparison with the earlier period of his life. During the nineties he wrote several articles in which he attempted, directly or indirectly, to suggest operational principles for Catholic theologians. He refers to the same issues in many other of his writings.

¹Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 46.

²Dulles, "Panel Discussion," 94.

The State of Post-Vatican II Theology

It is generally accepted that the Second Vatican Council was an example of fruitful co-operation between the magisterium and the theologians. By inviting theologians to serve as *periti* during the Council, the bishops encouraged the prospect that theologians could constructively impact the direction of the Church.¹ Some of them were among “the former victims of the Holy Office.” Others who had often been forbidden to teach and publish their writings were now held in “high honour.” Their role was no longer that of a “conveyor-belt system of the *magisterium*; they were to be the heralds of the new and dynamic element in the Church.”² Moreover, writes Jay P. Dolan, “the Council had sanctioned the right to dissent, and the majority of Catholic intellectuals welcomed this.”³

In more recent years Dulles would disagree with Dolan’s assessment that the Council “sanctioned the right to dissent” and inaugurated “a new era of freedom.” He goes as far as declaring that such interpretations were the root of various problems facing the Church in the post-Conciliar years. As a result of such thinking much of Roman Catholic theology today does not conform with the teachings of the Bible, tradition, or the episcopal magisterium.⁴ As the nineties progressed, in conformity with his preference for a traditional approach to theology, Dulles became increasingly critical of the theological trends represented by his more liberal colleagues in Catholic academia.⁵ Like George Kelly

¹Hebblethwaite, 103. The Council Fathers, Hebblethwaite notes, utilized more than four hundred *periti* (ibid.).

²Ibid.

³Dolan, 445. Dolan names Dulles as one of these intellectuals (ibid.).

⁴Dulles, “Pastoral Response to Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” 179. This point was particularly underlined by Dulles during my interview at Fordham University.

⁵Schaeffer, “Giants Dissent, Gently, Over Authority,” 4. Here and there, when discussing the current state of theology, Dulles’s language seems worth noticing. Thus, in *The Priestly Office*, those who would want to see adjustments in current practices within the Church are described as “clamor[ing]” for change. Others, who question the social mission of the Church, are criticized for adhering to a “secular” mentality. Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 70, 45. Similar criticisms were also voiced by Philip J. Murnion in his review of *The Priestly Office*, by Avery Dulles, *Church* 13 (1997): 51.

in 1976,¹ Dulles rejects the views advocated by some Catholic scholars who teach that “the church can reconstruct or reinvent itself to conform to the needs of the times.”² Too often, “progressivist” theologians “assume that the Holy Spirit is with them and their party, not with Scripture, tradition and the ecclesiastical magisterium.”³

The problems that plague contemporary Catholic theology, affirms Dulles, are unmistakable. There is, among other things, an unduly critical attitude towards the sources of theology, subjecting them to “deliberate doubt” and accepting only those that conform to “the criteria of autonomous reason.”⁴ A frequently misinterpreted concept of human

See also Avery Dulles, “How Catholic Is CTSA?” *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 13-4, where he offers a scathing criticism of the Catholic Theological Society of America’s 1997 convention. He himself was a past president of the society (1975) and in 1970 received its highest award. He concurs with Bernard Cardinal Law’s assessment that the CTSA “has become an association of advocacy for theological dissent and, in fact, a wasteland,” adding that Catholic theologians today face only one alternative: “to follow the directions represented by the CTSA or to adhere to the tradition as taught by the popes and councils” (ibid., 14). Dulles’s article is followed by a response by Mary Ann Donovan, professor of Historical Theology at Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, who writes: “Many of us who have admired Avery Dulles can only ask what could have led this eminent theologian to adopt so hostile an attitude toward the CTSA and to offer so misleading an interpretation of its 1997 convention.” Mary Ann Donovan, “How Catholic Is CTSA?” *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 14-6. While noting the correctness of some of Dulles’s criticism of the CTSA, Peter Steinfels also suggests that Dulles uses unfair language and ascribes tone and meanings that he “neither recall[s] nor find[s] in the text [of the conference].” Peter Steinfels, “How Catholic Is CTSA?” *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 16-7.

¹In his 1976 article “An Uncertain Church?” George Kelly alleged that a group of Catholic scholars “strategically situated in Catholic universities, in Catholic seminaries and mother-houses, and in Catholic editorial offices” are involved in “a well orchestrated effort” to de-emphasize the authority of the popes and bishops in the Church and create a more democratically run Church government. Interestingly enough, Kelly also attacked the idea of the two magisteria once advocated by Dulles: “Its [the Group] members have lately begun to assert their right to be the second authoritative teaching voice of the church, even if it means standing up to and against bishops and pope.” Kelly, “An Uncertain Church,” 8.

²Dulles, “Pastoral Response to Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” 179.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid. Such theology, Dulles points out, often begins with criticism of papal and episcopal pronouncements, attempting to find support for its arguments in tradition. Then it turns against tradition, criticizing it in the light of the Bible, and, finally, the Bible is criticized in the light of “the historical Jesus.” And, “if the historical reconstruction of Jesus does not yield the desired result,” even he comes in for criticism (ibid.); idem, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 14-5.

equality is all too often used to justify the existence of pluralism of thought and the validity of contradictory opinions.¹ Under pretense of being open to new ideas, the world of Catholic theology has become a confusing “jungle” of conflicting ideas, all aggressively promoted by their proponents.²

While conceding that it would be unfair to blame theology alone for the problems facing the Church, Dulles insists that theologians are at least partly responsible for the watering down of Catholic doctrine. They should not bury their heads in the sand, but contribute to the restoration of the authority of the Church in the world and to the revival of Catholic theology.³ Considering himself a theologian for whom the well-being and mission of the Church are of the highest importance, Dulles does not hesitate to define the fundamental characteristics of Catholic theology and to propose several principles according to which a theology that calls itself “Catholic” must operate.⁴

Constitutive Characteristics of Catholic Theology

Theology is defined by Dulles as “a disciplined reflection on faith” conducted “in faith.” It always begins with divine revelation and studies its nature, content, and implications.⁵ When correctly practiced, i.e., when it is done with an attitude of faith, theology can become “a great intellectual adventure” that enables theologians to explore the

¹Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 84.

²Ibid., 83-4.

³Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 18. Dulles is careful not to blame theologians for all the problems facing the Church. Other factors are mentioned as contributing to the contemporary crisis of ecclesial authority: the disappearance of purely Catholic neighborhoods that produced committed Catholics; the daily association of Catholic believers with non-Catholics; and a “daring” and “dangerous” shift in official policies allegedly approved by the Second Vatican Council. Idem, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 12-3; cf. idem, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 11-8.

⁴Dulles states that although there are “extremists” on both sides of the theological spectrum, he remains convinced that mainstream Catholic theologians can come to an agreement on basic principles of theological method (ibid., 18).

⁵Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 304.

mystery of God's revelation; to "put on the mind of Christ" and understand reality as it was seen by him.¹ Dulles specifies the following constitutive aspects that should characterize proper Catholic theology.

Catholicity and Catholicism

One's understanding of the nature of Roman Catholic theology, writes Dulles, depends, to a large extent, on one's views regarding the notions of "catholicity" and "Catholicism." The former, derived from the Greek *kath'holou*, may be translated "according to the whole." In the New Testament the term is closely associated with *pleroma*, which stands for fullness or plenitude, and is often applied to God. Hence, it is proper to say that "the church's catholicity is a participation in the catholicity (or fullness, if you prefer) of God and Christ." The purpose of the Roman Catholic Church is to bring its members and the world into the fullness of the knowledge of God. To accomplish this task, God established visible structures and institutions through which he chose to bestow his gifts.²

The primary goal of Catholic theology is to participate in the task of preservation, transmission, and appropriation of the message given to the Church. In accepting and "cherishing" Christ's revelation, theology "adheres to the fullness of the given, cleaves to God's Yes in Christ, and rejects all that stands in opposition to him." Catholic theology, therefore, is obliged to accept the "inclusiveness" that is implied by the concept of catholicity and the "specificity" provided by the visible mediation of the Church that is expressed in the concept of Catholicism.³

¹Dulles, "From the Heart of Priestly Formation: The Future of Seminary Theology," 40.

²Dulles, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 74, 80-1; idem, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 304.

³Ibid., 74-5, 80-1, 84; idem, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 304-05. Dulles indicates that, for him, the faith of the Roman Catholic Church is not just another type of religion that can be listed parallel to other systems of beliefs. He strongly argues that Catholic Christianity represents the only true Christian faith "in its purity and fullness. Any version of Christianity that is not Catholic is to that extent deficient. It lacks either the

The Evangelical Dimension of Theology

Catholic theology shares another constitutive characteristic, namely, its evangelical dimension. In accord with the general direction provided by popes Paul VI and John Paul II, Dulles believes that Catholic theology should become truly evangelical if it hopes to collaborate in the fulfillment of the Church's mission. While the episcopal leaders of the Church have embraced the task of evangelization,¹ Catholic theology "still lags behind" this post-Vatican II development and has not yet embraced the evangelical vision. This may be because such a program of evangelization requires a radical renewal of Catholic theology, which may threaten some established modes of thinking.²

Such a truly evangelical and Catholic theology differs from previous Catholic theologies, as well as from Protestant theology. Scholasticism and counter-reformational theologies were adequate for a society predominantly Christian. They presumed the truthfulness of traditional Catholic sources and were concerned mainly with pursuing "subtle theoretical questions." It was too rationalistic and ecclesiocentric to be considered evangelical. In contrast, the main purpose of Roman Catholic evangelical theology is to purity or the completeness that are connoted by the term 'Catholic'." Idem, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 75.

¹Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology," 28.

²Dulles considers that the reluctance to embrace the evangelical vision presented in the writings of recent popes should be overcome, especially in view of "the deep religious hunger that continues to stir in the hearts of contemporary men and women." Dissatisfied with the superficiality of modern culture, many long to discover the true meaning of life. Dulles points out that many evangelically oriented modern denominations, such as Seventh-day Adventists, Pentecostals, or Southern Baptists, have responded to such needs and are winning numerous converts. "One wonders," Dulles concludes, "why, with all the official encouragement given to evangelization by Vatican II and the recent popes, Catholics are for the most part ready to leave the task to Protestants, some of whom are overtly hostile to Catholicism." Ibid., 27-8. See also his commentary on the reception of *Evangelii Nuntiandi* in "The Reception of *Evangelii Nuntiandi* in the West," in *L'Esortazione Apostolica Di Paolo VI Evangelii Nuntiandi. Storia, Contenuti, Ricezione*, ed. Pubblicazioni Dell'Istituto Paolo VI 19 (Brescia: Istituto Paolo VI, 1998), 244-50.

reflect upon the “the ways in which the Holy Spirit transforms the gospel into the power of salvation for all who believe.”¹

Catholic evangelical theology should also differ from Protestant evangelicalism. It rejects the doctrine of salvation by faith alone and, instead, focuses on the role of the Church in renewing the lives of believers as well as transforming “the larger secular society in the image of the kingdom of God.” Dulles asserts that only an authentic Catholic theology, established upon the firm foundation of Catholic tradition and renewed in the spirit of evangelism, can hope to be useful to the Church in completing its mission to a world ridden by the conflicting teachings of contemporary philosophies.² Roman Catholic evangelical theology, therefore, must continually re-examine itself and eliminate all factors which may impede the process of evangelization. This objective, Dulles states, can best be achieved under the guidance of divinely established authorities within the Church. “By opening itself more fully to the word of God” as it is proclaimed through the Scriptures, tradition and the living authority of Christ, theology “can assist the Church to adhere to that word more faithfully and proclaim it more effectively, so that the whole world, in the words of Vatican II, ‘by hearing the message of salvation, may believe, and by believing may hope, and by hoping may love’.”³

Its foundations securely established, Dulles advances specific principles (criteria) that may help restore the credibility of Catholic theology and allow it to assist the Church with the program of evangelization.⁴

¹Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 28.

²Ibid.

³Ibid. 32.

⁴What follows is primarily a condensation of the material that Dulles presents in two articles, i.e., “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” written in 1995, and “Principles of Catholic Theology,” written in 1999, with some material from other sources. The former was originally delivered as a lecture during a Pre-Convention Seminar of the 1995 Catholic Theological Society of America. The seminar was convened by several Catholic theologians concerned with the state of Catholic theology. The second article is essentially a development of the earlier one. In “Criteria” Dulles presents fifteen principles. In the 1999 article he lists only ten that somewhat overlap the original fifteen. I have retained

Basic Principles of Catholic Theology

Respect for Reason

From patristic times Catholic theology proclaimed the fundamental compatibility of faith and reason, Dulles maintains. In fact, the existence of theology is grounded upon the belief that it “is by its very nature ordered to truth” since “revelation is a manifestation of the truth of God.”¹ Any teaching that conflicts with reason cannot have its origin with God. While faith is superior to reason, reason can serve as a foundation for the development of faith. Faith, then, serves as an object of theological reflection. “The pursuit of theology,” Dulles argues, “is itself an expression of confidence in the power of reason within the realm of faith.” This allows Catholic theology to navigate successfully between the errors of fideism and rationalism. Both trends are a perennial danger. In recent years agnosticism, a particular form of rationalism, has endangered Catholic thinking. Tracing its roots to Kant, it proclaims that nothing true can be known outside of what may be grasped by reason, implying that human utterances concerning the divine are mere paradoxes or metaphors. In keeping with the First Vatican Council, Dulles argues that contrary to agnostic assertions it is possible for humans to reach some understanding of the metaphysical reality. Doctrinal statements about God are not, he insists, vestiges of obsolete Scholasticism, but meaningful declarations about the ultimate reality.²

Missionary Universalism

To be considered Catholic, theology must also recognize that it is destined to work “within a universal and indeed a cosmic horizon.” God’s revelation was given to the entire human race. Christ comes to every human being in a unique way, even before the those more directly related to the topic of this dissertation.

¹Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 305.

²Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 76; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 306.

Christian message is proclaimed.¹ While elements of truth can be found in all religious systems, the fullness of the Christian message is found in the Roman Catholic Church alone and is certified by the authority of the living magisterium. Recognizing the universality of God's revelation protects Catholic theology from the dangers of "inclusivist pluralism" on the one hand, and "sectarian narrowness" on the other. Dulles, however, rejects the charge that Roman Catholicism is a "weak compromise" between these extremes. "The same principle that requires adherence to the fullness of the given calls for a rejection of all that could dilute or adulterate the gift." The universal dimension of God's revelation, explains Dulles, does not absolve the Church from missionary activity, for while Catholic theology may utilize the authentic Christian components found in other religious systems, it is obliged to work towards bringing all humanity towards the fullness of divine revelation.²

Ecclesial Context

To be Catholic, theology must be exercised within an ecclesial framework, for the very object of theological reflection, the Catholic faith, is mediated by the Church. It must be conducted from within the community of faith. The ecclesial quality of Catholic theology differentiates it from various individualistic theologies, as well as from those that are primarily "accountable to secular communities, whether academic, political, ethnic, or the like."³

That ecclesial context is the Roman Catholic Church, in which the Church established by Christ subsists, and which is permanently dependent upon its communion with the apostolic see of Rome. "Catholic theology," Dulles asserts, "*emanates from the*

¹Dulles, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 307. For this reason, Dulles asserts, Catholic theology rejects any theory that proclaims limited atonement and double predestination. Idem, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 77.

²Dulles, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 77-8; idem, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 307-08.

³Dulles, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 308.

Catholic Church, as it calls upon its members to meditate on its heritage of faith,” and “is *directed to the Catholic Church* inasmuch as it strives to build that Church.”¹

Differentiated Unity

As weighty is the principle of the unity of the body of Christ, for here Catholic theology should play a major role. By promoting fidelity towards Catholic institutions, traditions, and teachings, it can prevent the fragmentation of contemporary Catholicism. Not that unity should amount to conformity, for the Church, in agreement with its Catholicity, should make room for expressions of cultural distinctiveness and allow for various indigenous elements to positively affect the worship and practice of a Catholic community in a given geographical area. More importantly, Catholic theologians must take care not to allow the contemporary relativistic climate to break up the sense of unity that rests “upon universal human reason and upon the public revelation that God directs to the whole world.” At the same time, Catholic theology is to proclaim the truths of revelation and avoid promoting the self-interest of individual theological schools. Blinded by their own speculations and deprived of magisterial guidance, such theologians might easily lose their connection with the universal Church and become agents of disunity.²

Continuity with the Past

One’s connection with the past is another major principle that should guide Catholic theologians. Reverence for traditional Catholic teaching enables Catholic theology to counteract the encroachment of relativism and modernistic historicism, which claim that each succeeding generation must establish its own truths. This is ignoring that truths of divine revelation transcend the constrictions of time and place. Utilizing the wisdom found in Catholic tradition, theologians “will gratefully receive what has been handed down in the

¹Ibid. (emphasis his).

²Ibid., 309-10. Dulles especially takes to task any form of what he calls “theological activism.” Such activity is especially dangerous when it becomes an organized movement, much like a political party (ibid.).

tradition, and will seek to help others to appreciate and learn from it.” Far from being a hindrance to the development of doctrine, the determination to stay in continuity with the Catholic tradition will contribute to an authentic development of doctrine. It is imperative that Catholic theologians refrain from criticizing the past teachings of the Church as well as from promoting innovative ideas mainly for the sake of change.¹

The Sense of the Faithful and the Consensus Principle

What about the sense of the faithful? In the years following the Second Vatican Council, the concept of the *sensus fidelium* gained notoriety. The Council Fathers had hoped that an emphasis upon the *sensus fidelium* working in tandem with episcopal collegiality would recast the exercise of papal primacy. While in the past Dulles saw the *sensus fidelium* as one of the primary doctrinal sources,² in recent years he no longer considers it a “useful category.”³ In the post-Vatican II years the *sensus fidelium* has often served as a platform for the development of theories incongruent with Catholic tradition.⁴ Although he does not exclude the possibility that the sense of the faithful may still at times be a valid doctrinal source,⁵ Dulles has come to qualify the manner in which it is to be exercised. It must not be confused with “public opinion,” which is often influenced by its secular environment. It can be a useful source of doctrinal knowledge only if believers “are

¹Ibid., 310.

²Dulles, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 21; cf. idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 308; idem, “The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection,” 165.

³Dulles, interview, March 5, 2001.

⁴Ibid. Dulles's views regarding the *sensus fidelium* and the havoc wrought by the misinterpretation of the concept are discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

⁵In a recent statement, while asserting that the plenitude of doctrinal power was placed in the hands of the hierarchy, Dulles did not deny the fact that some doctrinal initiatives may come from below. While this is true, it still is the task of the hierarchy to discern and validate the presence of the Spirit. Dulles, “Panel Discussion,” 76.

disposed to think with the Church” and are in agreement with, and subject to, the guidance of the hierarchical magisterium.¹

Fidelity to the Magisterium

Catholic theologians must acknowledge that the pope, as the successor of Peter, and the college of bishops in communion with him, are the sole judges of doctrinal orthodoxy.² Thus, while they may be considered teachers in the Church, it must be stressed that theologians “do not *teach* the Church” and have no “authoritative teaching power.”³ They must yield to the hierarchical magisterium and labor for a trust-based relationship with its members. While not all statements of the magisterium have equal doctrinal weight,⁴ theologians, like other believers, should submit to and disseminate every teaching emanating from the Roman See. Catholic tradition, as authenticated by the magisterium, constitutes a “secure platform” upon which theologians may conduct their inquiries into the meaning of faith. Moreover, it needs to be noted that

thanks to the cumulative character of the process of doctrinal development, theologians are dispensed from continually having to reexamine matters that have been definitively settled. They are liberated to concentrate on new and actual questions, bringing to bear the full resources of Catholic wisdom as it has developed over the ages.⁵

Dulles does not, however, discard the possibility that legitimate questions may be raised regarding a given teaching. These should be considered as the subject of dialogue between the magisterium and theologians,⁶ the purpose of which is the eventual acceptance

¹Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 81; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 311. It appears that the notion of the *sensus fidelium* has been supplanted in the recent Dulles by an emphasis on the participation of all believers in the task of evangelization. Cf. idem, “Seven Essentials of Evangelization,” 398.

²Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313; cf. idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 10.

³Dulles, “Panel discussion,” 79 (emphasis his).

⁴Cf. pp. 174-77 above.

⁵Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313.

⁶The nature of dialogue, as seen by Dulles, is discussed in a later section of this

of hierarchical teaching. The work of those theologians who refuse to submit themselves to the authority of the magisterium “falls short of being fully Catholic.”¹

‘Ex Corde Ecclesiae’ and Canonical Mission

What about a theologian’s canonical mission? In the past, academic qualifications, such as advanced degrees, the recognition of fellow theologians, noteworthy publications, or holding the position of professor of theology at a Catholic institution of higher education guaranteed a theologian’s qualification to teach Catholic doctrine. This no longer is true, argues Dulles. Many theologians hold degrees from secular universities and their views are often influenced by a modern secular mentality which they inadvertently pass on to their students. Furthermore, modern views regarding academic freedom, accepted at many Catholic institutions, disallow scholars to use their faith in, or fidelity to, a given teaching as standards for teaching theology. “To the extent that they become involved in this system,” Dulles writes, “Catholic theologians lose the ecclesial status that they might otherwise have.”² For this reason, if theologians want to participate in the Church’s prophetic mission and be considered “collaborators” in forwarding the task of the Church, they should obtain a canonical mandate from the episcopal body. Rather than an extra burden, such a mandate or “canonical mission” would actually improve the relationship between theologians and the hierarchical leadership. Theologians should be eager to accept such a canonical mission as a sign of trust from the hierarchical leadership.³

It is not surprising, therefore, that Dulles came out in support of the implementation of precepts found in the apostolic constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, published by Pope John chapter dealing with the relationship between theologians and magisterium. See pp. 198-203 below.

¹Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 315.

²Ibid., 314.

³Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 314-15. Dulles qualifies his statement, however, by stating that all Catholic theologians do not necessarily need to obtain a canonical mission (ibid.).

Paul II in 1990.¹ The document, Dulles maintains, constitutes an attempt to establish rules to keep Catholic theology “in line with Catholic orthodoxy.”² To that effect, while recognizing the need for “honest research” and “a certain autonomy” for theologians, it also calls for episcopal supervision. “It remind[s] Catholic teachers,” Dulles adds, “of their duty to respect Catholic doctrine and morals in their teaching, ‘aware that they fulfill a mandate received from the Church,’ whose magisterium is ‘the authentic interpreter of Sacred Scripture and Sacred Tradition’.”³ On November 17, 1999, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops finally adopted a text on how *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* was to be implemented in the United States. This document states that while the work of theologians holding faculty positions in Catholic universities should “reflect current scholarship,” their teachings must also be in agreement with the current teachings of the magisterium. Theologians are thus required to receive a mandate from the bishop in whose diocese the school is located.⁴

¹For the complete text of the constitution, see John Paul II, “*Ex Corde Ecclesiae*,” *Origins* 20 (1990): 265-76; cf. Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” where Dulles calls for “vigilance . . . in regulating the flow of theological ideas” by the ecclesiastical authorities which should “indicate what theological ideas are compatible with Christian faith. This, one may surmise, is the very purpose for which Christ instituted an apostolic college with authority to teach” (ibid., 84).

²Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 14. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* is, according to Dulles, one of the three major papal attempts to bring theological teaching under the control of the episcopate. The first was John Paul II’s apostolic constitution, *Sapientia christiana*, *Origins* 9 (1979): 33-45, issued at the very outset of his pontificate. Then comes the English version of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1994), which Dulles recognizes as “the boldest challenge yet offered to the cultural relativism that currently threatens to erode the contents of Catholic faith.” Idem, “The Magisterium, The University, and the Catholic,” 14-5; cf. idem, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 46.

³Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 17.

⁴Ibid. While scholars sharing Dulles’s views welcomed the episcopal decision, its adoption by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops caused a major stir among others. Pamela Schaeffer reports that Sr. Margaret Farley, president of the Catholic Theological Society of America, stated that many theologians were “very worried.” “Clearly some theologians,” Farley continued, “who see their role as a kind of mission are pleased with this. However the great majority are dismayed and worried, wondering what the consequences of this will be. It will create a climate of suspicion not conducive to scholarly work or education.” The CTSA, Schaeffer reports, issued a statement which reported that “theologians recognize the concerns of bishops for genuinely Catholic

Accepting the canonical mission does not, in Dulles's opinion, violate freedom of inquiry, for freedom is "a right to understand and elucidate, not to contest," the teachings of the Church.¹ Freedom, Dulles maintains, can only be meaningful if it is used in the service of truth. Otherwise, it is only a "false and illusory freedom." True freedom cannot exist "without accountability to [a] higher agency."² Similarly, while academic freedom allows theologians to carry on their inquiries, to teach and publish, their study is necessarily limited by the criteria and methods inherent to theology itself, one of which is adherence to the sources of Catholic truth. "While no one is compelled to become a religious believer, anyone who undertakes to perform a task that presupposes faith would be disqualified by lack of faith."³

theology, and they share these concerns. However, efforts to control the work of theologians, as they are laid out in this document, are both unnecessary and potentially damaging to the best work of theology." For details, see Schaeffer, "Bishops Approve *Ex Corde* Norms," 6. The episcopal body itself does not seem fully united on the necessity of the norms either. Archbishop Rembert Weakland of Milwaukee protested the approval of the text, expressing concern as to how it would be implemented. He suggested that passing the document would lead to "public bickering and public disputes that will bring harm to the church." He added: "I have tremendous unrest in my heart. I am very uneasy about it. I believe passing this document now will create a pastoral disaster for the church in the U.S.A. I feel it is not the right moment. . . . Probably the tension between the hierarchy and theologians now is the highest I have ever seen it in my 36 years as a superior in the Catholic church. Now theologians will be ever more defensive and have less trust." Rembert Weakland, "It Will Lead Only to Public Bickering," *NCR*, December 3, 1999, 7. See also Pamela Schaeffer, "Academic Leaders Hope to Head Off Bishops' Vote on *Ex Corde* Norms," *NCR*, November 12, 1999, 12-3; idem, "Catholic U. Move to Tighten Control Over Religious Studies Faculty," *NCR*, December 17, 1999, 3; idem, "In Wake of *Ex Corde* Theologians Ponder Options," *NCR*, February 25, 2000, 7; James J. Conn, "The Academic Mandatum: Another Step Toward Implementation," *America*, February 5, 2001, 19-22; Patricia Lefevere, "Implementing License to Teach Worries Theologians: Bishops Will Standardize *Mandatum* Procedures," *NCR*, February 16, 2001, 7. Note that the National Conference of Catholic Bishops is a new designation for the U. S. Catholic Bishops Conference.

¹Dulles, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 91.

²Avery Dulles, *Truth as the Ground of Freedom: A Theme from John Paul II* (Grand Rapids: Acton Institute, 1997), 14; idem, "Dialogue," 9. Dulles points out that modern, and especially American, society tends to "absolutize" freedom (*ibid.*); idem, "Seven Essentials of Evangelization," 91.

³Avery Dulles, "The Place of Theology in a Catholic University," in *Catholic Theology in the University: Source of Wholeness*, ed. Virginia M. Shaddy (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1998), 67. On this point, Dulles agrees with Bernard Green, who states that while theologians have freedom to inquire "within faith," they are not "mere

Although consenting to the episcopal proposal,¹ Dulles remains somewhat concerned about the implementation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. “Many of us [Jesuits] suspect that ways can be found to implement the ‘mandate’ for teachers of theological subjects in this country,” he states, “but we recognize that zeal must be tempered by prudence so that the remedy will not inflict unintended damage.”² If bishops implement the norms with prudence and realism, and theological faculties recognize magisterial rights, the healing of tensions should be possible.³ Still, would the acceptance of episcopal norms affect the problem of dissent?

The Issue of Dissent

Dulles does not entirely discard the possibility of dissent within the Roman Catholic Church.⁴ Although doubts and non-disruptive dissent may sometimes be tolerated on the part of the majority of Church members who may be less informed regarding the teachings of the Church, such a “policy of lenience,” insists Dulles, does not apply to those who

searcher[s].” “Once the decision for the Church has been made,” Green writes, “the Catholic stands committed to a body of religious truth to which he is even willing to witness.” Bernard D. Green, “Catholicism Confronts New Age Syncretism,” *NOR*, April 1994, 19; cf. Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 15.

¹Richard P. McBrien disagrees with Dulles on this point and claims that implementing the measures contained in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* would compromise “the academic integrity of the faculty and the university.” McBrien believes that freedom and institutional autonomy would be impinged upon if an external control system was allowed to govern academic processes such as the appointment, retention and promotion of faculty, as well as the specification of courses faculty members could teach and in which departments. Academic administration and the faculty alone should determine these matters. Otherwise, “the Catholic institution in question would no longer be a university in the commonly accepted academic meaning of the word.” Richard P. McBrien, “Why I Shall Not Seek a Mandate,” *America*, February 12, 2000, 14.

²Avery Dulles, “Reply to Msgr. Kelly,” *Catholic New York*, July 22, 1999, 13; Richard P. McBrien writes that it is “unclear to everyone, including the bishops themselves, how the mandate will be implemented.” “Why I Shall Not Seek a Mandate,” 14.

³Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 22.

⁴Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 26-7.

teach Catholic doctrine. When the Church officially proclaims its teaching as truth, it cannot allow “those who speak in its name to teach the contrary.”¹

There are times, admits Dulles, when individual theologians might express concerns regarding the manner in which a certain teaching of the magisterium is supported. In such cases, they should submit their suggestions in a “prudent and respectful manner.” Even so, love for the Church and its unity should constrain them to make such instances of dissent “rare, reluctant, and respectful,”² remembering that public dissent is unacceptable.³ Dissent is “a deep wound in the body of Christ”⁴ and by its very nature threatens the unity of the Church by challenging its authority in matters of faith and morals. These are closely related to revealed truth.⁵

Thus, whenever dissenters continue to maintain their views and express them publicly, ecclesiastical authorities should enact “just penalties” by virtue of canon law.⁶

¹Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 27. In the early nineties Dulles still viewed dissent as a necessary and useful, although not entirely benign, feature of Church life. “To deny its existence or to seek to suppress it would be more harmful than to acknowledge it and deal with it honestly.” Idem, “The Teaching Mission of the Church and Academic Freedom,” 48. As the nineties progressed, however, his views on dissent became increasingly unyielding.

²Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89; idem, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 26-7. In my interview with Dulles at Fordham University, he referred to this as his “three ‘r’ principle” and several times underlined its importance.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 91. On this point, Dulles fully agrees with John Paul II’s statement: “It is sometimes claimed that dissent from the magisterium is totally compatible with being a ‘good Catholic’ and poses no obstacle to the reception of the sacraments. This is a grave error that challenges the teaching office of the bishops of the United States and elsewhere. . . . Dissent from Church doctrine remains what it is, dissent; as such it may not be proposed or received on an equal footing with the Church’s authentic teaching.” Idem, *The Splendor of Faith*, 72; cf. John Paul II, “The Pope’s Address,” *Origins* 17 (1987): 261.

⁴Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent,” 777.

⁵Dulles, “How to Read the Pope,” 968; idem, “*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent,” 777.

⁶Dulles, “How to Read the Pope,” 967; idem, “Pastoral Response to Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” 178.

Dissenting theologians have only one alternative: either to follow their aberrations or to adhere to truth present in the teachings of the popes and councils.¹ In a world where relativism and skepticism are increasingly threatening the stability and well-being of the Church, the unity of the Church and the orthodoxy of its teachings must be the primary concern of not just the pope and the bishops, but also of theologians.² While Dulles decries the present condition of Catholic theology, which he believes is in a “state of chaos,”³ he predicts its revivification, a restoration that would reinstate theology to its rightful place as defender of the teachings of the Church.

Dulles's View on the Future of Catholic Theology

In a seminal address, which he delivered in 1996 at the St. Joseph Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, in which he presented his vision for the future of Catholic theology,⁴ Dulles juxtaposed and compared two areas of theological activity, i.e., university theology and seminary theology.

University Theology

Dulles sees the university as a place where “research is carried on according to the principles of scientific method, beginning with hard data of positive science and facts that can be recognized by any normal person.” One may be able to do theology within the university, but its status is downgraded to just one of the sciences. As such, like other

¹Dulles, “How Catholic Is CTSA?” 14.

²Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 91; idem, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 26, 28; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313; idem, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 80.

³Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 18.

⁴This address was later published under the title “Prospects for Seminary Theology,” *Seminary Journal* (Winter 1996): 12-9; cf. idem, “The Future of Seminary Theology,” 38-42.

sciences, it is subject to the rigors of scientific methodology and is distinct from a faith commitment.¹

In this context, while theology may have “a more secure place” at Catholic universities, the last half century has witnessed the growing influence of secularism. It is no longer the “queen of the sciences” though it is granted a status similar to that of other disciplines. The university context pressures theological faculties to conform to objective scientific norms and to be open to critical inquiry. Commitment to academic freedom, as understood in a secular environment, fosters autonomy, and it is difficult to enforce the accountability of university theologians to ecclesiastical authorities. In their hiring and promoting policies, theological faculties usually pay more attention to a teacher’s scholarly achievements than to his or her faith commitment. The lack of orthodoxy is not often addressed.

It is true that a university environment has certain advantages. It offers opportunities for inter-religious and inter-disciplinary dialogue, as well as endless possibilities for scholarly research. Still, the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. Striving for secular accreditation, many Catholic schools pursue academic excellence and de-emphasize their religious distinctiveness. The transmission of the Catholic faith is in many cases no longer a priority. “Courses are often given from an uncommitted ‘scientific’ point of view that makes no demands on the faith of the students. Anything that smacks of apologetics or indoctrination is considered unworthy of the university.”²

Seminary Theology

A seminary environment presents a far superior chance for the development of genuine Catholic theology. It is more conducive to the implementation of the primary task of Catholic theology, i.e., the explanation and defense of revealed truths.³ It is an

¹Dulles, “Prospects for Seminary Theology,” 12-3.

²Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 13.

³Ibid.

environment which “stands firmly on three pillars . . . pure doctrine, evangelical spirituality, and liturgical piety.”¹ Here Catholic faith is “not simply” a matter of personal preference but holds an institutional dimension.

Besides, seminary theology occurs in a spiritual context where teachers and students immerse themselves in prayer, meditation, and the study of the sacred sources. Nor should one ignore its liturgical dimension, for the practice of Catholic theology requires theologians to participate in the life of the Church and in its sacraments, through which they may enter into a close relationship with God.²

Given these strengths,³ Dulles suggests ways to increase the visibility of seminary theologians, both nationally and internationally. Let Catholic seminaries develop a curriculum in which scholarly research and publications play an important role. See to it that a seminary’s influence not be confined to the diocese in which it is located, but accept “a greater share of responsibility for the future of the theological enterprise.” Encourage seminary theologians to make themselves more widely known by giving more speeches, participating in major theological conventions, and being involved in various intra- and inter-religious dialogues. In such a context seminaries would become attractive options for

¹Dulles, “Prospects for Seminary Theology,” 14. These three pillars were originally underlined by Dietrich Bonhoeffer after he resigned from his tenure as a professor at the University of Berlin in 1935 in protest to its secularization (ibid.).

²Ibid., 16.

³Dulles also notes several weaknesses of seminary theology. Thus, seminary theology tends to be overly dogmatic and therefore does not often venture into the unknown territories of theological exploration. This is regrettable because students conclude that the Church has answers to all the problems. Besides, seminary theology, like much of American Catholic society, has often been plagued by anti-intellectualism. “In their zeal to impart sound doctrine,” says Dulles, “the faculty could implant a lack of appreciation for serious thinkers who are grappling with unresolved questions.” In addition, seminary theology seems to underplay the problem of doctrinal development. The impression is often given that the official Church teachings have always been the same and have never changed. Finally, the hectic schedule prevents many seminary theologians from keeping in touch with the latest theological developments. The study of such developments could only enhance the qualifications of seminary theologians (ibid., 17-8).

creative theologians who would otherwise choose tenures as university teachers. Dulles writes:

The relatively low visibility of seminary professors who stand firmly within Catholic tradition allows more adventurous university professors to steal the limelight, thus contributing to the false impression that the theology is most vital when it liberates itself from its ecclesial matrix.¹

Since the Second Vatican Council, the center of theological enterprise has moved from seminary to university. This change has not served the enterprise of Catholic theology well, resulting in chaos and allergic attitudes towards the doctrinal authority of the Church. Unless university theologians find a way of integrating their work with the task of the Church at large, university theology could well lose its privileged status, and the center of theological enterprise might once again return to seminaries, where the purity of doctrine, spirituality, and liturgical piety are cherished, under the watchful supervision of Church leaders.²

On the Dialogue Between the Magisterium and Theologians

As Dulles sees it, the subservience of theologians to the magisterium does not preclude the importance of dialogue between these two bodies. As to the nature of such a dialogue, Dulles's views may best be illustrated by his response to the Common Ground initiative launched in 1996 by the late Joseph Cardinal Bernardin of Chicago. The purpose of the initiative, which resulted in two conferences, was to foster dialogue on crucial issues facing the Church. While the initiative was originally designed to constructively address the Church-wide polarization,³ it soon became apparent that the fundamental issue at stake

¹Ibid., 18.

²Ibid., 18-9; idem, "Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition," 15.

³See the opening paragraph of the founding statement, "Called to Be Catholic: Church in a Time of Peril," prepared by the National Pastoral Life Center and released by Cardinal Bernardin on August 12, 1996. For the text of the declaration, see *America*, August 31, 1996, 5-8, or *Origins* 26 (1996): 165-70.

The main issues that the initiative planned to address were the discrepancy between the teaching of the magisterium and the beliefs of many Catholics, the manner in which consultation and decision-making were to be conducted, the issue of the relationship between theology and the magisterium, and the problem of collegiality and subsidiarity in

was becoming the relationship between the magisterium and theologians.¹ While Bernardin's initiative received widespread support, some opposed it. Dialogue, they suggested, weakened the authority of the magisterium and encouraged dissent. Among the harshest critics of the initiative were cardinals Bernard Law of Boston, James Hickey of Washington, and Anthony Bevilacqua of Philadelphia. Margaret O'Brien Steinfels notes that as far as these bishops were concerned, "Common ground is spelled c-o-n-f-u-s-i-o-n. Seeking common ground, they warned, cannot be a back door to compromise on doctrinal matters. The truth is contained in the magisterium, and is not subject to discussion, much less revision. 'Conversion,' not dialogue, is the answer, wrote Cardinal Law."²

To nobody's surprise, Dulles too voiced his concerns regarding the initiative.³ His criticism is not directed against the notion of "dialogue," which, correctly understood, is an excellent thing, but more specifically to what the statement "Called to be Catholic" seems to the Roman Catholic Church. Philip J. Murnion, introduction to *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 2-3.

¹Such was the perception *Commonweal's* editor, Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, in "In Good Faith," *Commonweal*, September 13, 1996, 5-6. See also the article by archbishop Oscar Lipscomb, "Common Ground Between Bishops and Theologians," *Origins* 27 (1997): 72-4. Murnion notes that the issue of authority became so prominent during the first Common Ground Conference that the organizing committee decided to devote the second Conference to the issue of authority in the Church. See his introduction to *Church Authority in American Culture*, 3.

²Steinfels, "In Good Faith," 6. For Cardinal Bernard Law's response to the Common Ground Initiative, see his "Response to 'Called to Be Catholic,'" *Origins* 27 (1996): 170-201.

³Dulles clearly expressed his reservations in a McGinley Lecture at Fordham University in 1996. The lecture was published under the title "Travails of Dialogue." In the article Dulles also set forth his reservations regarding Archbishop John R. Quinn's separate call for dialogue between the magisterium and theologians before important doctrinal decisions were reached. For responses to Dulles's allegations, see Joseph Komonchak, "On the People of God as a Theological and Sociological Reality: The Case for Dialogue," *NCR*, June 8-14, 1997, 5, and Robert Imbelli, "'Common Ground' as Communion—A Witness for the Defense," *NCR*, December 22-28, 1996, 7. For Quinn's presentation and five responses to his presentation offered by R. Scott Appleby, Elizabeth A. Johnson, John F. Kane, Thomas P. Rausch, and Wendy M. Wright, see *The Exercise of the Primacy: Continuing the Dialogue*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998).

“imply,” particularly within “the current atmosphere.”¹ Dulles begins his critique by providing what he regards as the Church’s understanding of the nature of dialogue.

From Polemics to Loyalty

The concept of intra-ecclesial dialogue, Dulles believes, was indeed embraced by the Second Vatican Council. Prior to the Council, the Church exhibited a polemical attitude toward those who stood in opposition to the official teachings of the Church. Following the lead of John XXIII, both Paul VI and John Paul II espoused the concept, commending it as an evangelistic tool. Paul VI predicated it “on the supposition that the members of the Church are bound by the word of God and are obedient to the authorities instituted by Christ.” John Paul II likewise embraced it as an evangelistic tool. Dulles notes, however, that in the pope’s mind dialogue does not replace love for truth and the need for its proclamation.²

On that ground, Dulles defines dialogue as an encounter that must be carried on “in a spirit of mutual respect, with a view to the unity and peace of the whole Church.”³ Its ultimate purpose is a better comprehension of the teachings of the Church and their more persuasive proclamation, for evangelization is “a permanent priority of the Church.”⁴ Thus he writes:

Christian proclamation, even when conducted within a context of dialogue, presupposes that there is a divine revelation, embodying the truth that leads to eternal life. All revelation, in the Christian understanding, comes from the divine Word, which is one and eternal. When Christians engage in dialogue, they do so with the hope of making that one Word better known. In a sense, therefore, Christianity is monologic. Authentic dialogue would be futile unless it helped us to hear the one divine Word.⁵

¹Dulles, “Travails of Dialogue,” 17.

²Ibid., 16; cf. Paul VI, *Ecclesiam suam* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1964).

³Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313; idem, “Travails of Dialogue,” 17.

⁴Dulles, “Travails of Dialogue,” 20. For Dulles, *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* is an example of the “faithful transmission of the Catholic patrimony” (ibid.).

⁵Ibid.

Such an understanding of intra-ecclesial dialogue places theologians in a clearly subservient role, the Catholic episcopate being the only body in the Church divinely endowed with the charisms that “safeguard the transmission of the faith.” As an effective evangelistic tool, any dialogue must be conducted in a spirit of loyalty, trust, and obedience on the part of theologians.¹ Its subject matter should be limited to issues such as the timing of magisterial declarations, the manner of their expression, the strength of supporting argumentation or even, at times, the very content of magisterial pronouncements, always keeping in mind that the bishops have the last word.² Although Dulles concedes that tensions between the magisterium and theologians are, at times, inevitable, he maintains that constructive dialogue between these two bodies can help the Catholic program of evangelization.³ As he sees it, however, the modern notion of dialogue that he finds expressed in the statement announcing the Common Ground initiative calls for some critical remarks.

Critique of the Contemporary Notion of Dialogue

In the years following the Second Vatican Council, some Catholics saw dialogue as a convenient substitute for authority. Consensus between the bishops and the faithful came to be seen as the basis for decision-making in the Church, even in the area of doctrinal teaching, resulting in a widespread crisis of authority and dissent, which has not abated since the Council.⁴

Dulles suggests that the fundamental problem with such a notion of dialogue lies in its relativistic presuppositions. He concurs with Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger that the parties

¹Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 32; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 312; idem, “Travails of Dialogue,” 20.

²Dulles, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 313.

³Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 21; idem, “Evangelizing Theology,” 32.

⁴Dulles, “Travails of Dialogue,” 17.

involved in this kind of dialogue assume equality of their convictions, challenging the fact that some views may contain more truth than others. “Only if I suppose in principle that the other can be as right, or more right than I, can authentic dialogue take place.”¹

Moreover, a new form of liberalism has also influenced the modern concept of dialogue. All religious convictions are confined to the private realm, “so that no public authority may adjudicate questions of truth.” It is purported that all issues relating to truth and morality need to be solved individually, without reference to any external authority. Such a view, Dulles warns, provides justification for dissent, presuming that no one can be “bound in conscience to accept official teaching.”²

In conclusion, within such an atmosphere of individualism and relativistic pluralism, it is highly probable, explain Dulles, that Bernardin’s call for dialogue would be perceived by some Catholic theologians as an attempt to

settle for something less than the full doctrine of the Church and to reach a pragmatic *modus vivendi* among Catholics who continue to disagree about substantive issues. This would lend support for the view, already widespread, that Catholics are free to hold opinions contrary to the official teaching of the Church, at least if they adhere to “basic truths.”³

Intra-ecclesial dialogue should not be understood as a “panacea” designed to heal all the problems facing the Church. It does not necessarily lead to consensus. All parties should recognize that it is an imperfect tool and may at times be “counterproductive.” In some instances it does protract the debate and causes believers to make up their own minds on crucial issues. Often, rather than achieving consensus, prolonged debate only serves to consolidate conflicting opinions.⁴ Catholic theologians, therefore, would do well to subdue their “obsessive preoccupation” with internal debates and concentrate on winning

¹Ibid., 18. Dulles does not indicate the source of Cardinal Ratzinger’s remarks.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 18-9.

⁴Ibid., 20.

the world for Christ.¹ As far as the bishops are concerned, they should “rise to the challenge of Paul’s admonition to Timothy to ‘convince, rebuke, and exhort,’ and to be ‘unfailing in patience and in teaching’.” They should never resort to dialogue to evade their duty as guardians and protectors of truth.²

Avery Dulles’s Ecumenical Perspective

What about inter-denominational dialogue? A perusal of his writings in the nineties shows that ecumenical issues have not been particularly high on Dulles’s agenda. His chief concerns seem to be the safekeeping of orthodoxy, the furtherance of evangelism, and the nature of intra-ecclesial dialogue.

In inter-denominational dialogues his shift towards traditionalism has led him to increasingly emphasize the uniqueness of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church is the only church whose roots reach back to the early Christian community, which, in turn, “was endowed by its founder with covenanted means of grace—doctrinal, sacramental, and ministerial—that enjoy a promise of unfailing divine assistance.”³ Such a stance, in tandem with his current understanding of the magisterium’s role in the Church⁴ and his emphasis upon an evangelistic vision of the Church,⁵ has guided his most recent views on worldwide Christian unity.

Since the primary task of the Church, the guardian of the apostolic heritage, is proclamation, Dulles contends that a “vigorous program of evangelization” is non-negotiable. Unfortunately, such a program is being undermined by the belief, in certain Roman Catholic circles, that dialogue, a conversation between parties whose views are

¹Avery Dulles, “The Catholic Press,” *NCR*, June 8-14, 1997, 4.

²Dulles, “Travails of Dialogue,” 20.

³Dulles, review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, 45.

⁴See Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” 6-11.

⁵See Avery Dulles, “The New Evangelization and Theological Renewal,” *Sacred Heart University Review* 15 (1994-1995): 14-26.

equally valuable, may be substituted for proclamation. As a result, many Catholics have hesitated to present their listeners with the challenge of Catholic proclamation.¹ Catholics today need to recognize that the Roman Catholic Church possesses the fullness of the apostolic revelation, and that “every style of Christianity that lives apart from it suffers from a serious deficiency.”² Since only a church which possesses the full apostolic patrimony can withstand “the forces of dechristianization,”³ Dulles concurs with the document, issued in 1992 by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which suggests that other churches need to “undergo a ‘new conversion to the Lord’ so that they might ‘recognize the continuity of the primacy of Peter in his successors, the bishops of Rome’.” Such a view, Dulles maintains, places a special burden upon ecclesial communities to “acquire elements of the Christian patrimony that are still lacking to them.”⁴

Moreover, the noble goal of visible unity may not be worth much if achieved “at the expense of deeply held convictions.” Such a unity may prove “illusory,” since limitless accommodation may devalue the importance of doctrinal confessions. He thus rejects “easy relativism,” which he believes constitutes a perennial danger for the ecumenical dialogue.⁵ “Nothing short of fullness of revealed truth,” as present both institutionally and doctrinally within the Roman Catholic Church, “can satisfy the prayer of Jesus that all may be one.”⁶

¹Ibid., 18.

²Avery Dulles, review of *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, by Miroslav Volf, *FT*, November 1998, 52; cf. idem, review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, 45.

³Dulles, “Seven Essentials of Evangelization,” 400.

⁴Dulles, “The Church as Communion,” 137-38; cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” *Origins* 22 (1992): 108-12.

⁵Dulles, *The Craft of Theology*, 192-93.

⁶Dulles, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” 78, 80-1; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 304, 309. It appears that Dulles’s views on ecumenism changed somewhat even in the nineties. As late as 1992 he states that ecumenists on all sides should not be overzealous in their attempts to “overcome [their] diversities.” He insists that individual

This may be the reason why, during the 1990s, Dulles tended to become increasingly impatient with inter-ecclesial dialogue. He had come to believe that while such a possibility exists for groups who shared a common heritage, such as Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox, it is unrealistic to expect that such convergence could occur between Catholics and other Christian communities. Such a reunion would require the acceptance of the structure of the Roman Catholic Church, including the papacy as viewed by Vatican I and II, not to mention the role of the Roman magisterium as guardian of the truth and principle of unity.¹ This is probably why, in response to the enthusiastic announcement following the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission discussions of 1999, Dulles declared that the statement went too far in claiming that it resolved the major doctrinal issue of papal primacy. "Perhaps conversion," he stated, "rather than gradual convergence, will be required."²

ecclesial communities should preserve their distinctive heritage, which, rather than being obstacles, could contribute to mutual enrichment. "What could be more useless than a giant supermarket Church that stands for nothing in particular while offering something to everybody?" Genuine ecumenism recognizes the riches of each individual heritage. Idem, *The Craft of Theology*, 193. Dulles also stresses that the ecumenical community needs to recognize that those religious groups which have steadfastly adhered to their own deposit of faith, notably the Roman Catholic communion, may provide the best antidote to the ailments that come with modern culture, which is "surfeited with the lax and the ephemeral." While, in Dulles's opinion, full inter-ecclesial consensus may be out of reach, ecumenical Christianity, with each group staunchly adhering to its own heritage, may prove to be a catalyst to create a community that would transcend denominational barriers. In such a community, believers could "achieve a deeper realization of the ecclesial character of their own faith-commitments" (ibid.). Such an attitude, Dulles suggests, where Catholics relinquish their defensive stance and engage in enriching dialogue without forfeiting their own convictions, may prove to be a powerful aid in the Catholic program of evangelization. Idem, "Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition," 14. This approach, furthermore, might alleviate the animosity of various Christian groups towards Roman Catholicism in the United States, and may lead "reflective evangelicals, as they seek to appropriate the fullness of their Christian heritage . . . to find themselves drawing closer to Catholic positions." Idem, "Season of Grace," *The Tablet*, October 22, 1994, 1342.

¹Dulles, "The Unity for Which We Hope," 143, 123; cf. idem, "Paths to Doctrinal Agreement: Ten Theses," *TS* 47 (1990): 47. Dulles writes that "for the universalists it is a matter of reconstituting the unity of Christians by inducing all to accept the fullness of the apostolic heritage, indefectibly present in the Roman Catholic communion." Idem, "The Church as Communion," 137-8. As it has been noted above, in the nineties Dulles's sympathy lies clearly with the universalist stance. See pp. 159-62 above.

²Dulles, "An Important Bridge Must Yet Be Crossed," 5; cf. Anglican-Roman

Conclusion

This chapter examined the broad lines of Dulles's ecclesiology and, more specifically, his views on the magisterium and theologians, as set forth in his writings during the nineties. My research indicates that in recent years Dulles has adopted an increasingly "traditional" attitude. Traditionalism, or the defense of orthodoxy, he believes, is the only solution to curb the influence of secular methodologies upon Roman Catholic theology. At the same time, his enthusiasm towards the innovations built on various documents of the Second Vatican Council has abated considerably.

In the nineties, Dulles became one of the most vocal and prolific defenders of the prerogatives of the hierarchical magisterium in the United States. His recent writings have been devoted to the dissemination of the teachings of John Paul II, including his widely acclaimed work, *The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II*, published in 1999.

Dulles sees "progressivism," which he equates with liberalism, as the major foe of papal and episcopal authority. In his opinion, the remedy to the widespread damage wrought by post-Vatican II Catholic theology includes a full acceptance of the authority of the magisterium in its current form, as a divine institution, by Roman Catholic theologians,¹ the admission of their dependence on authoritative Catholic sources, and a shift from university to seminary theology. In this way, Dulles hopes to restore the place of doctrinal authority in the Church, and to revive the exercise of genuine Roman Catholic theology, thus restoring its status as the "queen of sciences."

Dulles claims not to have revised his ecclesiology substantially. He still views himself as a "moderate" whose views could be considered liberal and "highly dangerous"

Catholic International Commission, "The Gift of Authority," 17-29. Note also Dulles's dissatisfaction with the Roman Catholic-Lutheran declaration on the doctrine of justification. See his "Two Languages of Salvation," *FT*, December 1999, 25-30.

¹Ladislav Örsy, in his criticism of Dulles, notes that the latter insinuates that the only alternative for the form in which the magisterium might exercise its ministry "is the system presently in place," which does not need further development. Örsy, 11.

by some conservatives.¹ The changes in his ecclesiology, however, have led more than one fellow-Catholic theologian to assume that he has, in fact, forsaken the middle ground.

These changes are evident. As far as the foundational doctrine of revelation is concerned, Dulles clearly leans toward a propositional view of divine self-disclosure and the belief that God's revelatory activity ceased with the death of the apostles. Regarding his ecclesiology, he considers the "body of Christ" image and its implications as the most suitable for one's description of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. This image emphasizes the unity of the Church as well as its hierarchical structures.

The hierarchical magisterium is *the* medium God uses to transmit his revelation and to protect its integrity. Its primary purpose is the proclamation of God's word and the evangelization of the world. All members of the Church, including theologians, are required to submit loyally to the pronouncements of the magisterium. There is no longer room for a theological magisterium. While dialogue between the magisterium and other members in the Church should take place, its primary purpose must be the further elucidation of God's word contained in traditional and magisterial sources rather than the critique of magisterial statements.

Dulles's teaching on doctrinal authority during the period discussed in this chapter may be summarized in his own words:

I confess that I do not think it is my function to judge the authorities whom God has set over the Church. They have the commission and the charisms to safeguard the transmission of the faith. It is for them to judge theology, not to be judged by it. As a theologian I am grateful that there is someone to correct me.²

To suggest otherwise, Dulles believes, would undermine the "very essence of Catholic Christianity," which is the belief that God provided institutional channels to authoritatively proclaim his revelation to all humanity.³

¹Dulles, "Dialogue," 1; idem, interview by author, March 5, 2001.

²Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology" (1996), 32.

³Dulles, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 91; idem, review of *Christ Is the Answer: The Christ-centered Teaching of Pope John Paul II*, by John Saward, *The Tablet*, May 25, 1996, 693; idem, "Context of Christian Proclamation Sets

The discussion on the relationship between the magisterium and theologians in this and the previous chapter sets the stage for the concluding chapter of the present study, which endeavors to present Dulles's doctrine as a study in contrast between his early post-Vatican II and recent views. Has there been a shift? If so, how significant? What are the major conclusions to be drawn from Dulles's understanding of the nature of the doctrinal magisterium and the role of theologians in the Roman Catholic Church during the periods discussed in this dissertation? To these questions, as well as to the underlying reasons for his shift, we now direct our attention.

Parameters of Dialogue," 7; idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 28.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The preceding chapters presented Avery Dulles's views on doctrinal authority, more specifically the relationship between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians in the Roman Catholic Church. They provided sufficient evidence of perceivable differences between his early post-Vatican II views, referred to here as the "early" Dulles (late sixties to early eighties), and his more recent views, termed the "recent" Dulles (nineties to early two thousand). As mentioned in chapter 3, there is no agreement among theologians as to the extent of Dulles's shift. While some regard the change in Dulles's views as a "re-conversion," others argue that there is hardly any shift at all.¹ Obviously, such an evaluation is no easy task and may well reflect the opinion and bias of the critic more than anything else. It also points to the fact that, in Dulles's case, one cannot speak of a radical change. He has always been a highly esteemed Catholic theologian. His views have been sought and respected by both the hierarchy and theologians. While, at times, representatives of both conservative and liberal circles within the Church have criticized him, his writings have never been subjected to hierarchical inquiry.

The aim of this final chapter is twofold: first, to summarize the findings of the study, highlighting those elements where, in my opinion, Dulles altered his views regarding doctrinal authority in the Church; and second, to explore reasons for the shift.

¹See pp. 132-33 above.

A Summary of Findings: A Study in Contrast

This study thus far has presented Dulles's ecclesiology, both early and recent, and how it has affected his views on doctrinal authority within the Roman Catholic Church. The following pages bring together those aspects of Dulles's early and recent views where, I believe, the shift is most tangible.

The Magisterium and Doctrinal Authority in the Church

Early View

The nature and role of the doctrinal magisterium rapidly became one of the major concerns of the early post-Vatican II Church. As one could expect, much of Dulles's writings during that era dealt with these very issues. His work seems to have been driven by two primary concerns. First, he believed that the manner in which the ecclesiastical magisterium exercised its authority should be adapted to the demands of the modern age. Second, he hoped that by adapting the image of the magisterium through *ressourcement*—i.e., the retrieval of early sources of Catholic wisdom and self-understanding, initiated by Vatican II—the concept of the magisterium might become more palatable to both “intellectual” Catholics and non-Catholic Christians.

Dulles's program of updating the concept of the magisterium began with a recognition of its historical dimensions. In agreement with Yves Congar and other concerned Catholic scholars, he asserted that, while the presence of the magisterium was necessary for the vitality of the Catholic ethos, the form in which its authority was to be exercised should be adjusted to the requirements of its environment. Armed with historical evidence, Dulles maintained that it was difficult to determine which elements of ecclesiastical structures could be gathered under the umbrella of “divine institution.” Furthermore, the inflexibility of the traditional notion of *ius divinum* needed to be addressed. There was no reason, he concluded, why *ius divinum* could not incorporate

some elements of reversibility. This, in turn, led him to believe that an “epochal” re-adjustment of the magisterial function in the Church could be warranted by divine will.

This may well be the reason why Dulles endorsed the radical idea of two magisteria and became its chief exponent. This proposal, he believed, would bring the hierarchical magisterium up to date with modernity. Like his models-method, the concept of two magisteria came to be closely associated with his name. The result of years of careful reflection, the concept was based upon the fundamental presupposition that since revelation was committed to the Church as a whole, the entire people of God could contribute to the development of Catholic doctrine. If most believers did not concern themselves with theological or doctrinal issues, there were committed individuals in the Church whose voices should not be ignored, namely, the theologians.

Thus, on the basis of the New Testament and historical precedence, Dulles proposed that the Church recognize the need for two types of teachers who both would come under the common designation of “magisterium,” namely, those who, as the successors of the apostles, were called to officially express the faith of the Church, and those who were to “keep the inherited body of doctrine under constant review, questioning what is really questionable and denying what [they] believe . . . to be false.”¹ Both of these magisteria could claim the charism of truth, the *charisma veritatis certum*. Mutual interdependence and cooperation between these two magisteria was crucial and would serve a dual purpose. It would normalize the relationship between the episcopacy and theologians, and it would heighten the authority of the Church in the modern world.

The hierarchical magisterium

How then did Dulles envision the nature and function of the hierarchical magisterium? In the modern Church, the ministry of the hierarchical magisterium consists of two functions: papal and episcopal. While both were indispensable, Dulles believed that

¹Dulles, “Faith and New Opinions,” 479.

the nature and form of their ministry was subject to adaptation. Rather than defining these ministries through the prism of Neo-Scholasticism, one should view them within the framework of collegiality. In this way, the excessive juridicism of either office would be overcome and, together with the episcopate, the pope would serve as overseer of universal faith and protector of unity, rather than as monarch. Furthermore, the collegial sharing of power within the episcopate would serve as a model for the sharing of power within the Church as a whole.

The task of the hierarchical magisterium was, first, pastoral leadership. The bishops, Dulles believed, were responsible for maintaining doctrinal and liturgical standards. Next, they were to proclaim the Christian message contained in traditional Catholic sources. Finally, they were to officially express the divine revelation already present within the community. Dulles compared the magisterium's task to a "lens" which gathered and brought into focus the existing message of God, and set it forth in words.¹ Thus, instead of inhibiting the initiatives of the Holy Spirit in the Church, the hierarchical leadership needed to encourage believers in new initiatives and creative thinking. At the same time, the fact that the Holy Spirit assisted the bishops in their work as the official spokesmen of the Church did not imply that they possessed special powers which protected them from error. In order to facilitate its ministry, it was crucial for the episcopate to remain in open dialogue with other believers within the body of Christ, particularly with theologians.

The theological magisterium

Next to the episcopate, Dulles believed that, due to the learning and scholarship of Catholic theologians, the theological magisterium could contribute to doctrinal leadership. Without their contribution, the work of the Church would be impeded. In fact, the history of the Church showed that theologians had actively participated in the area of doctrinal leadership, thus providing grounds for recognizing theologians as leaders in doctrinal

¹See above p. 101 above.

matters. This conclusion was also supported by theological evidence, including the reinterpretation of apostolic succession and of the *charisma veritatis certum*.

Apostolic succession was definitely a hallmark of Catholic Christianity, yet time and again it had been used inappropriately and interpreted too narrowly. Too often, the doctrine had served as an excuse to defend outdated institutions and practices. A broader application called for recognizing that the Church as a whole had inherited the apostolic mandate. The entire Church had inherited the functions of apostles, prophets, and teachers, which were distributed among the membership by the Holy Spirit. The bishops, therefore, should not claim that all three functions were united exclusively in their own office. If indeed the gift of apostleship was the exclusive prerogative of the episcopal order, the functions of prophets and teachers could be exercised by other members of the Church while also coming under the umbrella of apostolic succession. Regarding *charisma veritatis certum*, Dulles argued that the view that only members of the episcopate were endowed with such a gift was a by-product of Neo-Scholastic theology. Historical evidence, as far back as the New Testament, indicated that the gift of discernment also belonged to teachers who were not necessarily bishops. In his opinion, these considerations allowed for the existence of a separate magisterium, a theological magisterium whose task would be to critically reflect on the Catholic faith and to help the hierarchical magisterium to more correctly express its official pronouncements.

Recent View

Dulles's recent views represent a move away from his proposal of two magisteria.¹ He now alerts Catholic theologians to the danger of setting themselves up as a parallel magisterium. This shift was probably precipitated by his current position on the nature of

¹Interestingly enough, in my interview with him, Dulles asserted that he still supports the proposal of two magisteria as presented in his *A Church to Believe In*. His proposal, he claimed, was much misunderstood at the time and was portrayed as a subversion of the doctrinal authority of the episcopate. He expressed exasperation with those theologians who portrayed his views in such a manner.

the hierarchical magisterium. In his view, the government of the Church as presently exercised was divinely intended and, as such, is not subject to human manipulation. Although he does concede that the Church can modify the manner in which the ministry is exercised in order to make it more “serviceable,” he fully supports the current ecclesiastical institutions and the manner in which the Church is governed.¹

Regarding the doctrine of apostolic succession, Dulles relates it to the episcopal order alone. Throughout the history of the Church, Dulles asserts, apostolic succession was the most potent instrument for protecting the unity of the Church. Besides, through episcopal ordination, bishops receive a special charism proper to their office. This gift, the *charisma veritatis certum*, is an amalgamation of the three New Testament gifts of apostleship, prophecy, and teaching, and is conferred upon the episcopate alone.

Within the episcopate, the papacy holds a unique position, as it was instituted by Christ and the “keys” were conferred upon Peter alone. The papal office is graced with a special charism, which distinguishes it from the rest of the episcopate. Thus, the pope is more than just a spokesman for the episcopal college. He is its effective head. While he continues to support the teachings of Vatican II on collegiality, in contrast to Archbishop Quinn,² Dulles believes that the way in which collegiality is currently exercised fulfills the

¹Dulles, “Jubilee 2000: Reform and Renewal in the Church,” p. 6 of 9. On March 24, 2000, the Catholic News Service reported on Dulles’s McGinley Lecture, entitled “The Papacy for a Global Church,” which he delivered at Fordham University on March 22, 2000. According to this report Dulles stated that those progressives who called for a reform of the papacy and a return to a more limited papal activity, as was the case during the patristic and medieval eras, were “nostalgic and anachronistic.” “The papacy, ‘will never go back’ to the status it had before the developments brought by the First and Second Vatican Councils.” These words, however, were deleted from the printed version of the article. See “Papacy Will Never Relinquish Global Role, Father Dulles Says,” *Catholic News Service*; available from <http://www.catholicnews.com/data/briefs/20000324.htm>; March 24, 2000, p. 1 of 2; cf. Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” 6-11. In my interview with him, Dulles clearly expressed disagreement with those progressive theologians and Church officials who seek to adjust the exercise of the papacy in the Church to the demands of the modern Church. He specifically mentioned Archbishop Quinn of San Francisco and Archbishop Weakland of Milwaukee.

²Cf. John R. Quinn, “The Exercise of the Primacy and the Costly Call to Unity,” 1-28, and idem, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 178-81.

Council's mandate. He rejects the view that the doctrine of collegiality altered the supremacy of the papal office and argues that the latter must be viewed according to the terms outlined in the documents of Vatican I and confirmed through documents such as *Nota Praevia* (1964).¹

The task of the hierarchical magisterium is the transmission and preservation of the deposit of faith, as well as to serve as a medium between God and his people. The bishops and the pope, as the sole authentic teachers of doctrine, are also called to proclaim the gospel of Christ, to guard it against error, and to definitely settle contentious debates within the Church. All hierarchical teachings, which are guided and protected by the Holy Spirit, must be greeted with loyal submission. This is essential for the preservation of Catholic unity and the missionary success of the Church. It does not come as a surprise, therefore, that Dulles expresses approval of the current way in which the ecclesiastical magisterium exercises its ministry.

While the early Dulles believed that committed Catholic theologians were endowed with a special charism, the recent Dulles views theologians as no different from other members of the Church. They must accept and adhere to the teaching of the episcopate.²

The 'Sensus Fidelium'

Dulles's shift away from the two magisteria may have been influenced by a change in his ecclesiology, more particularly by his understanding of the role of the *sensus fidelium* in the Church. In both periods under study, the way in which he views the sense

¹In my interview with him, Dulles stated that the current manner in which collegiality is exercised fully concurs with the *Nota Praevia*. This is in contrast with the position advanced by Cardinal Suenens, which, Dulles believes, would weaken the unity of the Church. Only strong authority and leadership can prevent the Church from becoming ineffective.

²Dulles argues that, following the push for an independent theological magisterium, the next logical step would be the demand to convert theology "into some kind of scientific study of religion." Dulles, "Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition," 22. It is not surprising, therefore, that he supports endowing theologians with canonical mission. Cf. idem, "Criteria of Catholic Theology," 314-15.

of the faithful appears to be conditioned by his epistemology and, as an outgrowth of the latter, by his ecclesiology.

Early View: Revelation and Ecclesiology

The early Dulles held that the Second Vatican Council amended the Neo-Scholastic understanding of revelation, emphasizing instead its pre-conceptual, existential, and personalistic aspects, and stressing that revelation had been committed to the whole Church and did not cease with the death of the apostles.¹

Dulles's early ecclesiology was strongly influenced by the Second Vatican Council and was compatible with his epistemological presuppositions. With other progressive theologians, he felt that the Council sanctioned a search for improved expressions of ecclesial realities. Consequently, he developed his celebrated models-methodology. His fundamental presupposition was plain enough: due to its nature as a mystery, the Church escaped obvious, univocal conceptualization. A balanced ecclesiology required that "by a kind of mental juggling act, we have to keep several models in the air at once."² Dulles's exposition of various models of the Church went along with a critique of the institutional model prevalent in pre-Vatican II days. He characterized institutional ecclesiology as authoritarian, unresponsive to its environment and unable to adapt to modern demands.³ With the exception of the institutional model of the Church, other models emphasized adaptation of institutional structures to the needs of the modern Church. In addition, they encouraged believers to take an active role in determining the teachings of the Church, as

¹Such views were expressed by Dulles in many of his early articles and systematically developed in his acclaimed *Models of Revelation*. Not surprisingly, the early Dulles reserved his strongest critique for the propositional model of revelation, although one must not conclude that he regarded revelation as entirely devoid of doctrinal content. Cf. Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, 134.

²Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 8.

³Dulles wrote that he "deliberately" took a "critical stance toward those ecclesiologies that are primarily or exclusively institutional" (ibid.).

well as its future direction.¹ Dulles's early teachings, therefore, represented a departure from the pre-Vatican II "ecclesiology from above." His view on doctrinal authority and the role of the *sensus fidelium* in the Church conformed to his ecclesiology.

Early View on the 'Sensus Fidelium'

As the Council did not provide the Church with clear alternatives to the authoritarianism prevalent in the pre-conciliar era,² Dulles proposed his own theory, a view at all points in agreement with his epistemological and ecclesiological presuppositions. His controversial proposition, which he called a "pluralistic theory of authority," emphasized mutual interplay between the various, equally important authoritative voices within the Church.³ These included the Holy Scriptures, sacred tradition, the *sensus fidelium*, and the hierarchical magisterium. Dulles held that interaction between these authorities would prevent an unhealthy concentration of power in the hands of a small class of selected individuals. He placed particular emphasis upon the concept of the *sensus fidelium*, an important aspect of which was the voice of theologians in the Church. He argued against the view that the Church should deem itself as a class society in which all doctrinal power was to be in the hands of a governing class. The Holy Spirit, and thus doctrinal power, was, in the first instance, given to the entire Church, and only "secondarily" to the

¹Although Dulles never proposed a fully democratic Church government, he did lean towards restructuring the institutions of the Church along the lines of a "parliamentary democracy." Commenting on Richard P. McBrien's proposal, set forth in *The Remaking of the Church*, Dulles wrote: "In general, I am sympathetic with the directions of this book. Many of the reforms McBrien proposes would, in my opinion, help to revitalize the Church by feeding into the ecclesiastical sphere the climate of freedom and participation characteristic of the American secular heritage." Dulles, review of *The Remaking of the Church*, 358. McBrien's proposals included clear and constitutionally protected rights of all members, the election of bishops by representative bodies, limited terms of office, the possibility of a married priesthood, of the ordination of women to the priesthood, a larger scope for the exercise of subsidiarity, a decentralization and separation of powers throughout the Church, etc. (ibid.).

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 95-101.

³Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 99.

leadership of the Church.¹ Hence, the role of the hierarchy was not to supersede the witness of the faithful but to help them fulfill their divinely given mission. Thus, if bishops were to remain true to their calling they were to “seriously consult” with theologians before making doctrinal decisions. They could not effectively make final pronouncements unless they allowed “competent persons, in full freedom, to say the next-to-last word.”²

From this perspective, Dulles’s early post-Vatican II ecclesiology proffers him as a progressive theologian with interests in ecclesiastical reforms that would take full advantage of the freedom and participation initiated by the Second Vatican Council.

Recent View: Revelation and Ecclesiology

While he maintains adherence to his early understanding of revelation,³ in recent years Dulles has been stressing the importance of the propositional model, which submits that revelation may be communicated to human beings and, subsequently, encased in specific formulations known as dogmas. These have permanent and universal validity, and are immune to “novel formulations.”⁴ This view is complemented by Dulles’s belief that the early Church received the fullness of revealed truth, which was to be preserved and transmitted. Such a notion of revelation is often accompanied by the view that truth descends from God and is mediated to the Church through the divinely established channel of a hierarchical magisterium. In agreement with this, Dulles argues against the conviction that revelation is given to the entire Christian community and then officially expressed by

¹Dulles, “Catholic Theology and the Secondary School,” 21. Within this context, Dulles writes: “It will not be sufficient to order them [the faithful], in an authoritarian way, to submit to decrees handed down from ecclesiastical authorities” (ibid.); cf. idem, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 304.

²Dulles, “The Contemporary Magisterium,” 305.

³See, for example, Dulles, “La théologie catholique nord-américaine depuis 1965,” 26. Likewise, in my interview with him, Dulles stated that he did not amend his views on revelation.

⁴Dulles, “The Challenge of Catechism,” 51.

the magisterium.¹ Such developments in Dulles's epistemology significantly impact his ecclesiology, which has also progressed toward an increasingly conservative stance. Consequently, as the second millennium drew to a close, his activities as a "reform" theologian were gradually replaced by an emphasis on the preservation of the Catholic heritage and of Church unity. This has been evidenced in several areas.

First, as the nineties progressed, Dulles began to move away from the models-methodology.² His understanding of the Church became more monolithic and critical of approaches in tension with the official teachings of the Church. While the early Dulles attempted to retain both the functional and ontological aspects of ecclesial realities, recent years have witnessed his increased emphasis on the latter, at the expense of the former. Consequently, he no longer emphasizes the adaptability and reformability of institutional structures. In fact, he claims that any move toward "greater tentativeness [and] flexibility . . . could undermine the specific strengths of Roman Catholicism."³ While he still refers occasionally to the various models of the Church, Dulles's recent writings emphasize the Church as the body of Christ and its mediatory nature. At times, his language implies even the identification of Christ with the Church, a problem he cautioned against in the early post-Vatican II years.⁴

Second, in agreement with his recent epistemological presuppositions, Dulles exhibits a preference for an ecclesiology from above. He affirms that the universal Church is not the result of communion among local churches. The Church exists as an ontological

¹See, for example, Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836.

²In my interview with him, Dulles specifically stated that he is beyond the method of models, which he believes was only a starting point in ecclesiology.

³Dulles, review of *Imaginer l'Église catholique*, 769.

⁴In 1968, Dulles warned: "Lest we provoke bitter disappointments," care must be taken not to identify the Church with Christ or to make it a kind of substitute for Christ. Those who view the Church as the mystical body of Christ, he continued, are particularly prone to make such an identification. Dulles, "Bergamo: 1968: A Theological Reflection," 25. The recent Dulles, however, writes that "Christ and the Church make up one mystical person." Idem, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," 37.

reality which precedes any particular church.¹ On this basis, he builds a strong case in favor of a clearly centralized and institutionalized Church, the main tasks of which are protection, transmission, and evangelization.² While the early Dulles objected to any form of authoritarianism, in recent years Dulles admits that his proposal of a strong ecclesiastical government may be rightly perceived as authoritarian. Centralization of the Church is necessary, however, if the Church is to become an effective agent of evangelization.³

Finally, in accordance with his preference for an “ecclesiology from above,” the recent Dulles emphasizes the divinely endowed powers of the ecclesiastical magisterium. In his writings, the voice of the Church leadership is basically equated with the voice of God. He resists the implementation of democratic principles in Church government since they tend to subvert ecclesiastical authority. He also calls for the strengthening of hierarchical structures, since “only the hierarchical form of government gives the official leadership the apostolic freedom that it needs to make decisions prayerfully in light of the Gospel and tradition.”⁴

¹“The particular churches were, as Vatican II puts it, ‘fashioned after the model of the universal church,’ which is therefore antecedent to them.” Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” 8. This statement was sharply criticized by Ladislav Örsy, who took Dulles to task for misinterpreting the intent of Vatican II. See Örsy, “The Papacy for an Ecumenical Age,” 11.

²Cf. Dulles, “The Papacy for a Global Church,” 8-10. In my interview with him, Dulles stated that in the past he had been too negative about the institutional model of the Church and that he no longer subscribes to some of his past criticisms.

³In my interview with him (March 5, 2001), Dulles stated that John Paul II and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger are “right on the mark when they exercise strong authority and leadership.” The measures they undertake protect the unity of the Church and the strength of its international identity. He disagrees with Archbishop Quinn, who insists on more freedom for local and national congregations. Quinn’s views, according to Dulles, do not represent an authentic vision of authority in the Church and are not in agreement with official teachings. For Archbishop Quinn’s views on collegiality, see “The Exercise of the Primacy and the Costly Call to Unity,” 1-28.

⁴Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 16.

Recent View on the 'Sensus Fidelium'

Considering Dulles's recent epistemology and his leanings towards an "ecclesiology from above," one should not be surprised to note that he no longer views the *sensus fidelium* as authoritative. He argues that, in general, Catholic believers are too strongly influenced by modern secular culture for their sense of the faith to serve as a useful doctrinal source,¹ unless, of course, they agree with the teachings of the magisterium.² While the early Dulles maintained that, prior to issuing doctrinal statements, the magisterium *must* consult the faithful, and theologians in particular, in recent years he maintains that consultation may be helpful, but not essential. Besides, the needs of the modern Church, as well as its size, argue against the idea of this type of consultation. This was also confirmed in my recent interview with him, when Dulles unequivocally stated that the *sensus fidelium* is no longer a particularly useful category.³

Thus, Dulles's recent ecclesiology shows him to be an increasingly conservative theologian with interest in greater centralization of the Church and increased ecclesiastical power. Such measures, he believes, may help to preserve the Catholic heritage and offset any further dissolution of Catholic Christianity.

¹Dulles maintains that the *sensus fidelium* can work only in a predominantly Catholic community, where Christianity pervades all aspects of social life. Because such an environment no longer exists, the concept of the *sensus fidelium* "gets more and more difficult to apply when you get into a highly secularized society where the majority of the members of the church are not in particularly close contact with the sources of faith, with scripture and tradition and even the magisterium and the sacraments, and their opinions are predominantly formed by secular context and by the popular media from which they even get their news about the church." Dulles, "Second General Discussion," 119.

²Ibid.

³Dulles, interview (March 5, 2001). Dulles's "wariness" with the concept of the *sensus fidelium* was also noted by the participants of the Common Ground discussions in 1999 and confirmed in my interview with him at Fordham University. See Murnion, "Introduction" to *Church Authority in American Culture*, 10. On the issue of the *sensus fidelium*, see Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; idem, "Infallible: Rome's Word on Women's Ordination," *NCR*, January 7, 1996, 10; idem, "Tradition Says No," *The Tablet*, December 9, 1995, 573. In my interview with him (March 5, 2001), Dulles suggested that rather than emphasizing the *sensus fidelium*, the Church should place greater emphasis upon the *sensus fidei* of individual saints. Cf. idem, "First General Discussion," 75-6.

The Role of Theologians

As Dulles's views on the role of the magisterium and the *sensus fidelium* have changed, his understanding of the role of theologians has also experienced a significant shift.

As noted earlier, the early Dulles believed that Catholic theologians formed an authoritative magisterium whose existence was a requisite for the well-being and mission of the Church. This theological magisterium performed a dual task, formative and corrective. As far as this formative function was concerned, theologians were to provide a critical and systematic reflection on the Catholic faith, one of the main purposes of which was the adaptation of the Christian message for a modern audience. Provided this was done in a theologically responsible manner, theologians would be permitted, at times, to overstep the boundaries of orthodoxy. While they needed to recognize the authority of tradition and the hierarchical magisterium, the theologians' authority was also to be recognized.¹ With regard to their corrective function, theologians could assess official statements prior to their issuance, and thus help the hierarchical magisterium avoid embarrassing mistakes. In Dulles's opinion, such assessments needed to be applied not just to current hierarchical pronouncements, but to the entire Catholic dogmatic heritage as well. Through critical inquiry and reformulation, the Christian message could become more acceptable to those living in modern days.

In contrast to his early views, Dulles's recent writings are characterized by increased concern regarding the state of Catholic theology. Thus, he calls for Catholic theology to re-examine its role in the Church, himself proposing some basic principles according to which today's Catholic theologians should function.

¹"Just as the official teaching of the Church constitutes an authority for theologians, so the doctrine of eminent theologians constitutes an authority of a sort for those who strive to formulate the official positions of the Church itself." Dulles, "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology," 399.

First, “Catholic” theologians must participate in the task of transmission and preservation of the Christian message. They must accept that the fullness of revelation has already been given. Next, they must participate in the mission of the Church, and reflect upon the ways in which the deposit of faith, as presented in the teachings of the magisterium, may be more effectively appropriated and more successfully shared with the world. To fulfill this dual mandate, Catholic theologians will, among other things, recognize that genuine Catholic theology should be directed toward building up the body of Christ. Reverence for traditional Catholic teaching must guide their enterprise and they will recognize the authority of the magisterium, which serves as the divinely established guardian of Catholic orthodoxy. To teach in Catholic institutions and to advise the episcopate, skilled and committed orthodox theologians need to be carefully selected. This process would be facilitated if the Church reinstated the granting of canonical missions. Dulles, therefore, supports the measures proposed in the apostolic constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesia*. Providing Catholic theologians with canonical mission would not only protect the Church from unorthodox teachings, but would also improve the relationship between the magisterium and theologians.

The adoption of such basic principles would not impede the exercise of freedom of inquiry. True freedom, Dulles holds, exists only within an environment of trust and accountability toward the leadership of the Church. In contrast to universities, such an environment is more characteristic of Catholic seminaries, where theology is allowed to flourish under the supervision of local bishops and which in fact should become the principal centers of theological training in the Church.

While Dulles has always held that commitment to the Church and its teachings is an important prerequisite for the exercise of the theological ministry, his understanding of this commitment seems to have differed somewhat during the two periods discussed in this dissertation. In the first two decades following the Council, he understood commitment to the Church as, primarily, commitment to God and to the search for truth. More recently,

however, Dulles has been teaching that this commitment is first and foremost to Catholic orthodoxy as defined by the magisterium and insists on the principle of *Roma locuta, causa finita*,¹ thus defining theological activity as the defense, explanation, and elaboration of magisterial statements. Such views remind one of the traditional division between *ecclesia docens* and *ecclesia discens*.²

Dulles's Recent Attitude Toward Vatican II

In the context of his shift in the area of doctrinal authority in the Church, one may wonder how, in recent years, Dulles has perceived the role of the Second Vatican Council. A perusal of his most recent writings reveals a veering in his attitude toward the Council's teachings and their implications for the life and mission of the Church. As we have noted several times, Dulles never ceased to regard Vatican II as a significant milestone and

¹Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 24.

²A similar criticism of Dulles's recent views was voiced by James Coriden and Joseph Komonchak. See the comments of these two scholars in "Panel Discussion," in *Church Authority in American Culture*, ed. Philip J. Murnion (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 77-79.

It also may be worth noting that, in recent years, Dulles wrote an essay lauding Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), the Catholic reformer and apologist who was the most articulate opponent of views espoused by the main Protestant reformers and whose ecclesiological teachings prepared the Catholic world for the elevation of the papal office in the nineteenth century. Dulles depicts Bellarmine as the "example of loyal service to the Church in [a] time of confusion and crisis. . . . A model of moderation and rationality" who, while being open to new developments, exhibited a strong attachment to Catholic tradition and the teachings of the magisterium. Dulles contends that Bellarmine rarely did anything on his own initiative, but was always willing to do that which was required of him. Not interested in personal gain, he always strove to advance the cause of the Church. It was probably for that reason, Dulles suggests, that he was generally trusted and supported by ecclesiastical authorities. Loyalty, Dulles goes on, was a primary characteristic of Bellarmine's service. "He did what was asked of him; he spoke frankly when consulted, but he never urged his own opinions to the detriment of the Church itself. He was loyal to his religious order, loyal to the Holy See, loyal to the Church, and loyal especially to God, in whom he placed all his trust and confidence." For these reasons, Dulles believes, Bellarmine's teachings transcend its time and are able to effectively address the problems of subsequent centuries. Avery Dulles, "Saint Bellarmine: A Moderate in a Disputatious Age," *Crisis*, December 1994, 44; cf. idem, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 93. It is interesting to note that Bellarmine's teachings seem to have influenced Dulles during his journey towards the Roman Catholic Church in the early forties. So much so that he selected the name "Robert" at his confirmation. Idem, "Saint Bellarmine: A Moderate in a Disputatious Age," 39.

providential event in the history of the Church, often highlighting its achievements in his writings.¹ At the same time, however, he has been asserting that its teachings may no longer specifically address the needs of the contemporary world. “Vatican II, which spoke so well to the needs of its own day, may not give exactly the message that needs to be heard in our generation.”²

In 1996, Dulles published a jubilee edition of his celebrated *A Testimonial to Grace*.³ It includes a new chapter, “Reflections on a Theological Journey,” which is in fact an autobiographical review of his career and provides insights into his perception of the Second Vatican Council and the events that followed. The overall impression one gains is that he now dwells more on the negative consequences of the Council upon the life of the Church. At times, the tone is reminiscent of conservative polemicists such as George A. Kelly, Ralph McInerny, and James Hitchcock.⁴

Dulles does not deny that, together with other theologians, he was caught up in the post-Vatican II enthusiasm. He admits that, at the time, he applauded the achievements of the Council in the areas of openness, freedom, and interdenominational dialogue. Contrary to the evidence presented in chapter 2 of this dissertation, however,⁵ he also states that even during the Council he thought it necessary to combine these reforms with “continued allegiance to Thomas Aquinas, Ignatius of Loyola and, in general, the great medieval and

¹Cf. Avery Dulles, “The Lure of Catholicism,” *NOR*, March 1995, 8; idem, “John Paul II and the Advent of the New Millennium,” *America*, December 9, 1995, 11.

²Avery Dulles, “The Role of Tradition in Catholic Christianity,” *Emmanuel* 96 (1990): 13.

³Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996).

⁴Cf. Kelly, *The Battle for the American Church*; McInerny, *What Went Wrong with Vatican II*; James Hitchcock, *The Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971).

⁵It needs to be stressed that the following words were written from the perspective of Dulles’s current viewpoint. In his early post-Vatican II writings, there is nothing that resembles similar criticism of the impact of the Second Vatican Council. As outlined in chapter 2, pp. 60-67, the opposite seems to be true.

baroque heritage of music, art, literature, philosophy, and theology.”¹ He concedes that while he viewed some of the conciliar and post-conciliar reforms as well-founded and necessary adjustments to modern culture, many did not impress him as “improvements.” The removal of Latin as the liturgical language, “popular tunes” instead of Gregorian chant, a de-emphasis of the veneration of the saints and the elimination of shrines and statues from churches struck him as “impoverishments that had to be regretfully endured.” Thus, he wrote, “it might be necessary . . . to live through a barren season of slovenly improvisation until the Church could experience some kind of cultural revival.”²

As far as the popular claim that the Second Vatican Council reversed some of the traditional teachings of the Church, Dulles unequivocally states that such an impression “is a false one. . . . Vatican II reversed no settled Catholic teaching.”³ He grants that some passages found in *Dignitatis humanae*, the constitution on religious freedom, might be perceived as an instance where alleged change could be conceived. Even so, the Constitution would not have been accepted if the bishops had not been convinced by John Courtney Murray and other progressive theologians that it constituted “a homogeneous development in continuity with earlier Catholic teaching.”⁴ In fact, the Second Vatican Council not only reaffirmed the previous teachings of the Church, but presented the

¹Dulles, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 109.

²Ibid.

³Avery Dulles, “Reversals at Vatican II?” *America*, May 29, 1999, 22; idem, “The First General Discussion,” 102-04. The difference between the early and recent Dulles on this point is rather startling. In *The Resilient Church* (1977) Dulles wrote that “most importantly . . . Vatican II quietly reversed the earlier positions of the Roman magisterium on a number of important issues.” He then enumerated areas in which several such reverses occurred (ibid., 109).

⁴Dulles, “Reversals at Vatican II?” 22. This statement was made in response to the article by Thomas Reese, “Of Many Things,” *America*, May 15, 1999, 2, where Reese wrote: “This edifice of certitude came to a crashing end with the Second Vatican Council, which reversed so many strongly held church positions that it was difficult to give unquestioning allegiance to what remained” (ibid.).

modern Church with a solid and indisputable body of unambiguous teachings.¹ Thus, rather than instituting a paradigm shift, the Council's teachings were "a nuancing of what had been previously taught."²

As a result, much of Dulles's literary output of the last decade or so has been dedicated to the defense of pre-Vatican II Catholic teachings and to the demonstration of the Council's continuity with Vatican I. Dulles often uses strong words to defend pre-Vatican II teachings and regards them as valid and relevant to a modern audience. He deplores the tendency of "progressive" scholars³ to neglect and de-emphasize these teachings, as well as those set forth by pre-Vatican II popes. Such tendencies, he asserts, spawn "a climate of suspicion as though the pontificate of Pius XII was simply in the dark ages."⁴ He personally believes that the official Church teachings of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries prepared the Church and the world for the Second Vatican Council.⁵ Much of what was agreed upon during the First Vatican Council found its way into the Constitutions of the Second Vatican Council. Thus, the teachings of Vatican I cannot be de-emphasized.⁶ Much like the great Church councils of the past, the First Vatican Council

¹Dulles, "The Basic Teaching of Vatican II," 125; idem, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 86-7.

²Dulles, "Panel Discussion," 80; idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 10. It is also interesting to note the exchange between Dulles and John Noonan, who, in the words of the *NCR* reporter, was "flabbergasted" when Dulles insisted that Vatican II reversed no previously taught teaching. He commented: "You've got to grapple with it [the reversal of official teaching], Avery, or you just don't understand what has happened in the history of our church." John Noonan, "Panel Discussion," in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 103; see also McClory, 11.

³Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 21.

⁴Dulles, "Panel Discussion," 80.

⁵Dulles, review of *Witness to Hope: The Biography of Pope John Paul II*, 55-6.

⁶It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the teachings of Vatican I are prominently featured in Dulles's recent writings as he strives to demonstrate continuity between Vatican I and Vatican II.

stands as an authoritative and unquestionable source of Catholic teachings.¹ It seems evident that close continuity with past Catholic teachings has become an important issue for the recent Dulles.²

It is within this context that Dulles makes the following statement, confirming his current stand: "The prevailing opinion seems to be that the minority at Vatican II prevented the majority from fully succeeding in their laudable efforts at reform. It might be more correct to hold that the minority enabled the council to maintain proper continuity with the Catholic tradition."³ As one of his recent reviewers has noted, "the church that Dulles would erect [would] not tolerate much suggestion for structural change."⁴ Considering his current position regarding the Second Vatican Council and his increased emphasis upon

¹Dulles, "An Important Bridge Must Yet Be Crossed," 5. Such sentiments were expressed by Dulles following the issuance of a statement "The Gift of Authority," resulting from discussions between Roman Catholics and Anglicans in 1999. Dulles criticized the statement for not dealing with the most important issue, namely, the problem of jurisdiction and doctrinal authority. He writes: "Can Anglicans acknowledge that, in Vatican I's words, the pope has 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole church'? Can they say with Vatican II that the pope, as vicar of Christ, has supreme pastoral power over the whole church and can always exercise it freely?" Dulles concludes poignantly that "perhaps conversion, rather than gradual convergence, will be required" (ibid.); cf. idem, "The Basic Teaching of Vatican II," 125.

Elsewhere, Dulles takes to task a theologian for his excessive enthusiasm towards the advances of Vatican II, and for making unduly negative comments about Vatican I, such as accusing it of "falsely understood triumphalism." Idem, review of *Fundamental Theology*, by Heinrich Fries, *TS* 58 (1977): 732; cf. idem, "The Ecclesial Dimension of Faith," 418-32.

²See, for example, Dulles's article "The Church as 'One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic'," 23-4. One may also cite his frequent referral to the *Nota Praevia*, which was appended to the dogmatic constitution *Lumen gentium* and which emphasized the authority of the pope "to decide questions without formal consultation of the bishops and a strictly collegial action." Idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19; idem, "Panel Discussion," 80; idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; idem, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 11. During my interview with him, Dulles also underlined the importance of *Nota Praevia* several times.

³Dulles, review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I and II* (1999), 313.

⁴Philip J. Murnion, review of *The Priestly Office*, 51. Another reviewer of the same volume suggests that, while Dulles claims to follow the principles presented in the Second Vatican Council, his views are reflective "of the particular reception of Vatican II present in the writings of John Paul II." Richard, 38-9.

continuity, it is not too surprising that Dulles often defends Neo-Scholasticism, a system he once criticized, and longs for the Church of his younger years.¹

In conclusion, it may be stated that while Dulles never ceased to exercise his ministry within the boundaries of Catholic orthodoxy, it is evident that there has been a shift in several of his views during the periods discussed in this dissertation.² Using Dulles's own terminology, this shift may, in short, be identified as a move from "discontinuity" toward "continuity."³ While the early Dulles emphasized the new and innovative teachings of the Council, the recent Dulles attempts to demonstrate the Council's continuity with traditional, pre-Conciliar Catholic teaching.⁴ To a large degree, his recent views could be described as fundamentally continuous with his pre-Vatican II beliefs, which were presented in the beginning of chapter 2 of this dissertation.⁵ At the risk of oversimplification, therefore, it may be asserted that Dulles has returned to his pre-Vatican II understanding of the Church.

¹Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 13. Dulles considers it unfortunate that the theological developments leading up to the Second Vatican Council placed Neo-Scholasticism at a disadvantage. For many Catholics, he maintains, the Council gave occasion for downplaying the Neo-Scholastic theological heritage of the Church. In the decades following the Council, such a program was taken to the extreme. While the conciliar documents did not specifically mention Scholasticism, Dulles maintains that they implicitly reaffirmed the obligation that "theology be based on the perennially valid philosophical heritage that comes down through Thomas Aquinas." Dulles concedes that by bringing attention back to Neo-Scholasticism he may be "going against the spirit, if not against the letter, of Vatican II," but, as he now sees it, only a theology based on scholastic principles can "stand as a bulwark against the philosophical relativism and historicism of the present day." Idem, "Is Neo-Thomism Obsolete? Vatican II and Scholasticism," 8; cf. idem, *The Craft of Theology*, 129.

²James Massa and Leo O'Donovan, whom Dulles identifies as theologians who correctly perceive his current views, would disagree with this conclusion. Cf. p. 133, n. 2 above.

³Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," 442; cf. p. 61 above.

⁴Cf. Dulles, *The Resilient Church*, 109; idem, "Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology," 85-7; idem, "The First General Discussion," 102-04.

⁵Cf. pp. 53-9 above.

The recapitulation, in this section, of Dulles's understanding of the doctrinal authority in the Church inclines me to share some appreciative as well as critical observations regarding his work.

Appreciation and Criticisms

It is not without reason that many consider Dulles to be the leading ecclesialogist in contemporary American Catholicism. Reading Dulles is like examining the blueprints of a most competent theological architect. In a clear and forceful style, he harmonizes the results of theological reflection and historical research, addressing crucial ecclesiological issues. By bringing together elements from Scripture, tradition, and the writings of popes and bishops, and systematizing their relationships so that all the parts fit together, Dulles successfully blends contrasting positions into workable syntheses. His writings display depth of theological thought matched by keen historical perspective, penetrating analytical ability, and deep biblical concerns. Even the casual reader will appreciate the lucid and composed style of his writing. When Dulles deals with controversial issues such as the dual magisterium in the Church, one comes to appreciate the irenic tone used to express the confessional teachings standing behind his personal convictions.

I must acknowledge that, as a Christian believer and a student of theology myself, I have personally learned much from Avery Dulles. And I am far from being alone in recognizing his remarkable qualities. Dulles's passion for truth and his rigorous intellectual honesty have been highly praised.¹ Admiration has likewise been expressed for his ability to steer a middle course with regard to controversial issues within Catholic Christianity.² His sense of balance and fairness allows him to be seen as a theologian/priest who attempts

¹See, for example, Leo J. O'Donovan and T. Howland Sanks, preface to *Faithful Witness: Foundations of Theology for Today's Church* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1989), ix; T. Pawikowski, review of *A Church to Believe In*, by Avery Dulles, *Catholic Sentinel*, August 27, 1982, 12; John Sullivan, review of *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, by Avery Dulles, *Heythrop Journal* 38 (1997): 89-90.

²See Bole, 11; Robert A. Sirico, review of *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, by Avery Dulles, *Crisis* 6 (1988): 49-51.

to truly understand others' views and to report them fairly.¹ He writes about issues that hold almost everyone's interest. His understanding of numerous disciplines in the humanities also deserves commendation. His prolific literary output is second to none. Most importantly, however, his faithfulness to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church and his commitment to a genuine transmission and preservation of its heritage are impressive. While it is true that his teachings have varied over the years, his commitment to the Roman Catholic Communion has never been questioned, and his goal has always been to serve the Church to the best of his abilities.

Despite Dulles's impressive credentials and the impact that his writings in both periods under study have had upon Roman Catholic ecclesiology, his views may not be devoid of some weaknesses. A few are briefly considered here.

1. In order to strengthen his argument, Dulles tends to emphasize only certain sections of Conciliar or other official documents. This results in the apparent passing over of other, equally important statements. Thus, in the early period he emphasized the new and innovative teachings of the Second Vatican Council, rarely discussing those in clear continuity with pre-Conciliar teachings.² Recently, however, Dulles seems to neglect the innovative teachings of the Council, primarily stressing its traditional teachings.³

¹George Weigel, quoted in Bole, 11.

²Thus, a perusal of Dulles's early writings reveals an almost complete absence of references to the *Nota Praevia* appended to *Lumen gentium*. Another example of such hermeneutics is found in his "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology," where Dulles agrees with the authors of *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (1973) that revelation is such a complicated phenomenon that it remains virtually concealed by faith. The official text, however, also stated that the hierarchical magisterium is a supernaturally enabled medium which can communicate revealed truth in propositional formulations. The document also ascribed a subservient role to Catholic theologians. These emphases are missing in Dulles's article, since his goal was to elevate the role of theologians in the Church. See Dulles, "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology," 398-99; cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "*Mysterium Ecclesiae*," *CM*, October 1973, 54-9.

³For instance, the Council's teachings on collegiality and the *sensus fidelium* receive cursory and almost hesitant treatment in his writings. Ladislav Orsy also aims this criticism at Dulles's recent views. He writes that Dulles's recent views on primacy may be viewed as "advocacy . . . driven by the art and craft of rhetoric. It uses or omits information to support a 'thesis,' which is that the development of the exercise of papal

2. Throughout his career, Dulles has prided himself on being a “moderate” theologian whose views have been centrist, which has allowed him to synthesize divergent views.¹ It is somewhat perplexing, however, that almost without exception Dulles himself defines where the center is and, thus, the meaning of the term “moderate.” In the early period, he used it to define progressiveness and openness, in contrast with the stifling attitudes of official Catholicism which, in his eyes, resisted Vatican II reforms. Recently, Dulles defines the term “moderate” as adherence to the teachings of the magisterium, in contrast to the “progressivists” who “clamor” for reform.² Such a position, however, places Dulles in the conservative camp, the only more conservative option being a rejection of Vatican II teachings, in the Lefebvrian style.³

3. Dulles addresses the dichotomy between extrinsic and intrinsic authority in the Church and indicates that there should be no conflict between these in a healthy Church. While extrinsic authority is always identified with the institutional authority of the Church, it is not always clear what constitutes intrinsic authority. At times he identifies it with the inner guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit. Elsewhere, it is equated with the “charism of learning” characteristic of theologians.⁴

4. The hallmark of Dulles’s early work on doctrinal authority in the Church was his proposal of the “pluralistic theory of authority” and the resultant proposition of the two office has reached a point where no significant changes are needed.” Örsy, “The Papacy for an Ecumenical Age,” 15.

¹My interview with Dulles confirmed that he continues to view himself as such.

²Dulles often uses such terminology in his recent writings.

³In this context, it is interesting to note that in 1994 Dulles wrote an article entitled “A Moderate in a Disputatious Age,” extolling Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), a conservative Catholic theologian. Three years later, William Bole wrote a laudatory article about Dulles, using the same phrase as a title. See Dulles “Saint Bellarmine: A Moderate in a Disputatious Age,” 39-44; cf. Bole, 11.

⁴See Dulles, “Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority,” 9; cf. idem, *Models of the Church*, 63-4; idem, “The Modern Dilemma of Faith,” 19, and idem, *The Survival of Dogma*, 39, 80.

magisteria. Despite its merits, the theory had two significant weaknesses. The first was the question of final authority in the Church. Was it the duty of theologians to accept the views of the magisterium, or was the magisterium obligated to take theological criticism as the final word? Only in the latter case could theologians “keep the inherited body of doctrine under constant review, questioning what is really questionable and denying what [they] believe to be false.”¹ Such a position, however, would lead to endless discussions.² Dulles’s recent view of the hierarchical magisterium, and particularly the pope’s magisterium, as the final authority in matters of faith and practice strikes me as more congruent with traditional Catholic teaching. Moreover, Dulles provided a less than convincing rationale as to why he decided to stop at only two magisteria.

5. In his recent writings, Dulles leaves little room for the middle ground, or mediating position, on many issues. He seems to divide the Catholic Church into two camps: those who accept magisterial teachings and those who challenge them. This is clearly evident in his 1998 article, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” where one of the sections carries the title “Two Christian Mentalities.”³ In his view, the magisterium, which is supported by divine authority, is consistently right. Those who disagree with magisterial teachings are wrong.⁴ Hence, there are only two kinds of Catholics: countercultural,

¹Dulles, “Faith and New Opinions,” 479.

²A similar criticism was expressed by the late Archbishop Robert Dwyer, of Portland, who charged Dulles with advocating the view that the Church was no more than “a polite debating society.” Dwyer, 4.

³See Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 13; cf. idem, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 21, where Dulles identifies “conservative” inclinations with a “sacral” spirit and “progressive” tendencies with a “secular” spirit. Cf. idem, “Panel Discussion,” 75; idem, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7; and idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 132-33.

⁴Ibid. The following quote further illustrates Dulles’s recent attitude: “On the one hand you have a pope, backed by the hierarchical leadership of the church, issuing prohibitions with a claim to divine authority and on the other hand a progressivist wing that seeks to correct what it regards as an obsolete, distorted, culture-bound tradition.” Idem, “Pastoral Response to Teaching on Women’s Ordination,” 178. While in this case Dulles referred to the issues of birth control and women’s ordination, his remarks have wider application, as he himself notes (ibid.).

orthodox Catholics and cultural, or secular, Catholics. It appears that Dulles follows the same inclination as far-right conservatives, who assume that thinking Catholics can embrace only extreme forms of thinking. This contrasts with the picture painted by Archbishop Rembert Weakland, for instance, who suggests that the majority of Catholics in his archdiocese “can be found in a kind of middle ground.” They are committed Catholics who are genuinely concerned about the state of the Church. While they do not always support every initiative coming from the Vatican, they are actively countercultural and strive against secularism.¹ While many of these actively involved Catholics insist on the implementation of the reforms initiated by Vatican II, they remain eager to maintain the unity of the Church and work towards the preservation of Catholic heritage.²

Similarly, one wonders what moderation resides in Dulles’s recent insistence on a “sharp distinction” between the secular and sacred ways of understanding authority? Secular structures of authority, he contends, are “set up from below” and are geared to meet the needs of a given group of people. In the sacred order, however, “it is God who intervenes in history to institute and reveal a way of salvation, and God sets up a structured community, with sacramental structures if you like, to preserve and transmit the revelation and to bring about this salvific dispensation.” By its very nature, therefore, the Church must not conform to the paradigms of secular society.³ Such a sharp distinction between

¹Rembert G. Weakland, “Reflections for Rome,” *America*, April 18, 1998, 12; cf. Robert J. Schreiter, “The Impact of Vatican II,” in *The Twentieth Century: A Theological Overview*, ed. Gregory Baum (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1999), 171; Ladislav Örsy, “The Limits of Magisterium,” *The Tablet*, August 25, 1990, 1067-068; Richard A. McCormick, “The Church and Dissent: How Vatican II Ushered in a New Way of Thinking,” *Commonweal*, February 27, 1998, 20.

²On this point, Joseph Komonchak also criticized Dulles, calling his categorizing “crude.” He said: “I do think that [Dulles’s position] may be prejudicing the issue from the beginning, because many of the people who have found difficulties with either of the two positions did so on what they thought at least were not simply secular grounds but specifically Christian and theological grounds.” Komonchak, “First General Discussion,” in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999), 79.

³Dulles, “First General Discussion,” in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999) 75-6.

the sacred and secular, however, is not as precise as may at first appear. Historical evidence shows that Church institutions have often been modeled on, and have contained elements of, secular structures.¹ This dichotomy, increasingly characteristic of the recent Dulles, rather than being worked out on a positive basis, seems to be based on his opposition to the progressive stance.²

6. It is difficult to avoid the problem raised by Dulles's understanding of how the episcopal charism interacts with the sense of the faithful. In the early period, Dulles opposed the view that bishops were endowed with special powers that protected them from doctrinal errors. He held that their judgment was affected by their education, culture and other factors. In recent years, this understanding has been superseded by an emphasis on a magisterial charism which sets the bishops apart from other believers, including theologians, whom he views as influenced by secularism and relativism. The bishops are seen as a separate class of believers who alone are not affected by present-day culture.³

7. The recent Dulles has increasingly insisted that the primary responsibility of the Church, and the magisterium in particular, is the preservation and defense of the deposit of faith. It is not often clear, however, what this "deposit of faith" is. What does he mean by "doctrinal firmness" in defense of the deposit of faith?⁴ Does it apply equally to the

¹For a concise history of the development of ecclesiastical structures throughout the history of Catholic Christianity see Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959), 11-44.

²See Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 21.

³This was also noticed by Richard Gaillardetz, who responded to Dulles's statements regarding this issue as follows: "Since the same Spirit that animates the people of God, all the baptized, also assists the bishops by virtue of their episcopal consecration, we have to also grant the possibility that there may be cultural factors that can be impediments to those who hold teaching offices as well. . . . If we only focus on how the laity are subject to secular values, and we don't pay attention to the real impediments that can be present for those who exercise the teaching office of the church, we lose credibility." Richard Gaillardetz, "Second General Discussion," in *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999), 123-24.

⁴See especially Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 8-17.

statements of the Bible, the pronouncements of ecumenical councils, the papal encyclicals, and the various instructions issued by the Vatican? If so, the circle is complete, and his current views imply a return to his pre-Vatican II positions regarding doctrinal authority in the Church.

Attempting to Understand Dulles's Shift

Thus far, we have examined the shift in Dulles's views on the relationship between the magisterium and theologians. However, the reasons for this change have received little attention. How may the differences between the early and the recent Dulles be interpreted? Contrary to the findings of this dissertation, as well as the impressions of many of his colleagues, Dulles disagrees with the assertion that his views have changed. In a recent press interview, which followed his being named to the College of Cardinals, Dulles said: "There is nothing in my writings that I would retract."¹ Thus, his recent writings offer no methodical explanation of what happened. Still, in this context, reading the recent Dulles leaves one with the impression that several factors may well have played a significant role. All seem to stem from one major conviction shared in a note written to George A. Kelly.² In response to Kelly's praise of Dulles's recent views,³ the latter wrote: "Many thanks for your encouraging note. . . . I hope that between us (and with much help from others) we can help contain some of *the madness that now passes for Catholic Christianity*."⁴ What

¹"Dulles Takes Church's Hard Line to Rank of Cardinal," *Orange County Register*, available from <http://www.ocregister.com/community/religion/21dullescci.shtml>; February 21, 2001, p. 1 of 2.

²George Kelly refers to the note he received from Dulles in his "The Second Coming of the American Church," *Catholic Dossier* 4 (1998): 24.

³Msgr. George Kelly, in a note to Dulles in 1998, wrote: "I have been [so] impressed with the material I see coming from your pen that I wanted to send a word of congratulations! . . . Your statements on the priesthood and definitive Church teachings are just what the Church needs at this time." George A. Kelly, Rockaway Beach, NY, to Avery Dulles, The Bronx, NY, 30 July 1998, photocopy, in my possession [used by permission].

⁴This statement was made by Dulles in response to Kelly's note. Avery Dulles, Bronx, NY, to Msgr. Kelly, 3 August 1998, photocopy, in my possession (emphasis mine). Photocopies of this correspondence were mailed to me personally by Msgr. Kelly.

would impel a theologian known for his careful and measured views to use such strong language? I would like to submit that Dulles's shift may be traced to concern for the Church he loves. This concern seems to include three interrelated elements: the deterioration of religious life, the influence of secularism on the life and thought of the Church, and the issue of dissent.

The Breakdown of Religious Life: The Unforeseen Effects of Vatican II

The early Dulles believed that the Council charted a new course for the Church, particularly in its call for renewal and more effective ways to disseminate Catholic truth. The Church was no longer to be seen in terms of a single, unified "perfect society." Rather, believers were called to reassess its institutions, as well as the traditional ways of expressing the Catholic faith.¹ A new era of pluralism, where "authentic Christian sources" were to be protected from "being crushed by the weight of any single authority," was to foster the "Church tradition for human freedom and dignity."²

In contrast, Dulles's recent writings give the impression that, in his view, the promises of the early post-conciliar years have not been fulfilled. While in the early post-Vatican II years Dulles immersed himself in the work of reforming the Church, recent years are marked by the reflection that, some time soon after the Council, the Church moved from self-criticism to self-destruction. The new era of intra-ecclesial unity and cooperation envisioned by the Council did not materialize. Too many Catholics, in their fervor to adopt the reforms of Vatican II, overreacted and went beyond conciliar reforms.³ They felt that

¹Dulles, *Models of the Church* (1974), 8; idem, "Some Recent Death of God Literature," *TS* 28 (1967): 118. In 1965, Dulles wrote that, since the Second Vatican Council, "the Church has been engaged in a vast program of self-examination and self-reform, much of it in line with the central thrust of the Reformation." Idem, "Luther's Unfinished Reformation," 33.

²Dulles, *The Survival of Dogma*, 88; idem, "The Open Church," 20.

³Dulles, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; idem, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 10-1; idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 131. A similar conclusion was reached by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger. See "Ratzinger Criticizes Post-conciliar Changes," *NCR*, June 21, 1985, 26; cf. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Ratzinger Report* (San

radical reforms were justified by the Council's emphasis on the image of the Church as the pilgrim People of God. While the Council indeed encouraged self-criticism and reform, these reformers went further and called for a review of the entire doctrinal heritage. They emphasized the innovative teachings of the Council, overlooking its reaffirmation of the traditional teachings of the Church. The results have been devastating for the Catholic community¹ and a personal disappointment to Dulles,² who dedicated his life to the dissemination of the Council's message.

This devastating crisis manifested itself in several areas of Church life. It was the most detrimental, Dulles believes, to apologetics. Traditional catechetical methods and the conventional teaching manuals were, for the most part, discarded, "without anything to take their place." Suddenly, the defense of the Catholic faith, as well as the motivation for its propagation, no longer seemed important.³ As a result, a whole generation of Catholics, both laity and clergy, lacked a solid understanding of the Catholic heritage and, rather than turning to the authority of the teaching office, depended on sources hostile to the Church, such as the media, for information about the Church and its teachings.⁴ "Having entered the Catholic communion before Vatican II," Dulles writes, "we are troubled by the impression that Catholics today are not as eager in their defense of the faith as were their predecessors before the Council. Although Vatican II had many positive effects, it seems

Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985), 37. In fact, a perusal of Dulles's recent writings reveals that he shares many concerns with Cardinal Ratzinger.

¹Dulles, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 10-1.

²In fact, one gets the impression that the recent Dulles may be somewhat embarrassed by his early post-Vatican enthusiasm. The 1996 "Journey" strikes one as Dulles's apology for his "exaggerated" enthusiasm toward the alleged improvements advocated by the Council. Caught up in the general post-conciliar fervor, he states that he may have overemphasized the deficiencies of the pre-conciliar period. In my interview with him, Dulles also expressed similar sentiments.

³Dulles, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 11.

⁴Dulles, "The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic," 14; cf. idem, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 26, and idem, "Dialogue," 9.

to have weakened the apostolic zeal and self-confidence of the Catholic community.”¹ A lack of appreciation for the Catholic heritage, Dulles believes, affected commitment to the Catholic faith. Thus, the post-Vatican II era has witnessed a gradual decline in Mass attendance and participation in the sacramental life of the Church.² In addition, the implementation of some reforms suggested by the Council eventually brought a decline in the spiritual life of the faithful, as well as a destruction of many forms of piety that had sustained the faith of believers for centuries.³

Catholic education was also affected by the post-conciliar crisis. A marked decline in enrollment⁴ has been accompanied by Catholic schools becoming less distinctively Catholic.⁵ In many of them, Dulles argues, the curriculum no longer makes “specific claims for sacred history, sacred doctrine, and sacred polity. Catholicism is introduced as one point of view—dominant but no longer supreme—and is considered in relation to the outlooks of other churches, other religions, and other ideologies”⁶ It is unfortunate that, in order to justify such changes in the curriculum, Catholic educators often appeal to Vatican II. While one purpose of the Council was “to bring the Church out of its ghetto-like isolation, and to situate it in the modern world,” it did not abandon insistence on the inviolability of traditional Catholic teaching, argues Dulles.⁷

¹Dulles, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 10, 11. See also the report by Roberts, “Dulles Urges Bishops to Enforce Papal ‘No’,” 6.

²Avery Dulles, “Liturgy and Tradition: A Theologian’s Perspective,” *Antiphon* 3 (1998): 4-5.

³Dulles, *The Priestly Office*, 42.

⁴Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 10-8.

⁵Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 13.

⁶Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 12-3; idem, “The Four Faces of American Catholicism,” 107.

⁷Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 13-4.

Closely related to the crisis in Catholic education is the debate related to the nature and role of the priesthood. While Vatican II gave new emphasis to the role of the priest, presenting it in the context of the proclamation of the Word and pastoral leadership, thus overcoming “an unhealthy clericalism,” Dulles bemoans the fact that much of post-conciliar scholarship has set its sight on overcoming the vestiges of “medieval sacralism and attuning the ordained ministry to the spirit of the times.” Some have gone so far as to propose abolishing the ordained priesthood, placing greater emphasis upon the priesthood of all believers, doing away with priestly celibacy, and even ordaining women to the priestly ministry. Each of these proposals, in Dulles’s opinion, not only undermines the sacramental understanding of the priesthood but contributes to the “crisis of priestly identity,” as well as to the rapidly diminishing numbers of priestly vocations in the West.¹

Dulles is similarly concerned about the liturgical crisis in the post-Vatican II Church. In a 1998 article, he discusses two contrasting liturgical trends which he terms “otherworldly” and “this-worldly.”² The former focuses on the transcendent qualities of Catholic ritual, whose purpose is to arouse a “sense of numinous awe in the presence of the holy, the totally other.” “This-worldly” liturgy, on the other hand, focuses on the existential qualities of worship, inviting believers to celebrate their religious experience. God is not seen in terms of ultimate otherness, but is present “here and now in the members themselves.” While shunning Lefebvrian extremism, Dulles favors the former approach and lays the blame, at least in part, for the decline in Mass attendance and the failure to attract young people to the religious ministry on “the withering away” of various forms of popular piety, such as novena prayers, parish missions, eucharistic adoration, and the rosary. These “sustained the faith and commitment of Catholics in the centuries before

¹Dulles, “The Priest and the Great Jubilee,” 31-2. See also idem, *The Priestly Office*, 43.

²Dulles, “Liturgy and Tradition: A Theologian’s Perspective,” 4-11.

the Second Vatican Council” and were associated with an “otherworldly” liturgical trend.¹ Imitating popular entertainers and talk show hosts—a trend in many Catholic communities—is detrimental to the solemnity and formality that has traditionally been associated with Catholic worship.² For this reason, Dulles calls for the Catholic faithful to reassess the validity of “otherworldly” forms of liturgical life, which he views as “the principal bearer of a tradition that comes down without a break from Christ and the apostles, and is normative for the universal church.”³

Dulles attributes most of these problems to an erroneous interpretation of Vatican II. He writes: “In their zeal to embrace the reforms of Vatican II, some Catholics overreacted. They felt that since the Church was not immune to criticism and reform, every Catholic doctrine and practice could properly be called into question. They so emphasized what was new and different in Vatican II that they neglected its support and reaffirmation of the great body of Catholic tradition.”⁴

Secularism and Relativism

Dulles’s concern regarding the breakdown of religious life is only the most visible expression of the crisis that engulfed the Roman Catholic Church in the post-conciliar years. This critical stage must be seen within the context of a worldwide crisis, which undergirded the changes in the Roman Catholic community, and which is often identified as “the Sixties.” This particular decade initiated a cultural revolution which led to growing secularism and relativism, and subsequently to a frontal assault on all forms of authority, at

¹Ibid., 11. “Private devotions,” Dulles comments, “though they emanate from popular experience of the community should always be kept in line with the objective form of revelation” (ibid., 20).

²Dulles, “Liturgy and Tradition: A Theologian’s Perspective,” 11.

³Ibid.

⁴Dulles, foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* 10-1; cf. idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 133.

all levels of society. The all-pervasive influence of secular culture upon Catholic believers has been one of Dulles's most striking concerns in recent years.

Catholic Christians, he believes, are faced with a "rampant secularism that recognizes no higher sovereignty than the human will and rejects in the name of autonomy the very idea of a divine intervention in the world."¹ Such a culture glorifies the affluent life, promotes hedonism, and encourages consumerism and individualism, qualities directly opposed to Christian values.² A major characteristic of secularism is its relativistic bent which claims that the concept of "truth" can be understood only within the context of the cultural or historical setting in which it is found. The logical consequence, Dulles explains, is that one cannot "profess to be certain of any religious belief that is contested in another social setting."³ As such, relativism is in "severe tension" with the gospel.⁴ It asserts that the Christian message must be reconstructed for every generation.⁵

Secularism and relativism have influenced the Western version of Roman Catholicism in several ways. To begin with, they have led to a false understanding of freedom. In the modern relativistic climate, freedom is understood "as the ability to choose whatever one pleases." This translates into the belief that every individual has the undeniable right to decide what is truth, relegating Christian faith to the status of human opinion.⁶ This understanding of the Christian faith has significantly influenced a generation of Catholics who obtained their religious education in the decades following the cultural revolution of the sixties. They view the Church as a voluntary association in which

¹Dulles, "Principles of Catholic Theology," 82.

²Dulles, "John Paul II and the New Evangelization," 59; cf. idem, "The Priest and the Great Jubilee," 38-9.

³Dulles, "Orthodoxy and Social Change," 12.

⁴Avery Dulles, quoted in Odell, 7.

⁵Dulles, "Evangelizing Theology," 30.

⁶Ibid., 31; idem, "Travails of Dialogue," 18.

believers have the freedom to make individual choices regarding specific beliefs.¹ Next, this attitude of “selective adherence” has created many so-called “communal Catholics,” for whom “superficial religiosity” and a “loose connection” with the Church is all they need to sustain their religious identity. Such an outlook, Dulles contends, can hardly be seen as “faith and discipleship in the full Christian sense of those words.”²

Moreover, this false understanding of freedom is closely related to anti-authoritarianism. The distrust of society toward all forms of authority has affected the way that many Catholics view their Church. They see it as a highly organized institution which coerces and oppresses individual beliefs and initiatives, and disinclines them to place their trust in its leadership. The pronouncements of the magisterium, which are generally countercultural, are no longer universally accepted.³ As a result, “in rejecting the authority of revealed religion, [Catholics] are generally submitting to the authority of the secularist opposition, which has its own institutions and promotional organs.”⁴ The clergy and the episcopate themselves are not fully immune to the all-pervasive influence of secularism. In such an environment, “where the weakening and disappearance of the religious symbols and practices by which Catholic beliefs were formerly sustained,” it is very difficult for the Church to “pass on the Catholic tradition to new generations.”⁵ For these reasons, Dulles maintains that the Church as a whole needs to return to a traditional, countercultural stance and resist any forms of accommodation.⁶

¹Dulles, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 9, 13.

²Dulles, “The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic,” 9.

³Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 20, 25.

⁴Dulles, “Evangelizing Theology,” 31.

⁵Dulles, interview; idem, “The Four Faces of American Catholicism,” 107.

⁶Dulles, “The Four Faces of American Catholicism,” 107; cf. idem, review of *Teaching with Authority*, 836; idem, “Criteria of Catholic Theology,” 309; idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 12-4.

The Issue of Dissent

The contemporary breakdown of religious life, which was precipitated by secularism and relativism, went hand in hand with another phenomenon, namely, dissent in the Church. This factor, I submit, is probably the most significant cause for the shift in Dulles's thinking over the years. In fact, during my interview with him, the problem of dissent struck me as his most prominent concern.¹ While the early Dulles considered dissent inherent to the health of the Roman Catholic communion,² the recent Dulles sees it differently. Following the Second Vatican Council, he maintains, there was a need to open up to the world, to be receptive to new ideas outside of the Church, and to change what could and should be changed.³ But this is no longer the case. Thus he stated a few months ago:

In the seventies dissent became almost normal in the United States. It became habitual. This extended not only to non-infallible teachings but also to the established dogmas of the Church. Modern theologians reassess everything. Scripture is re-interpreted; the teachings of the early councils of the Church are questioned and subjected to doubt. If this were to continue, it would eventually lead to the dissolution of Catholic Christianity.⁴

Increasingly influenced by secularism and relativism, progressive Catholic theologians continue to assert themselves as a voice equal to that of the leadership of the Church. Dulles sees their increasing "self-assertion against hierarchical authority"⁵ and their insistence on their right to dissent from magisterial teachings as one of the main reasons for the many problems in the Church.⁶ He does not seem to be particularly

¹While Dulles does not agree with the assertion that his theological views might have changed, he does admit that his views on dissent are no longer the same. Dulles, interview.

²Dulles, "Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II," 672-73; idem, *Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem*, 23-4.

³"Dulles Takes Church's Hard Line to Rank of Cardinal," 1.

⁴Dulles, interview.

⁵Dulles, "How Catholic Is the CTSA?" 14; cf. Bole, 11.

⁶The tone of Dulles's many recent writings exhibits nostalgia for pre-Vatican II Catholicism. In a recent article, he notes that "in the church that I remember from my

concerned about sporadic instances of dissent, which should be “rare, reluctant, and respectful,” but rather with the “general climate” in which dissent “is considered courageous, authentic, and forward looking, while submission is viewed as cowardly, hypocritical, and retrograde.”¹ He decries any form of public and systematic dissent, which is characterized by organized opposition to magisterial teachings, active recruitment of followers, press conferences, or solicitation of signatures to petitions. Such a form of dissent ignores “the distinctiveness of the church, which is a community of faith that lives by means of common acceptance of doctrines authoritatively mediated.” While public dissent may be acceptable in civil society, it undermines “the very essence of Catholic Christianity,”² which is led by a class of believers who, assisted by the Holy Spirit, speak authoritatively in the name of Christ. Besides weakening the impact of the teachings dissented to, public dissent “discredits” the authority of the magisterium, thus harming the mission of the Church.³ Its proponents have thwarted the attempts of responsible theologians to implement the reforms initiated by the Second Vatican Council, and hampered “the development of any consensus among Catholics in favor of the official teaching of their church.”⁴ Confused by the irresponsible teachings of progressive theologians, many lay members on their part have made up their own minds on controverted issues.⁵

youth, Catholics could be counted upon to support the teaching of the pope; public criticism of the magisterium by Catholics was almost unheard of.” Idem, “Orthodoxy and Social Change,” 13.

¹Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89.

²Dulles, “Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue,” 7.

³Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89. These remarks were issued partly in reaction to McCormick’s “The Church and Dissent: How Vatican II Ushered in a New Way of Thinking.”

⁴Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 20.

⁵Dulles, “Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology,” 89; idem, “*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*,” 23; cf. “*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent,” 776.

Dissent has resulted in “a kind of spiritual schism,” where various parties “attend different liturgies, join different professional societies, publish and read their own journals, and even set up their own educational institutions.”¹ Dulles agrees with Bernard D. Green who admits, “I see a perilous amount of contentiousness, polarization, and fragmentation in the American Church.”² Like Green, he sees Catholic theologians hopelessly divided³ and wonders whether American theologians on both sides of the spectrum can still recognize themselves as belonging to the same Roman Catholic Church.⁴ “Enough has been said,” he concludes, “to make it clear that . . . dissent is a deep wound in the body of Christ. No one who loves and cares for the church can be content to see the present state of affairs continue.”⁵

In recent years Dulles has grown increasingly impatient and critical in his remarks regarding Roman Catholic theology. While in the late eighties he was still open to the possibility of dissent,⁶ in the late nineties Dulles began to criticize progressive theologians in increasingly severe tones and to blame them for the current crisis in the Church.⁷ Consequently, his remarks have at times been disturbing even to those who agree with his

In retrospect, as we noted in an earlier chapter, the recent Dulles traces his dissatisfaction with dissent to two pivotal events which, he believes, ushered in an era of an open dissent in the Roman Catholic Church, i.e., the reception of *Humanae vitae* and the 1976 “Call to Action” conference. Dulles, interview. See also idem, *A Testimonial to Grace and Reflections on a Theological Journey*, 110.

¹Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 16-7.

²Bernard D. Green, “Tremors in the Foundation of the U.S. Catholic Church,” *NOR*, October 1993, 16, 11; Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 17.

³Dulles, interview.

⁴Dulles, “Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition,” 17.

⁵Dulles, “*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent,” 777.

⁶Avery Dulles, “Motives and Types of Dissent,” *NOR*, January-February 1989, 8-9.

⁷See, for example, Dulles, “How Catholic Is CTSA?” 13-4.

views.¹ Though not the only one, Dulles's concern regarding dissent in the Church may well be the most likely reason for his move away from his early "pluralistic theory of authority," and specifically from his "two magisteria" approach.

In conclusion, it appears that the root of the divergences between the early and recent views of Dulles is his concern that increasing numbers of Catholics came to view the Second Vatican Council as an event which opened the door for a smorgasbord of innovations and theological opinions he regards as incompatible with traditional Catholic teaching. As the years progressed, such initiatives resulted in intra-ecclesial confusion and insubordination on all sides of the theological spectrum. It is not surprising, therefore, that in his twilight years Dulles has come to support what he believes is the only possible solution to Catholic profligacy, namely, increased authority and vigilance on the part of *the* magisterium. It is interesting to note, however, that in the seventies Dulles blamed the crisis of authority in the Church on the leadership, whom he chastised for their inability to move forward with Vatican II reforms.² While he no longer explicitly blames the bishops and the pope, his constant urging for doctrinal firmness and authoritarianism gives the impression that the blame for the current crisis may still lay at the feet of the episcopal leadership. This time, however, the fault lies in their inability to act authoritatively.³

¹According to Tom Roberts, following Dulles's presentation on women's ordination to US bishops in Portland, OR, in 1996 (the meeting was conducted behind closed doors), several bishops, while agreeing with the essence of Dulles's message, expressed their concern regarding the severity of his views. Bishop Kenneth Untener of Saginaw, MI, said: "His writing, speaking and personal contact have been helpful over the years. Because of that, I was disappointed with the tone of the paper and what I believe to be slanted remarks. He makes some oddly pejorative statements about theologians who disagree with him that I think are uncharacteristic of him. I think it is unfair and unworthy of him." A similar critique was offered by Bishops Raymond Lucker of New Ulm, MN, and Anthony G. Bosco of Greensburg, PA, both of whom were disturbed by Dulles's "antagonism" toward theologians who disagree with him. Tom Roberts, "Unanimous Voice Is Recommended But Bishops Divided on Women's Issue," *NCR*, July 26, 1996, 7.

²Dulles, "Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority," 9; cf. idem, "Ecumenism: Problems and Opportunities for the Future," in *Toward Vatican III*, 93, and idem, "'The Dearest Freshness': Hope Today," *America*, December 6, 1975, 406-07.

³See, for example, Dulles, "*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*," 19-20; idem, *A Testimonial to Grace* (1996), 112; Tom Roberts reached a similar conclusion.

Notwithstanding the difficulties the Church has faced in recent decades, Dulles does not doubt the ultimate triumph of Catholic Christianity. He writes: "It is urgent to overcome internal wrangling and get on with the great task of bringing Christ to the world. 'Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand' (Mt 12:25). If Catholics continue to trust their sacred heritage, and treat the papal teaching with due respect, the witness of the entire Church will be strengthened and the world will be drawn closer to Christ its Lord."¹

A Final Word

In this study I have dealt merely with some basic aspects of Dulles's understanding of the nature of religious authority and the manner in which it is exercised in the Roman Catholic Church. Particular attention was given to the relationship between the hierarchical magisterium and theologians, and their respective roles in the Church. This starting point should encourage further consideration of Dulles's views, especially (1) the relationship between the pope and the bishops, (2) the issue of infallibility, (3) the problem of doctrinal development, (4) the nature of faith, and (5) the adaptation and renewal of the Church in a constantly changing environment.

See his "Dulles Urges Bishops to Enforce Papal 'No'," 6, and idem, "Unanimous Voice Is Recommended," 7. See also Dulles's recommendations for bishops in "Pastoral Response to the Teaching on Women's Ordination," 180.

¹Dulles, "Women Priests: The Case Against," 49.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avery Dulles's works are listed in chronological sequence. The secondary sources are listed in alphabetical order by surname, but for those authors who have multiple works, the order is chronological.

Primary Sources by Avery Dulles

Books and Pamphlets (Sole Authorship)

- A Testimonial to Grace.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946.
- Protestant Churches and the Prophetic Office.* Woodstock, MD: Woodstock College Press, 1961.
- Apologetics and the Biblical Christ.* New York: Missionary Society of Saint Paul the Apostle, 1963.
- The Dimensions of the Church.* Westminster: Newman Press, 1967.
- Revelation and the Quest for Unity.* Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1968.
- Revelation Theology: A History.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- The Survival of Dogma.* New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- History of Apologetics.* New York: Corpus Instrumentorum, 1971.
- Models of the Church.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.
- Church Membership as a Catholic and Ecumenical Problem.* Milwaukee: Marquette University Theology Department, 1974.
- The Resilient Church.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977.
- A Church to Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom.* New York: Crossroads, 1982.
- Models of Revelation.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- The Catholicity of the Church.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Models of the Church.* New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- The Reshaping of Catholicism.* San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988.
- Models of Revelation.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992.

- The Craft of Theology*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1992.
- The Assurance of Things Hoped For*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- A Testimonial to Grace and Reflections on a Theological Journey*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1996.
- John Paul II and the Teaching Authority of the Church: Like a Sentinel*. Regina: Campion College, University of Regina, 1997.
- Truth as the Ground of Freedom: A Theme from John Paul II*. Grand Rapids: Acton Institute, 1997.
- The Priestly Office: A Theological Reflection*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.
- The Splendor of Faith: The Theological Vision of Pope John Paul II*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.

Articles

- "On Keeping the Faith." *From the Housetops* 1 (September 1946): 60-6.
- "Coming Home." In *Where I Found Christ*, ed. by John O'Brien, 63-81. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1950.
- "Catholics in Secular Colleges." *The Catholic Mind* 49 (1951): 559-62.
- "Church Unity and Roman Primacy in the Doctrine of St. Cyprian." *The Theologian* 10 (Spring 1954): 33-48.
- "The Protestant Concept of the Church." *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 132 (1955): 330-05.
- "Paul Tillich and the Bible." *Theological Studies* 17 (1956): 345-67.
- "The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement." *Downside Review* 239 (January 1957): 38-54.
- "The Protestant Preacher and the Prophetic Mission." *Theological Studies* 21 (1960): 544-80.
- Review of *The Spirit of Protestantism*, by Robert McAfee Brown. In *The Catholic World* 193 (July 1961): 263-64.
- "What Hopes and What Misgivings Do You Entertain Regarding the Currently Emerging Religious Dialogue in America?" *America*, January 14, 1961, 461-62.
- Review of *Concile et retour à l'unité*, by Hans Küng. *Theological Studies* 22 (1961): 704-06.
- Review of *The Council, Reform and Reunion*, by Hans Küng. *Catholic Book Reporter*, April-May 1962, 11.

Review of *The Council, Reform and Reunion*, by Hans Küng. In *America*, March 31, 1962, 861-02.

"Les catholiques américains à l'ère 'post-protestante'." *Christus* [Paris] 9 (1962): 533-45.

"The Council and the Sources of Revelation." *America*, December 1, 1962, 1176-177.

"Catholic Ecumenism: Possible, Useful, Necessary." *The Catholic Reporter*, May 4, 1962, 11.

"The Theology of Revelation." *Theological Studies* 25 (1964): 43-58.

"Pope Paul's Ecumenical Perspectivte." *The Catholic World* 200 (October 1964): 15-21.

"Response to Krister Stendahl's 'Method in the Study of Biblical Theology'." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt, 210-16. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

"Luther's Unfinished Reformation." *The Catholic Mind*, April 1965, 32-35.

"The Gospels and Apologetic Method." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 19 (1965): 151-60.

"A Different Reading." *Commonweal*, January 22, 1965, 530-31.

"Ecumenical Dialogue and Apostolic Renewal." *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 153 (November 1965): 300-15.

"The Church." In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott, 9-13. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

"Symbol, Myth, and the Biblical Revelation." *Theological Studies* 27 (1966): 1-26.

"Philosophy: Catholic and Protestant." In *Christian Philosophy and Religious Renewal*, ed. George F. McLean, 158-162. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1966.

"The Constitution on Divine Revelation in Ecumenical Perspective." *The American Ecclesiastical Review* 154 (1966): 217-31.

"Faith and Dogmatic Pluralism." *America*, May 13, 1967, 728.

"Faith and Doubt." *America*, March 11, 1967, 350.

"Jesus of History and Christ of Faith." *Commonweal*, November 24, 1967, 225-32.

"Faith and New Opinions." *America*, October 28, 1967, 479.

"Some Recent Death of God Literature." *Theological Studies* 28 (1967): 111-18.

"Faith Come of Age." *America*, August 5, 1967, 137.

"The Protestant Contribution to Catholic Renewal." *The Hartford Quarterly* 7 (Summer 1967): 7-17.

"Revelation, Theology of." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 12:440-44.

"Revelation in Recent Catholic Theology." *Theology Today* 24 (October 1967): 350-65.

Review of *A Question of Conscience*, by Charles Davis. *America*, November 11, 1967, 568-72.

"Karl Rahner on 'Human Life'." *America*, September 28, 1968, 250-52.

"Bergamo, 1968: A Theological Reflection." *Worldmission* 19 (Fall 1968): 17-28.

"The Modern Dilemma of Faith." In *Toward a Theology of Christian Faith*, ed. Michael Mooney, Joseph J. Koechler, John Dinges, and Michael C. Scheible, 11-32. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1968.

Review of *Revelation Theology*, by Edward Schillebeeckx. *Commonweal*, April 5, 1968, 81-2.

"The Ecumenical Movement Is in Trouble." *The Lamp*, April 1968, 16-9, 31-2.

"Fr. Dulles Replies." *America*, May 25, 1968, 685-86.

"Dogma as an Ecumenical Problem." *Theological Studies* 29 (1968): 397-416.

"The Succession of Prophets in the Church." In *Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity*, ed. Hans Küng, 52-62. Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1968.

Review of *The Church*, by Hans Küng. *America*, April 20, 1968, 545-46.

"The Open Church." *Chicago Studies* 8 (Spring 1969): 17-28.

"The Contemporary Magisterium." *Theology Digest* 17 (1969): 299-311.

"Karl Barth: A Catholic Appreciation." *Christian Century*, March 26, 1969, 408-10.

"Jesus of History and Christ of Faith." In *God, Jesus, and Spirit*, ed. Daniel Callahan, 91-109. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

"Faith, Reason and the Logic of Discovery." *Thought* 45 (1970): 485-502.

"Authority and Reason in the Assent of Faith." In *Spirit, Faith and Church*, ed. Wolfhart Pannenberg, Avery Dulles, and Carl E. Braaten, 32-50. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

"Official Church Teaching and Historical Relativity." In *Spirit, Faith and Church*, ed. Wolfhart Pannenberg, Avery Dulles, and Carl E. Braaten, 51-72. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

Review of *Faith Under Challenge*, by Heinrich Fries. *Commonweal*, May 15, 1970, 229-30.

- "The Magisterium and Authority in the Church." In *Theology in Revolution*, ed. George Devine, 29-45. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1970.
- "Loyalty and Dissent: After Vatican II." *America*, June 27, 1970, 672-73.
- "Hans Kung's Infallible? An Inquiry, A Symposium." *America*, April 24, 1971, 427-28.
- "The Church Is Communications." *The Catholic Mind*, October 1971, 6-16.
- "The Meaning of Revelation." In *The Dynamic in Christian Thought*, ed. Joseph Papin, 52-80. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1971.
- "The Idea of a National Pastoral Council." In *A National Pastoral Council: Proceedings of an Interdisciplinary Consultation August 28-30, 1970 in Chicago, Ill.*, ed. J. Paul O'Connor, 3-20. Washington, DC: U.S.C.C., 1971.
- "Church, Churches, Catholic Church." *Theological Studies* 33 (1972): 199-234.
- "The Contemporary Relevance of the Ignatian Vision." *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* (Fall 1972): 145-54.
- "My Views Were Caricatured." *The Wanderer*, December 21, 1972, 8.
- "The Theology of Hans Küng: A Comment." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 27 (1972): 137-42.
- "The Church as Multimedia." *New Catholic World*, January-February 1972, 22-4, 43-6.
- "Current Trends in Mission Theology." *Theology Digest* 20 (Spring 1972): 26-34.
- "Reflections on Doctrinal Agreement." In *Episcopalians and Roman Catholics: Can They Ever Get Together?* ed. H. J. Ryan and J. R. Wright, 51-66. Denville, NJ: Dimension Books, 1972.
- Review of *Method in Theology*, by Bernard Lonergan. *Theological Studies* 33 (1972): 553-55.
- "Catholic Theology and the Secondary School." *Catholic Mind*, September 1973, 15-24.
- "Conscience and Church Authority." In *Conscience: Theological and Psychological Perspectives*, ed. C. Ellis Nelson, 115-22. New York: Newman Press, 1973.
- "Incarnation, 1973: Reflections at Christmas." *Commonweal*, December 28, 1973, 335-36.
- "Ministry and Intercommunion." *Theological Studies* 34 (1973): 643-78.
- Review of *The Remaking of the Church*, by Richard P. McBrien. *America*, November 10, 1973, 358-59.
- "Rozmowa z Avery Dullesem, SJ." Interview by Jozef Krasinski, *Tygodnik Powrzechny*, November 11, 1973, 3.
- "The Apostolate of Theological Reflection." *The Way* 20 (Autumn 1973): 114-23.

- "The Papacy: Bond or Barrier?" *Catholic Mind*, September 1974, 45-59.
- "The Problem of Revelation." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 29 (1974): 77-106.
- "Helping the Kingdom Come." Interview by Jack Wintz, *Saint Anthony Messenger*, January 1974, 24-30.
- "A Proposal to Lift Anathemas." *Catholic Mind*, May 1975, 40-5.
- "How Can Christian Faith Be Justified Today?" *Communio* 2 (1975): 343-56.
- "Homily for the Convention Eucharist." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 30 (1975): 267-69.
- "Dilemmas Facing the Church in the World." *Origins* 4 (1975): 548-51.
- "'The Dearest Freshness': Hope Today." *America*, December 6, 1975, 406-07.
- "Papal Authority in Roman Catholicism." In *A Pope for All Christians?* ed. Peter J. McCord, 48-70. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- "The Theologian and the Magisterium." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 31 (1976): 235-46.
- "What Is Magisterium?" *Origins* 6 (1976): 81-8.
- "A Response—Certainty in the Catholic Church." *Long Island Catholic*, Thursday, December 9, 1976, 8.
- "Method in Fundamental Theology: Reflections on David Tracy's *Blessed Rage for Order*." *Theological Studies* 37 (1976): 304-16.
- "*Ius Divinum* as an Ecumenical Problem." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 681-708.
- Review of *Fundamental Theology*, by Heinrich Fries, *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 732.
- "Authority and Criticism in Systematic Theology." *Theology Digest* 26 (1978): 387-99.
- "The Magisterium in History: A Theological Reflection." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 264-81.
- "Ecumenism: Problems and Opportunities for the Future." In *Toward Vatican III*, ed. David Tracy, Hans Küng, and Johann B. Metz, 91-101. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.
- "Faith, Justice and the University." *Catholic Mind*, October 1978, 25-32.
- "The Two Magisteria: An Interim Reflection." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 35 (1980): 155-69.
- "Heresy Today?" *America*, March 1, 1980, 162-64.

- "*Successio apostolorum—Successio prophetarum—Successio doctorum.*" In *Who Has the Say in the Church?* ed. Jürgen Moltmann and Hans Küng, 61-7. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- "Imaging the Church for the 1980s." *Thought* 56 (June 1981): 121-38.
- "The Church: Sacrament and Ground of Faith." In *Problems and Perspectives of Fundamental Theology*, ed. R. Latourelle and G. O'Collins, 259-73. New York: Ramsay, 1982.
- "Truth, Life in Christ Form Real Authority." *National Catholic Reporter*, October 8, 1982, 9.
- "Scripture: Recent Protestant and Catholic Views." In *The Authoritative Word: Essays on the Nature of Scripture*, ed. Donald K. McKim, 239-61. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.
- "An Ecclesial Model for Theological Reflection: The Council of Jerusalem." In *Tracing the Spirit*, ed. James E. Hug, 218-41. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- "The Emerging World Church: A Theological Reflection." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 39 (1984): 1-12.
- "Faith, Church, and God: Insights from Michael Polanyi." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 537-50.
- "Vatican II and the American Experience of Church." In *Vatican II: Open Questions and New Horizons*, ed. Gerard M. Fagin, 38-57. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- "Bishops' Conference Documents: What Doctrinal Authority?" *Origins*, January 24, 1985, 528-34.
- "What Is the Doctrinal Authority of a Bishops' Conference?" *Origins* 14 (1985): 528-34.
- "Paths to Doctrinal Agreement: Ten Theses." *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 32-47.
- "Community of Disciples as a Model of the Church." *Philosophy and Theology* 1 (Fall 1986): 99-120.
- "Motives and Types of Dissent." *New Oxford Review*, January-February 1989, 8-9.
- "University Theology as a Service to the Church." *Thought* 64 (1989): 103-15.
- "A Half Century of Ecclesiology." *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 419-42.
- "Episcopal Conferences: Their Teaching Authority." *America*, January 6-13, 1990, 7-9.
- "Catholicism and American Culture: The Uneasy Dialogue." *America*, January 27, 1990, 54-9.
- "The Church and the Universal Catechism." *America*, March 3, 1990, 201-03, 201-03, 218-19.

- Review of *Paradigm Change in Theology*, by Hans Küng and David Tracy. *The Tablet*, July 7, 1990, 858.
- "The Teaching Mission of the Church and Academic Freedom." *America*, April 21, 1990, 397-402.
- "The Role of Tradition in Catholic Christianity." *Emmanuel* 96 (1990): 4-13, 21, 28-9.
- "Is Neo-Thomism Obsolete?" *New Oxford Review*, May 1990, 5-11.
- "Ecumenism without Illusions: A Catholic Perspective." *First Things* 4 (1990): 234-38.
- "The Dogma of the Assumption." In *The One Mediator, the Saints and Mary*, ed. Joseph Burgess, 279-94. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1992.
- "John Paul II and the New Evangelization." *America*, February 1, 1992, 52-9, 69-72.
- "The Four Faces of American Catholicism." *Louvain Studies* 18 (1993): 99-109.
- "The Teaching Mission of the Church and Academic Freedom." In *Issues in Academic Freedom*, ed. George S. Worgul, 42-56. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 1992.
- "The Church and the Kingdom." In *A Church for All Peoples*, ed. Eugene LaVerdiere, 13-27. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- "Harvard as an Invitation to Catholicism." In *The Catholics of Harvard Square*, ed. Jeffrey Wills, 119-24. Petersham, MA: Saint Bede's Publications, 1993.
- "Church as the Locus of Salvation." In *The Thought of Pope John Paul II*, ed. John M. McDermott, 170-87. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1993.
- "*Humanae Vitae* and the Crisis of Dissent." *Origins* 22 (1993): 774-77.
- "Narrowing the Gap: Gospel and Culture." *Origins* 23 (1994): 677-80.
- "Season of Grace." *The Tablet*, October 22, 1994, 1342.
- "Women's Ordination." *Commonweal*, July 15, 1994, 10-1.
- "Tradition and Creativity: A Theological Approach." In *Quadrilog: Tradition and the Future of Ecumenism*, ed. Kenneth Hagen, 312-27. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Review of *Retrieving Fundamental Theology*, by Gerald O'Collins. *Commonweal*, March 11, 1994, 20-1.
- "Dialogue." Interview by J. Koopman, *National Catholic Register*, July 24, 1994, 1, 9.
- "Saint Bellarmine: A Moderate in a Disputatious Age." *Crisis*, December 1994, 39-44.
- "The New Evangelization and Theological Renewal." *Sacred Heart University Review* 15 (1994-1995): 14-26.

- "The Challenge of Catechism." *First Things*, January 1995, 46-53.
- "Criteria of Catholic Theology." *Communio* 22 (1995): 303-15.
- "Seven Essentials of Evangelization." *Origins* 25 (1995): 397-400.
- "The Lure of Catholicism." *New Oxford Review*, March 1995, 6-14.
- "What the New Evangelization Demands of Us." Interview by Thomas P. O'Connor. *New Covenant* 24 (June 1995): 7-10.
- "The Unity for Which We Hope." In *Evangelicals and Catholics Together: Toward a Common Mission*, ed. Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus, 115-46. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1995.
- "The Gospel of Life: A Symposium." *First Things*, October 1995, 32-3.
- "The Ecclesial Dimension of Faith." *Communio* 22 (1995): 418-32.
- Review of *Religion and Revelation: A Theology of the World's Religions*, by Keith Ward. *Theology Today* 52 (1995): 398-99.
- "Tradition Says No." *The Tablet*, December 9, 1995, 1572-573.
- "John Paul II and the Advent of the New Millennium." *America*, December 9, 1995, 9-15.
- "Infallible: Rome's Word on Women's Ordination." *National Catholic Register*, January 7, 1996, 10.
- "Evangelizing Theology." *First Things*, March 1996, 27-32.
- "Pastoral Response to the Teaching on Women's Ordination." *Origins* 26 (1996): 177-80.
- Review of *Christ Is the Answer: The Christ-centered Teaching of Pope John Paul II*, by John Saward. *The Tablet*, May 25, 1996, 693.
- Review of *Church Teaching Authority: Historical and Theological Studies*, by John P. Boyle. *First Things*, August-September 1996, 57-8.
- "Context of Christian Proclamation Sets Parameters of Dialogue." *National Catholic Register*, December 8-14, 1996, 7.
- "The Church as Communion." In *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, ed. Bradley Nassif, 125-39. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996.
- "Gender and Priesthood: Examining the Teaching." *Origins* 25 (1996): 778-84.
- Foreword to *What Is Catholicism?* by John Redford. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 1996.
- Review of *Imaginer l'Église catholique*, by Ghislain Lafont. *Theological Studies* 57 (1996): 768-69.
- "The New Catechism: A Feast of Faith." *Theology Today* 53 (July 1996): 148-51.

- "Prospects for Seminary Theology." *Seminary Journal* (Winter 1996): 12-9.
- "The Ignatian Charism and Contemporary Theology." *America*, April 26, 1997, 14-22.
- Review of *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church*, by Richard R. Gaillardetz. *The Tablet*, June 28, 1997, 836.
- "John Paul II: Theologian." *Communio* 24 (1997): 713-27.
- "Travails of Dialogue." *Crisis*, February 1997, 16-20.
- "The Catholic Press." *National Catholic Register*, June 8-14, 1997, 4.
- "Revelation as the Basis for Scripture and Tradition." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 21 (1997): 104-20.
- "The New Evangelization: Challenge for Religious Missionary Institutes." In *Word Remembered, Word Proclaimed: Selected Papers from Symposia Celebrating the SVD Centennial in North America*, ed. Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroder, 17-31. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1997.
- "The Catholic Press and the New Evangelization." *Origins* 27 (1997): 62-3.
- "From the Heart of Priestly Formation: The Future of Seminary Theology." *Catholic International* 8 (1997): 38-42.
- "Orthodoxy and Social Change." *America*, June 20, 1998, 8-17.
- "Avery Dulles Replies." *Crisis*, November 1998, 3.
- "The Priest and the Great Jubilee." *The Priest*, June 1998, 31-9.
- "How to Read the Pope." *The Tablet*, July 25, 1998, 967-68.
- "Sense of the Faithful." *National Catholic Reporter*, May 1 1998, 21.
- "The Ways We Worship." *First Things*, March 1998, 28-34.
- "How Catholic Is CTSA?" *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 13-4.
- Review of *The Doctrine of Revelation: A Narrative Interpretation*, by Gabriel Fackre. *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 527-29.
- "La théologie catholique nord-américaine depuis 1965." *Revue de l'Institut catholique de Paris* 68, October-December 1998, 9-28.
- "Women Priests: The Case Against." *Dublin Studies* 87 (1998): 43-50.
- "The Reception of *Evangelii Nuntiandi* in the West." In *L'Esortazione Apostolica Di Paolo VI Evangelii Nuntiandi. Storia, Contenuti, Ricezione*, ed. Pubblicazioni Dell'Istituto Paolo VI 19, 244-50. Brescia: Insituto Paolo VI, 1998.
- "Should the Church Repent?" *First Things*, December 1998, 36-41.

"The Place of Theology in a Catholic University." In *Catholic Theology in the University: Source of Wholeness*, ed. Virginia M. Shaddy, 59-71. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1998.

Review of *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, by Miroslav Volf. *First Things*, November 1998, 50-2.

"Faith and Reason, a Note on the New Encyclical." *America*, October 31, 1998, 7-8.

"Liturgy and Tradition: A Theologian's Perspective." *Antiphon* 3 (1998): 4-11, 20.

"Mary and the Millennium." *Catholic Update*, December 1998, 1-4.

Avery Dulles, Bronx, NY, to Msgr. Kelly, 3 August 1998, photocopy, in my possession.

"The Basic Teaching of Vatican II." In *Sacred Adventure*, ed. William C. Graham, 125-37. New York: University Press of America, 1999.

"Charism of the New Evangelizer." In *Retrieving Charisms for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Doris Donnelly, 33-45. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

"Catholic Doctrine: Between Revelation and Theology." *Proceedings of the Catholic Society of America* 54 (1999): 83-91.

"Catholics in the World of Mass Media." *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 22 (Summer 1999): 15-21.

"Two Languages of Salvation." *First Things*, December 1999, 25-30.

"Principles of Catholic Theology." *Pro Ecclesia* 8 (1999): 73-84.

"An Important Bridge Must Yet Be Crossed." *The Globe*, May 27, 1999, 5.

"*Humanae Vitae* and *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis*." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, 14-28. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.

"Panel Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 75-7, 79-81, 86-7, 94-5. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.

"First General Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 103-06, 117. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.

"Second General Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 119, 132-34. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.

Review of *The Exercise of the Primacy: Continuing Dialogue*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley. *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 307-13.

Review of *Papal Primacy and the Episcopate: Toward a Relational Understanding*, by Michael J. Buckley. *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 307-13.

Review of *Towards a Papacy in Communion: Perspectives from Vatican Councils I and II*, by Hermann J. Pottmeyer. *The Thomist* 63 (1999): 307-13.

"Two Languages of Salvation." *First Things*, December 1999, 25-30.

Review of *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*, by Carl E. Braaten. *First Things*, January 1999, 42-6.

"Reply to Msgr. Kelly." *Catholic New York*, July 22, 1999, 13.

"Donald Bloesh on Revelation." In *Evangelical Theology in Transition: Theologians in Dialogue with Donald Bloesh*, ed. Elmer M. Coyler, 61-76. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999.

"The Church as 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic'." *One in Christ* 35 (1999): 12-26.

Review of *Witness to Hope: The Biography of Pope John Paul II*, by George Weigel. *First Things*, November 1999, 49-75.

"Reversals at Vatican II?" *America*, May 29, 1999, 22.

"Jubilee 2000: Reform and Renewal in the Church." March 26, 2000, Dominican Ecclesial Institute Public Lectures. Available from www.op.org/dei/texts/Dulles.htm; May 2, 2000, 9 pages.

"The Papacy for a Global Church." *America*, July 15-22, 2000, 6-11.

"The Magisterium, the University, and the Catholic." Unpublished paper presented at John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, April 3, 2000.

Interview by author, March 5, 2001, Fordham University.

"Reason, Faith, and Theology: An Interview with Cardinal Avery Dulles, S.J." Interview by James Martin, *America*, March 5, 2001, 7-10.

Co-Authored Works

With Wolfhart Pannenberg and Carl E. Braaten. *Spirit, Faith and Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

With Patrick Granfield. *The Church: A Bibliography*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1985.

Secondary Sources

Abbott, Walter M., ed. *The Documents of Vatican II in New and Definitive Translation with Commentaries and Notes by Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Authorities*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

Acton, John. *Essays on Church and State*. London: Hollis and Carter, 1952.

- Afonso, Meneo A. *What Is the Nature of Authority in the Church?* New York: University Press of America, 1996.
- Alberigo, Giuseppe. *Election and Consensus in the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- _____. "The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 19 (1982): 119-45.
- _____. "The Announcement of the Council from the Security of the Fortress to the Lure of the Quest." In *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, 1:1-54. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.
- _____. "Conclusion: Preparing for What Kind of Council?" In *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, 1:501-8. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Alberigo, Giuseppe, and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds. *History of Vatican II*. Vol. 1. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Allen, John L. "Appointments Boost Latin American Bloc: Pope Names 37 New Cardinals, Promises More." *National Catholic Reporter*, February 2, 2001, 5.
- Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. "The Gift of Authority." *Origins* 29 (1999): 17-29.
- Appleby, R. Scott. "The Contested Legacy of Vatican II." *Notre Dame Magazine* 28 (Summer 1999): 23-7.
- _____. "Ending as It Began? The American Century and the Americanist Dream." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 29-45. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. Interview by author, August 9, 1999, Andrews University.
- Arrupe, Pedro. "Questions for a Globe-Trotting General." *America*, August 7, 1971, 55-8.
- Ash, James L. "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church." *Theological Studies* 37 (1976): 227-52.
- Associated Press. "Theologians Criticize the Vatican Rigidity." *New York Times*, December 14, 1990, 23.
- Aubert, Roger. *The Church in a Secularized Society*. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.
- Baker, Kenneth. "Five Different Views of the Church." Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, October 1974, 74-6.
- Baker, Robert A. "An Introduction to the Study of the Development of Ecclesiology." Ph.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1944.

- Banks, Robert. *Paul's Idea of Community*. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980.
- Bannerman, D. Douglas. *The Scripture Doctrine of the Church*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1955.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.
- Bassett, W.W. "Subsidiarity, Order and Freedom in the Church." In *The Once and Future Church: A Communion of Freedom*, ed. J. A. Coriden, 205-65. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1971.
- Baum, Gregory. "Vatican II's Constitution on Revelation: History and Interpretation." *Theological Studies* 28 (1967): 51-75.
- _____. *The Credibility of the Church Today*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- _____. *Faith and Doctrine*. Paramus, NJ: Newman Press, 1969.
- _____. Foreword to *The Democratic Church*, by Donald E. Nicodemus. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1969.
- _____. "Toward a New Catholic Theism." *The Ecumenist* 8 (1970): 53-61.
- Becker, Joseph M. *The Re-Formed Jesuits: A History of Changes in Jesuit Formation During the Decade 1965-1975*. 2 vols. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992.
- Benson, Edward White. *Cyprian, His Life, His Times, His Work*. London: Macmillan, 1897.
- Berbusse, Edward J. "A Do-Your-Own Thing Church," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, December 1984, 74-7.
- Bergson, Henri. *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. New York: H. Holt, 1935.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *The Church*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.
- _____. *The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965.
- Bermejo, Luis M. *Towards Christian Unity*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Bernardin, Joseph. "Archbishop Sees Mixed Results from Justice Conference." *Origins* 6 (1976): 324.
- _____. "Pastoral Sensitivity and Fidelity to the Gospel." *Origins* 7 (1977): 29-32.
- _____. Foreword to *Vatican II Revisited by Those Who Were There*. Edited by Alberic Stacpoole. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1986.
- Best, John E. "Paul's Theology of the Corporate Life of the Local Church." Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1983.

- Bianchi, C. Eugene, and Rosemary Radford Ruether, eds. *A Democratic Catholic Church: The Reconstruction of Roman Catholicism*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1992.
- Bloesh, Donald. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Christian Century*, January 29, 1975, 89-91.
- Boase, T. S. R. *Boniface VIII*. London: Constable and Company, 1933.
- Boff, Leonardo. *Die Kirche als Sakrament*. Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1972.
- . *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*. New York: Crossroads, 1985.
- . *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church*. New York: Orbis Books, 1986.
- Bokenkotter, Thomas. *Dynamic Catholicism*. New York: Image Books Doubleday, 1992.
- Bole, William. "A Moderate in a Disputatious Age." *Our Sunday Visitor*, May 25, 1997, 10-1.
- Boniface VIII. *Unam Sanctam*. In *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, comp. H. E. Denzinger, 186-87. St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957.
- Bourke, Myles M. "Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 493-511.
- . "Collegial Decision-making in the New Testament." In *Who Decides for the Church?* ed. J. A. Coriden, 1-13. Hartford, CT: Canon Law Society of America, 1971.
- Boyle, J. Robert. "Theologians and Bishops: Freedom and Assent." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 44 (1989): 91-102.
- Boyle, John P. "The Academy and Church Teaching Authority: Current Issues." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 40 (1985): 173-80.
- . *Church Teaching Authority: Historical and Theological Studies*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.
- Braaten, Carl E. *History of Hermeneutics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- . "Reunion, Yes; Return, No." *Una Sancta* 23 (1966): 27-33.
- . *The Apostolic Imperative: Nature and Aim of the Church's Mission and Ministry*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985.
- Bracken, Joseph A. "Ecclesiology: The One and the Many." *Theological Studies* 43 (1982): 298-311.
- Branick, Vincent. *The House Church in the Writings of Paul*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989.

- Brodrick, James. *Robert Bellarmine, Saint and Scholar*. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1961.
- Broucker, José de. *The Suenens Dossier: The Case for Collegiality*. Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1970.
- Brown, Raymond E. *Priest and Bishop*. New York: Paulist Press, 1970.
- . "The Dilemma of the Magisterium vs. the Theologians—Debunking Some Fictions." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 290-307.
- . "New Testament Background for the Concept of Local Church." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981): 1-14.
- . *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. *The Ecumenical Revolution: An Interpretation of the Catholic-Protestant Dialogue*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.
- . Introduction to *A Pope for All Christians?* ed. Peter J. McCord, 1-12. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- Brown, Robert McAfee, and Gustave Weigel. *An American Dialogue: A Protestant Looks at Catholicism and a Catholic Looks at Protestantism*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960.
- Brunner, Emil. *The Misunderstanding of the Church*. London: Lutterworth, 1952.
- Buckley, Michael J. *Papal Primacy and the Episcopate: Toward a Relational Understanding*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Burke, P. "The Monarchical Episcopate at the End of the First Century." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 7 (1970): 499-518.
- Burns, Patrick J. "Communion, Councils, and Collegiality: Some Catholic Reflections." In *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church*, ed. P. C. Emptie and T. A. Murphy, 151-72. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1974.
- . Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Theological Studies* 35 (1974): 563-65.
- Burt, Julian. "Contemporary Theological Pluralism." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, April 1980, 17-24.
- Butler, Christopher. *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- . *The Theology of Vatican II*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1967.
- Butterworth, Robert. Review of *The Resilient Church*, by Avery Dulles. *The Month* 11 (1978): 136-37.

Campenhausen, Hans von. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959.

———. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969.

The Canisianum. *The Church*. New York: P.J. Kennedy and Sons, 1963.

Carey, Patrick W. *The Roman Catholics*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993.

Carey, Patrick W., and Earl C. Muller, eds. *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1997.

Carrington, Philip. *The Early Christian Church. Vol. 1, The First Christian Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1994.

Catholic Concise Dictionary. Edited by Robert C. Broderick. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1966. S.v. "Magisterium."

Catholic News Service. "Father Avery Dulles Urges Defense of Catholic Orthodoxy." *National Catholic Register*, April 19-25, 1998, 2.

Cerfaux, L. *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.

Chapin, A. B. *A View of the Organization and Order of the Primitive Church*. New Haven: S. Babcock, 1845.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1978.

Christian, Robert F. "A Rebuttal to Avery Dulles." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, March 1979, 62-7.

Clarke, Lowther W. K. *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 1937.

———. "Origin of Episcopacy." In *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern*, ed. Claude Jenkins, 1-46. London: SPCK, 1930.

"Cologne Declaration, the." *Origins* 18 (1989): 633-44.

Congar, Y. *Lay People in the Church*. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957.

———. "The Historical Development of Authority in the Church: Points for Christian Reflection." In *Problems of Authority*, ed. John M. Todd, 119-56. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.

———. *La Collégialité épiscopale. Histoire et théologie*. Paris: Cerf, 1965.

- _____. "The People of God." In *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller, 197-207. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1966.
- _____. *A Gospel Priesthood*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- _____. *Priest and Layman*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1967.
- _____. *Tradition and Traditions*. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- _____. *This Church That I Love*. Denville: Dimension Books, 1969.
- _____. *L'Église une, sainte, catholique et apostolique*. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- _____. *Ministères et communion ecclésiale*. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- _____. "Norms of Christian Allegiance and Identity in the History of the Church." In *Truth and Certainty*, ed. E. Schillebeeckx, 11-26. New York: Herder and Herder, 1973.
- _____. "Theologians and the Magisterium in the West." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 210-24.
- _____. "Local Autonomy and Central Power." *Theology Digest* 29 (1981): 227-30.
- _____. "Trials and Promises of Ecumenism." In *Voices of Unity*, ed. Ans J. van der Bent, 22-32. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981.
- _____. "A Semantic History of the Term Magisterium." In *Readings in Moral Theology*, ed. Charles Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 297-313. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- _____. "A Brief History of the Forms of the Magisterium." In *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 314-31. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Congar, Y., and B.-D. Dupuy, eds. *L'épiscopat et l'Église Universelle*. Paris: Cerf, 1962.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Mysterium Ecclesiae*. *Catholic Mind*, October 1973, 54-9.
- _____. "Doctrinal Congregation's Declaration on Hans Küng." *Origins* 9 (1980): 461-63.
- _____. "On the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian." *Origins* 20 (1990): 117-26.
- _____. "Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion." *Origins* 22 (1992): 108-12.
- _____. *Dominus Iesus*. *Origins* 30 (2000): 209-19.
- Conn, James J. "The Academic Mandatum: Another Step Toward Implementation." *America*, February 5, 2001, 19-22.

- Conzelmann, Hans. *History of Primitive Christianity*. Nashville: Abington Press, 1973.
- Conzemius, Victor. *Katholizismus ohne Rom: Die Altkatholische Kirchengemeinschaft*. Zürich: Benzinger Verlag, 1969.
- Cooke, Bernard, J. *Ministry to Word and Sacraments*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- . "The Church: Catholic and Ecumenical." *Theology Today* 36 (1979): 353-67.
- , ed. *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- . "Call to Action." In *What's Left? Liberal American Catholics*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver, 147-54. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999.
- Cooke, R. J. *The Historic Episcopate*. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1896.
- Corban, A. B. *The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization*. London: Methuen and Company, 1975.
- Coriden, James A., ed. *The Once and Future Church: A Communion of Freedom*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1971.
- . "Commentary." In *The Code of Canon Law: Text and Commentary*, ed. James A. Coriden, Thomas J. Green, and Donald E. Heintschel, 543-86. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- . "Panel Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 77-8, 85-6, 90-2, 95-6. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.
- Coriden, James A., Thomas Green, and Donald E. Heintschel, eds. *The Code of Canon Law: A Text and Commentary*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Corrigan, Raymond. *The Church and the Nineteenth Century*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1938.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Early Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.
- Curran, Charles E. Foreword to *Theology and Authority*, by Richard Penaskovic. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987.
- . "A Moderate in a Disputatious Age." Interview by William Bole. *Our Sunday Visitor*, May 25, 1997, 10-1.
- Curran, Charles E., and Robert E. Hunt. *Dissent in and for the Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.
- Curran, Charles E., and Richard A. McCormick, eds. *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

- _____. *Readings in Moral Theology: Dissent in the Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Cyprian *Epistles*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:275-409.
- Cyprian *On the Unity of the Church*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 5:421-29.
- Daly, Gabriel. *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- _____. "Catholicism and Modernity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 53 (1985): 773-96.
- _____. "Theological and Philosophical Modernism." In *Catholicism Contending With Modernity*, ed. Darrell Jodock, 88-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Daly, Lowrie J. *The Medieval University, 1200-1400*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Danielou, Jean. *The Christian Centuries*. Vol. 1, *The First Six Hundred Years*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964.
- Dargan, E.C. *Ecclesiology*. Louisville: Dearing, 1897.
- Dalrymple, John. "The Holy Spirit and Personal Responsibility." In *Authority in a Changing Church*, ed. John Dalrymple, 203-31. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.
- Davids, Adalbert. "One or None: Cyprian on the Church and Tradition." In *The Unifying Role of the Bishop*, ed. Edward Schillebeeckx, 46-52. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Davidson, James D., Andrea S. Williams, Richard A. Lamanna, Jan Stenftenagel, Kathleen Maas Weigert, William J. Whalen, and Patricia Wittberg. *The Search for Common Ground: What Unites and Divides Catholic Americans*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1997.
- Dearden, John. "Family." *Origins* 6 (1976): 317-23.
- Deedy, John. "American Catholicism." *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1994. 22-4.
- Dedek, John. *Contemporary Medical Ethics*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1975.
- Dederen, Raoul. *Un réformateur catholique au XIXe siècle: Eugène Michaud (1839-1917)*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1963.
- _____. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 13 (1975): 80-1.
- _____. "American Catholicism: Facing a Crackdown," *Adventist Review*, April 2, 1987, 369-71.
- Dei Filius*. In *Documents of Vatican Council I, 1869-1870*, selected and trans. John F. Broderick, 37-52. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1971.

- Dei Verbum*. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 111-28. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- D'Elia, Donald J., and Stephen M. Krason, eds. *We Hold These Truths and More: Further Reflections on the American Proposition, the Thought of Fr. John Courtney Murray, S. J. and Its Relevance Today*. Steubenville, OH: Franciscan University Press, 1993.
- De Letter, P. "Revelation, Private." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 12:446-48.
- Derrick, Christopher. *Church Authority and Intellectual Freedom*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981.
- Devine, George, ed. *Theology in Revolution*. New York: Alba House, 1970.
- The Didache*. In *Early Christian Fathers*, ed. Cyril C. Richardson, 1:171-79. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.
- Dignitatis humanae*. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 675-96. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- Dionne, J. Robert. *The Papacy and the Church: A Study of Praxis and Reception in Ecumenical Perspective*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1987.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. "The Ministry in the Early Church." In *The Apostolic Ministry*, ed. Kenneth E. Kirk, 183-304. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1947.
- _____. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: Dacre Press, 1960.
- _____. *Jurisdiction in the Early Church*. London: Faith House, 1975.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*. New York: Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- Doino, William. "John J. Mulloy, 1916-1995." *Sumsum Corda* 1 (Summer 1996): 45-54.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1985.
- Donna, Rose Bernard. "Introduction." In *Saint Cyprian Letters*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari, ix-xxv. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1964.
- Donovan, Mary Ann. "How Catholic Is CTSA?" *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 14-6.
- Downey, Michael. Interview by author, April 12, 2000, Andrews University.
- Duchesne, Louis. *Early History of the Christian Church from Its Foundation to the End of the Third Century*. New York: Longmans, Green and Todd, 1909.
- "Dulles Sees New Shape for Authority." *National Catholic Reporter*, October 15, 1969, 7.

"Dulles Takes Church's Hard Line to Rank of Cardinal." *Orange County Register*, available from <http://www.ocregister.com/community/religion/21dullescci.shtml>; February 21, 2001, 1-2.

Dunn, James. *Jesus and the Spirit*. London: SCM Press, 1975.

_____. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

Dunn, Patrick J. *Priesthood*. New York: Alba House, 1990.

"Dulles Takes Church's Hard Line to Rank of Cardinal." *Orange County Register*, February 21, 2001, p. 1 of 2. Available from <http://www.ocregister.com/community/religion/21dullescci.shtml>.

Dwyer, Robert. "Catholic Church as Debating Society." *National Catholic Register*, January 5, 1975, 4.

Egan, Joseph. "The Nature of Fundamental Theology: A Critical Study of the Works of Avery Dulles, Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, Gerald O'Collins and David Tracy." S.T. D. dissertation, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1989.

Ehrhard, Arnold. *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Ellis, John Tracy. "The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life." In *The Catholic Church U. S. A.*, ed. Louis J. Putz, 315-57. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956.

_____. *American Catholicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Empie, Paul, ed. *Teaching Authority and Infallibility in the Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1980.

Empie, Paul, and T. A. Murphy, eds. *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.

Engen, J. Van. "Bellarmine, Robert." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984. 132.

Eno, Robert B. "Authority and Conflict." *Église et théologie* 7 (1976): 49-54.

Ernst, Cornelius. "The Primacy of Peter: Theology and Ideology." *New Blackfriars* 50 (1969): 347-404.

Estevez, Jorge Medina, "The Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium." In *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller, 101-22. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Extraordinary Synod of Bishops, Rome 1985: A Message to the People of God and the Final Report. Washington, DC: NCCB, 1986.

Fahey, Michael A. "Continuity in the Church Amid Structural Changes." *Theological Studies* 35 (1974): 415-40.

_____. "Am I My Sister's Keeper?" *America*, October 28, 2000, 12-5.

Farley, Margaret. Interview by author, August 9, 1999, Andrews University.

Farrer, A. M. "The Ministry in the New Testament." In *The Apostolic Ministry*, ed. Kenneth E. Kirk, 113-82. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1947.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Ferguson, Everett. "Bishop." *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1990. 150-57.

Fesquet, Henri. *The Drama of Vatican II*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Flew, Newton R. *Jesus and His Church*. London: Epworth Press, 1951.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. *The History of the Christian Church*. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.

Forsyth, P.T. *Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1917.

Fouilloux, Étienne. "The Anterpreparatory Phase, The Slow Emergence from Inertia (January, 1959-October, 1962)." In *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo. Vol. 1. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.

"Four Speakers, Four Views on Authority." *National Catholic Reporter*, March 20, 11.

Friedrich, Gerhard. "Prophets and Prophecies in the New Testament." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968. 6:828-61.

Fuelenbach, J. *An Evaluation of the Recent Theological Discussion of First Clement: The Question of the Primacy of Rome*. Studies in Sacred Theology, Second Series no. 267. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1977.

Funck-Brentano, F. *The Middle Ages*. London: William Heinemann, 1922.

Gabriel, A. L. *Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Medieval University*. Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1969.

Gaillardetz, Richard R. *Witnesses to the Faith: Community, Infallibility, and the Ordinary Magisterium of Bishops*. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

_____. "An Exercise of the Hierarchical Magisterium." *America*, July 30, 1994, 19-22.

_____. *Teaching with Authority: A Theology of the Magisterium in the Church*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.

- . "Second General Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 123-24. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.
- Galli, Mario Von. *The Council and the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Ganoczy, Alexandre. "Ministry, Episcopacy, Primacy." *One in Christ* 6 (1970): 348-85.
- . "How Can We Evaluate Collegiality vis-à-vis Papal Primacy?" In *Papal Ministry in the Church*, Concilium, ed. H. Küng, 84-94. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- Gaudium et spes*. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 199-308. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- George, J. S. *The Principle of Subsidiarity with Special Reference to Its Role in Papal and Episcopal Relations in the Light of Lumen Gentium*. Canon Law Studies, no. 463. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1968.
- Gilkey, Langdon. *Religion and the Scientific Future*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- . *Catholicism Confronts Modernity: A Protestant View*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.
- Gladstone, W. E. *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1875.
- González, Justo. *A History of Christian Thought*. 3 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987-88.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1970.
- Gore, Charles. *The Church and the Ministry*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- Gough, Austin. *Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Granfield, Patrick. *Ecclesial Cybernetics: A Study of Democracy in the Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- . *The Papacy in Transition*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1981.
- . "The Rise and Fall of *Societas Perfecta*." In *May Church Ministries Be Politicians?* *Concilium* 15, ed. Peter Huizing and Knut Walf, 3-8. New York: Seabury Press, 1982.
- . "Presidential Address: The Uncertain Future of Collegiality." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 40 (1985): 95-106.
- . *The Limits of the Papacy: Authority and Autonomy in the Church*. New York: Crossroads, 1987.

- Green, A. E. "Revelation, Virtual." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 12:444-46.
- Green, H. Benedict. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Expository Times* 88 (1977): 220.
- Green, Bernard D. "Tremors in the Foundation of the U.S. Catholic Church," *New Oxford Review*, October 1993, 11-6.
- . "Catholicism Confronts New Age Syncretism." *New Oxford Review*, April 1994, 18-22.
- Greshake, Gisbert. *The Meaning of Christian Priesthood*. Westminster: Christians Classics, 1988.
- Häggglund, Bengt. *History of Theology*. London: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Haight, Roger. *Dynamics of Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- Halliburton, John. *The Authority of a Bishop*. London: SPCK Holy Trinity Church, 1987.
- Hanson, Anthony. *The Meaning of Unity*. London: Highway Press, 1954.
- Hanson, Stig. "The Unity of the Church in the New Testament." Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University, 1946.
- Harnack, Adolf. *The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries*. New York: Williams and Norgate, 1910.
- Harrison, E. F. "Apostle, Apostleship." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1984. 70-2.
- Haskins, Charles H. *The Rise of Universities*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923.
- Hasler, August. *How the Pope Became Infallible: Pius IX and the Politics of Persuasion*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1981.
- Hatch, Edwin. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*. London: Rivingtons, 1888.
- Heaney, John J. *The Modernist Crisis: Von Hügel*. Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1968.
- Hebblethwaite, Peter. *The Runaway Church: Post-Conciliar Growth or Decline*. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.
- . *The Year of Three Popes*. London: Collins, 1978.
- . *Paul VI: The First Modern Pope*. New York: Paulist Press, 1993.
- . *Pope John Paul II and the Church*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1995.

- Helwig, Monika. "Who Is Truly a Catholic Theologian?" *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 42 (1987): 99-100.
- Henn, William. *The Honor of My Brothers*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 2000.
- Henn, William and Philip J. Murnion, eds. *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.
- Hennessey, James. *The First Council of the Vatican: The American Experience*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Hertling, L. *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1972.
- Heyns, J. A. *The Church*. Pretoria: N. G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1980.
- Hill, Edmund. *Ministry and Authority*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1988.
- Hinchliff, Peter. *Cyprian of Carthage and the Unity of the Christian Church*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1974.
- Hitchcock, James. *The Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- . "The Fellowship of Catholic Scholars." In *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, 186-210. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Hodge, Charles. "The Unity of the Church." *Eternity* 9 (1958): 21-8.
- Hofmann, Paul. *Anatomy of the Vatican*. London: Robert Hale, 1984.
- Hoffmann, Joseph. "Théologie et magistère. un 'modèle' issu de Vatican I." In *Les théologiens et l'Église*, ed. Charles Pietri, 77-101. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1980.
- Holmes, J. Derek. *The Papacy in the Modern World*. New York: Crossroads, 1981.
- Holmes, J. Derek, and Bernard W. Bickers. *A Short History of the Catholic Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.
- Hort, Fenton J. A. *The Christian Ecclesia*. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- Hughes, John J. "Hans Küng and the Magisterium." *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 368-89.
- . "Christian Priesthood." *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. 1987. 11:536-40.
- Huizing, Peter. *Electing Our Own Bishops*. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.
- Huizing, Peter, and Knut Walf, eds. *May Church Ministers Be Politicians?* New York: Seabury Press, 1982.

- Imbelli, Robert. "'Common Ground' as Communion—A Witness for the Defense." *National Catholic Register*, December 22-28, 1996, 7.
- Inman, Michael R. "The Existentialism of John Macquarrie: Its Implications for Modern Theology and Ecclesiology." Ph.D. dissertation, Duquesne University, 1997.
- International Theological Commission. "Theses on the Relationship Between the Ecclesiastical Magisterium and Theology." In *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 151-70. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- International Theological Commission, Texts and Documents 1969-1985*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1989.
- Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1: 315-567.
- Jackson, George A. *The Fathers of the Third Century*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.
- Jay, Eric G. "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters." *Second Century* 1 (1981): 125-162.
- Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. 2 vol. London: Thomas Nelson, 1961.
- Jensen, J. "Revelation, Concept of (In the Bible)." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1960. 12: 436-39.
- Jimenez-Urresti, Teodoro. "The Ontology of Communion and Collegial Structures in the Church." In *Concilium: Pastoral Reform in Church Government*, ed. Teodoro Jimenez-Urresti, 8:3-24. New York: Paulist Press, 1965.
- Jodock, Darrell. "Introduction I: the Modernist Crisis." In *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*, ed. Darrell Jodock, 1-19. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- John Paul II. "Principles of Freedom." *Origins* 9 (1979): 306-08.
- _____. *Sapientia christiana*. *Origins* 9 (1979): 33-45.
- _____. "The Task of the Latin American Bishop." *Origins* 12 (1983): 661-62.
- _____. "The Pope's Address." *Origins* 17 (1987): 257-61.
- _____. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. *Origins* 20 (1990): 265-76.
- _____. *Redemptoris missio*. In *The Encyclicals of John Paul II*, ed. J. Michael Miller, 494-570. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1996.
- _____. *Ad tuendam fidem*. *Origins* 28 (1998): 113-16.
- Johnson, Paul. *Pope John Paul II and the Catholic Restoration*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

- Johnson, Elizabeth, A. "Going Fishing: Papal Primacy and the Words of Women." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 47-55. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- Jossua, Jean-Pierre. *Le Père Congar: La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu*. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- Journet, Charles. *The Church of the Word Incarnate: An Essay in Speculative Theology*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- Joyce, G. H. "Revelation." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1912. 13:1-2.
- Kaiser, Robert Blair. *Pope, Council and World*. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Kane, John F. "Roman Catholicism and the Contemporary Crisis of Authority." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 57-70. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SMC Press, 1964.
- Kelly, George A. "An Uncertain Church? One View—Uncertain Catholic Church Revisited." *Long Island Catholic*, December 9, 1976, 8.
- _____. *The Battle for the American Church*. New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- _____. "Fr. Dulles' Church to Believe In." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, October 1983, 11-22.
- _____. *Inside My Father's House*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- _____. "The Second Coming of the American Church." *Catholic Dossier* 4 (1998): 24-5.
- _____. Rockaway Beach, NY, to Avery Dulles, The Bronx, NY, 30 July 1998, photocopy, in my possession.
- _____. "A Battle the Vatican Cannot Afford to Lose." *Inside the Vatican*, May 1999, 29-34.
- _____. "Jesuits' Old Views." *Catholic New York*, July 15, 1999, 21.
- _____. Interview by author, July 28, 1999, Andrews University.
- King, Francis E. "Avery Dulles on the Magisterium." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, October 1977, 9-17.
- King, Thomas M. "Society of Jesus." *The Modern Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1994. 817-18.
- Kirmse, Anne-Marie R. "The Church and the Churches—A Study of Ecclesiological and Ecumenical Developments in the Writings of Avery Dulles, S.J." Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1989.
- _____. Interview by author, January 22, 2001, Andrews University.

- Kloppenburger, Bonaventure. *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*. Chicago: Franciscan Press, 1974.
- Knowles, David. *Christian Monasticism*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Koester, Helmut. *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.
- Koopman, A. Johannes. "The 'Theological Powerhouse'." *National Catholic Register*, September 29, 1996, 6.
- Komonchak, Joseph. "The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches." In *Where Does the Church Stand*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, 30-5. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981.
- _____. "Ministry and the Local Church." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981): 56-82.
- _____. "The Ecclesial and Cultural Roles of Theology." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 40 (1985): 15-32.
- _____. "The Magisterium and Theologians." *Chicago Studies* 29 (1990): 307-29.
- _____. "The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)." In *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, 1:167-356. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.
- _____. "Interpreting the Council: Catholic Attitudes Toward Vatican II." In *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, ed. Mary Jo Weaver and R. Scott Appleby, 17-36. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- _____. "Theologians in the Church." In *Church and Theology*, ed. Peter C. Phan, 63-87. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1995.
- _____. "On the People of God as a Theological and Sociological Reality: The Case for Dialogue." *National Catholic Register*, June 8-14, 1997, 5.
- _____. "Panel Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 78-9, 81-5, 87-90, 92-4. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.
- _____. "First General Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 106-7, 108-9. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.
- _____. "Panel Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, ed. Philip J. Murnion, 120-21, 138-40, 150, 151-2. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1999.
- _____. "All Dressed in Scarlet." *Commonweal*, February 23, 2001, 9.
- Küng, Hans. *Structures of the Church*. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1964.

- _____. *The Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- _____. "What Is the Essence of Apostolic Succession?" In *Apostolic Succession: Rethinking a Barrier to Unity*, ed. Hans Küng, 28-35. New York: Paulist Press, 1968.
- Küng, Hans, ed. *Papal Ministry in the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- Küng, Hans, and Leonard Swidler, eds. *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?* San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- Kurtz, Lester R. *The Politics of Heresy: The Modernist Crisis in Roman Catholicism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986.
- Kwitny, Jonathan. *Man of the Century: The Life and Times of Pope John Paul II*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1997.
- Lakeland, Paul. "Accommodation to Secularity: The Tracy-Dulles Controversy." *The Month* 11 (1978): 162-66.
- Lane, Dermot A. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *The Living Light* 21 (October 1984): 74-7.
- Lanne, Emmanuel. "The Local Church: Its Catholicity and Apostolicity." *One in Christ* 6 (1970): 288-313.
- Latourelle, René. *Theology of Revelation*. Staten Island: Alba House, 1966.
- Law, Bernard. "Response to 'Called to Be Catholic'." *Origins* 27 (1996): 170-01.
- Lawrence, L. H. *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*. New York: Longman House, 1984.
- Lebreton, Jules. *The History of the Primitive Church*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1949.
- Lee, Anthony D., ed. *Vatican II: The Theological Dimension*. Washington, DC: Thomist Press, 1963.
- Lefebvre, Marcel. "Quelle est la mission du théologien?" *Église et théologie* 22 (1991): 177-90.
- Lefevere, Patricia. "Implementing License to Teach Worries Theologians: Bishops Will Standardize *Mandatum* Procedures." *National Catholic Reporter*, February 16, 2001, 7.
- Leo XIII. *Aeterni Patris*. In *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, ed. John J. Wynne, 34-57. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903.
- _____. *Testem benevolentiae*. In *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, ed. John J. Wynne, 441-53. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903.
- Lerch, J. R. "Teaching Authority of the Church (Magisterium)." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 13:959-65.

- Lietzmann, Hans. *The Founding of the Church Universal*. New York: Scribner, 1950.
- _____. *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. New York: Scribner, 1949.
- Lightfoot, J. B. S. *Clement of Rome, The Two Epistles*. London: Macmillan, 1869.
- _____. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956.
- _____. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians: Dissertation on Ministry*. London: Macmillan, 1913.
- Lilley, A. Leslie, ed. *The Programme of Modernism*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.
- Lipscomb, Oscar. "Common Ground Between Bishops and Theologians." *Origins* 27 (1997): 72-4.
- Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Lubac, Henri de. *The Church and Mystery*. New York: Alba House, 1969.
- _____. *A Theologian Speaks*. Los Angeles: Twin Circle Publishing, 1985.
- Lumen Gentium*. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 14-101. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- Lynch, John E. "Coresponsibility in the First Three Centuries: Presbyterial Colleges and the Election of Bishops." *The Jurist* 31 (1971): 14-53.
- _____. "The Magisterium and Theologians from the Apostolic Fathers to the Gregorian Reform." *Chicago Studies* 17 (Summer 1978): 188-209.
- _____. "Church Polity." *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. 1987. 3:472-86.
- MacEoin, Gary. *What Happened at Rome? The Council and Its Implications for the Modern World*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Maistre, Joseph Marie de. *The Pope, Considered in His Relations with the Church, Temporal Sovereignities, Separated Churches, and the Cause of Civilization*. New York: H. Fertig, 1975.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Maritain, Jacques. *The Range of Reason*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1953.
- Marshner, William A. "Culture, Concept and Dogma in Avery Dulles." *The Wanderer*, December 21, 1972, 8.
- Marty, Martin E. *A Short History of American Catholicism*. Allen, TX: Thomas More, 1995.

- Mascall, E. L. *The Recovery of Unity*. London: Longmans, Green, 1958.
- Massa, James. "Dean of Theology: Avery Dulles at Eighty." *Crisis*, September 1998, 16-21.
- May, William E. "The Magisterium and Moral Theology." In *Symposium on the Magisterium: A Positive Statement*, ed. John J. O'Rourke and Thomas Greenburg, 71-94. Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1978.
- _____, ed. *Vatican Authority and American Catholic Dissent: The Curran Case and Its Consequences*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1987.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. *The Americanist Heresy in Roman Catholicism, 1895-1900*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Church: The Continuing Quest*. New York: Newman Press, 1970.
- _____. "Collegiality: The State of the Question." In *The Once and Future Church: A Communion of Freedom*, ed. J. A. Coriden, 1-24. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1971.
- _____. *The Remaking of the Church*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- _____. "Catholic Theology, 1974: Problems and Prospects." *Proceedings of Catholic Theological Society of America* 29 (1974): 397-411.
- _____. *Catholicism*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1981.
- _____. "Roman Catholicism: *E Pluribus Unum*." *Religion and America*, ed. Mary Douglas and Steven Tipton, 179-89. Boston: Beacon Press, 1983.
- _____. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Spirituality Today* 36 (1984): 76-8.
- _____. "Conflict in the Church: Redefining the Center." *America*, August 22, 1992, 78-81.
- _____. *Report on the Church: Catholicism After Vatican II*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.
- _____. "Why I Shall Not Seek a Mandate." *America*, February 12, 2000, 14-6.
- _____. "Red Hat After Lurch to Right." *National Catholic Reporter*, February 16, 2001, 17.
- _____. Email interview by author, February 19, 2001.
- McClory, Robert. "So Much Common Ground, Debate Disappeared." *National Catholic Reporter*, March 20, 1998, 10.
- _____. "Four Speakers, Four Views on Authority." *National Catholic Reporter*, March 20, 1998, 10.

- McCord, Peter J. ed., *A Pope for All Christians?* New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- McCormick, Richard A. "Notes on Moral Theology." *Theological Studies* 29 (1968): 679-741.
- . "The Teaching Role of the Magisterium and of Theologians." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 24 (1969): 239-54.
- . "Notes on Moral Theology." *Theological Studies* 40 (1979): 59-112.
- . "The Chill Factor: Recent Roman Interventions." *America*, June 30, 1984, 475-81.
- . *The Critical Calling: Reflections on Moral Dilemmas Since Vatican II*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1989.
- . "The Church and Dissent: How Vatican II Ushered in a New Way of Thinking." *Commonweal*, February 27, 1998, 15-20.
- McCue, J. F. "Roman Primacy in the First Three Centuries." In *Papal Ministry in the Church*, ed. H. Küng, 64:36-53. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- McDonnell, Killian. "Papal Primacy: Development, Centralization, and Changing Styles." In *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church*, ed. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy, 173-92. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1974.
- McInerny, Ralph M. *What Went Wrong with Vatican II*. Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 1998.
- McInuire, C. T. "Vatican Council I (1869-1870)." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1984. 1134-135.
- McKenna, Stephen. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Best Sellers*, May 1, 1974, 67.
- McKenzie, John L. *Authority in the Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.
- McManners, John. *Church and Society in Eighteenth Century France*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- McManus, Frederick R. "The Scope of Episcopal Conferences." In *The Once and Future Church: A Communion of Freedom*, ed. J.A. Coriden, 129-204. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1971.
- McManus, William E. "The Right of Catholics to Govern the Church." *America*, November 14, 1992, 374-78.
- Metz, Johann Baptist. "Theology Today: New Crises and New Visions." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 40 (1985): 1-14.
- Mitchell, Nathan. "The Roman Primacy in the Second Century and the Problem of the Development of Dogma." *Theological Studies* 25 (1964): 161-96.

- _____. "The Roman Primacy in the Patristic Era: The Beginnings Through Nicaea." In *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church*, ed. P. G. Empie and T. A. Murphy, 44-72. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1974.
- _____. *Mission and Ministry*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1982.
- Meyendorff, J. *The Primacy of Peter in the Orthodox Church*. Leighton, Buzzard, Bedfordshire: Faith Press, 1963.
- Miller, Samuel H., and G. E. Wright, eds. *Dialogue at Harvard*. Cambridge: Belknap, 1964.
- Misner, P. "Papal Primacy in a Pluriform Polity." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 11 (1974): 239-61.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. Foreword to *Who Has the Say in the Church*, ed. Jürgen Moltmann and Hans Küng. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- Moltmann, Jürgen, and Hans Küng, eds. *Who Has the Say in the Church?* New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- Moore, Sebastian. "Change in Focus." In *Authority in a Changing Church*, ed. John Dalrymple, 1-11. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.
- Moran, Gabriel, "Revelation, Fonts of." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 12:439-40.
- _____. "Revelation, Primitive." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 12:440.
- Morris, Charles R. *American Catholic: The Saints and Sinners Who Built America's Most Powerful Church*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Mulloy, John J. "The Dulles Changes: Developments or Corruption?" *The Wanderer*, November 16, 1972, 5.
- _____. "If So, It Was Fr. Dulles' Caricature." *The Wanderer*, December 21, 1972, 8.
- Murnion, Philip J. Review of *The Priestly Office*, by Avery Dulles. *Church* 13 (1997): 50-1.
- _____. Introduction to *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, 1-13. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.
- Murphy, Charles M. "Collegiality: An Essay Toward Better Understanding." *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 38-49.
- Murray, J. C. "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power." *Theological Studies* 9 (1948): 491-535.
- _____. *We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- _____. "Freedom, Authority, Community." *America*, December 3, 1966, 734-41.

- Müller, Alois, ed. *Democratization of the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.
- National Pastoral Life Center. "Called to Be Catholic: Church in a Time of Peril." *America*, August 31, 1996, 5-8.
- _____. "Called to Be Catholic: Church in a Time of Peril." *Origins* 26 (1996): 165-70.
- Neufeld, Karl Heinz. "In the Service of the Council: Bishops and Theologians at the Second Vatican Council." In *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, ed. René Latourelle, 1:74-105. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Neuhaus, Richard John. "The Public Square." *First Things*, April 1994, 57-68.
- _____. "The Public Square." *First Things*, August-September 1995, 67-84.
- _____. "The Public Square." *First Things*, November 1995, 71-87.
- _____. "The Public Square." *First Things*, October 1996, 74-96.
- Newman, John H. *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1897.
- "News: Signs of the Times." *America*, November 4, 2000, 5.
- Nichols, Peter. *The Pope's Divisions: The Roman Catholic Church Today*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.
- Nilson, Jon. "The Rights and Responsibilities of Theologians: A Theological Perspective." In *Readings in Moral Theology: Dissent in the Church*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 5-34. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Noonan, John. "First General Discussion." In *Church Authority in American Culture: The Second Cardinal Bernardin Conference*, 102-03, 104,. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.
- Novak, Michael. *The Open Church: Vatican II, Act II*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- _____. "The Authority of National Conferences of Bishops: Catholic Social Thought." *America*, January 6-13, 1990, 10-3.
- Nowotny, Adam. "Fortress Catholicism." In *The Church in Anguish*, ed. Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler, 31-38. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986.
- Oakley, F. *Council over Pope?* New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- O'Collins, Gerald. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Gregorianum* 65 (1984): 181.
- _____. *Retrieving Fundamental Theology: The Three Styles of Contemporary Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1993.
- O'Connell, Marvin R. *Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1994.

- O'Connell, Timothy E. "A Final Report." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 282-89.
- Odell, Catherine. "Jubilee 2000 Should Be 'New Springtime for Church'." *National Catholic Register*, June 28-July 4, 1998, 1, 7.
- O'Donnell, Christopher. *Ecclesia: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Church*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- O'Donovan, Leo J. Review of *The Craft of Theology*, by Avery Dulles. *Theological Studies* 54 (1993): 759-61.
- O'Donovan, Leo J., Sara Butler, Peter F. Chirico, Joseph A. Komonchak, Richard A. McCormick, and James H. Provost. "CTSA Committee Report on Cooperation Between Theologians and the Church's Teaching Authority." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 35 (1980): 325-31.
- O'Donovan, Leo J., and T. Howland Sanks. Preface to *Faithful Witness: Foundations of Theology for Today's Church*, ix-xiii. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1989.
- O'Gara, Margaret. *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I, and the French Minority Bishops*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988.
- Oman, John. *The Church and the Divine Order*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.
- O'Meara, Thomas F. "Ecumenist of Our Times: Yves Congar." *Mid-Stream* 27 (1988): 67-76.
- Ong, Walter J. "Catholic Theology Now." *Theology Digest* 23 (Winter 1975): 338-46.
- Örsy, Ladislav. "Magisterium: Assent and Dissent." *Theological Studies* 48 (1987): 473-97.
- _____. *The Church: Learning and Teaching*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987.
- _____. "The Limits of Magisterium." *The Tablet*, August 25, 1990, 1066-069.
- _____. "The Papacy for an Ecumenical Age." *America*, October 21, 2000, 9-15.
- Osborne, Kenan B. *Priesthood, A History of Ordained Ministry in the Roman Catholic Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Our Sunday Visitor's Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1991 ed. S.v. "Bishop," "Neo-Scholasticism."
- Padavano, Anthony. "The Church Takes Time to Reform." *National Catholic Reporter*, August 27, 1982, 11.
- "Papacy Will Never Relinquish Global Role, Father Dulles Says." *Catholic News Service*; available from <http://www.catholicnews.com/data/briefs/20000324.htm>; March 24, 2000, 2 p.
- Pastor Aeternus*. In *Documents of Vatican Council I, 1869-1870*, selected and trans. John F. Broderick, 53-63. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1971.

- Paul VI. *Ecclesiam suam*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1964.
- . *Evangelii nuntiandi*. In *Proclaiming Justice and Peace*, ed. Michael Walsh and Brian Davies, 207-42. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1984.
- Pawlikowski, T. Review of *A Church to Believe in*, by Avery Dulles. *Catholic Sentinel*, August 27, 1982, 12.
- Pawley, B.C., ed. *The Second Vatican Council: Studies by Eight Anglican Observers*. London: Oxford University, 1967.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Commonweal*, April 1975, 90-91.
- . *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.
- Peter, Carl J. "Dimensions of Ius Divinum in Roman Catholic Theology." *Theological Studies* 34 (1973): 227-50.
- Piggin, F. S. "Trent, Council of." *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984. 1110.
- Pius IX. *Syllabus Errorum*. In *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. Comp. H. E. Denzinger, 435-42. St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957.
- Pius X. *Pascendi dominici gregis*. In *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, comp. H. E. Denzinger, 514-41. St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1957.
- Pius XII. *Humani generis*. In *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, ed. Gerald C. Treacy, 171-186. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- . *Divino afflante Spiritu*. In *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, ed. Gerald C. Treacy, 64-87. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- . *Mystici Corporis*. In *Four Great Encyclicals of Pope Pius XII*, ed. Gerald C. Treacy, 7-51. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- Place, Michael D. "From Solicitude to Magisterium." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 225-41.
- Pontius. "Life of St. Cyprian." In *The Fathers of the Church, Early Christian Biographies*, ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari, 15:3-24. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1952.
- Poole, Ayliffe. *The Life and Times of Saint Cyprian*. London: Griffith Farran Okeden and Welsh, 1840.
- "Pope Reminds Jesuits to Be Faithful to Magisterium." *The Wanderer*, April 19, 2001, 1, 6.
- Pottmeyer, Hermann J. "A New Phase in the Reception of Vatican II: Twenty Years of Interpretation of the Council." In *The Reception of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, Jean-Pierre Jossua, and Joseph A. Komonchak, 27-43. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1987.

_____. *Towards a Papacy in Communion*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.

Principe, Walter. "Bishops, Theologians, and Philosophers in Conflict at the Universities of Paris and Oxford: The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 40 (1985): 114-26.

Provencher, Norman. "Modernism." *Dictionary of Fundamental Theology*. Edited by René Latourelle. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1995. 719-23.

Provost, James H. "Safeguarding the Faith." *America*, August 1, 1998, 8-12.

Provost, James H., and Knut Walf, eds. *Collegiality Put to the Test*. London: SCM Press, 1990.

Pruter, Karl. *A History of the Old Catholic Church*. Scottsdale, AZ: St. Willibrord's Press, 1973.

Quinn, Jerome D. "Charisma Veritatis Certum, Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 4.26.2." *Theological Studies* 39 (1978): 520-25.

Quinn, John R. "The Magisterium and Theology." *Proceedings of Catholic Theological Society of America* 24 (1969): 255-61.

_____. "The Exercise of the Primacy and the Costly Call to Unity." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 1-28. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.

_____. *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1999.

Rackham, Richard B. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.

Radmacher, Earl D. *What the Church Is All About*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978.

Rahner, Karl. *Free Speech in the Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959.

_____. *Visions and Prophecies*. London: Burns and Oates, 1963.

_____. *Bishops: Their Status and Function*. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.

_____. *The Church after the Council*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

_____. *Theological Investigations: Concerning Vatican Council II*. Vol. 6. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1969.

_____. *Vorfragen zu einem ökumenischen Amtsverständnis*. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.

_____. "Magisterium." *Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1981. 285-87.

- _____. "Open Questions in Dogma Considered by the Institutional Church as Definitively Answered." In *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 129-50. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- _____. "The Dispute Concerning the Teaching Office of the Church." In *Readings in Moral Theology: The Magisterium and Morality*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 113-28. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Rahner, Karl, and Joseph Ratzinger. *The Episcopate and the Primacy*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Ramsey, Arthur M. *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1936.
- Ramsey, Michael, and Leon-Joseph Suenens. *The Future of the Christian Church*. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1970.
- Rashdall, H. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Age*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. *The Ratzinger Report*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985.
- _____. *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology*. New York: Crossroads, 1988.
- _____. *The Nature and Mission of Theology: Approaches to Understanding Its Role in the Light of Present Controversy*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995.
- "Ratzinger Criticizes Post-conciliar Changes." *National Catholic Reporter*, June 21, 1985, 26.
- Rausch, Thomas P. "Church, Hierarchy and Churches: Popular Catholic Misconceptions." *America*, December 15, 1992, 445-9.
- _____. "Archbishop Quinn's Challenge: A Not Impossible Task." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 71-88. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- Reese, Thomas J. *Archbishop: Inside the Power Structure of the American Catholic Church*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989.
- _____, ed. *Episcopal Conferences: Historical, Canonical and Theological Studies*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1989.
- _____. *A Flock of Shepherds*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1992.
- _____. "The Bishops' Conference: Secretive, More Clerical, Less Vocal." *America*, June 3, 1995, 14-8.
- _____. *Inside the Politics and Organization of the Catholic Church*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Of Many Things." *America*, May 15, 1999, 2.

"Report: An Ongoing Discussion of Magisterium." *Origins* 9 (1980): 541-51.

Richard, Lucien. Review of *The Priestly Office*, by Avery Dulles. *The Catholic Library World* 68 (1997): 38-9.

Rigg, James H. *Comparative View of Church Organisations*. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1891.

Rikhof, Herwi. *The Concept of Church*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1981.

Roberts, Tom. "Dulles Urges Bishops to Enforce Papal 'No'." *National Catholic Reporter*, July 26, 1996, 6.

———. "Unanimous Voice Is Recommended But Bishops Divided on Women's Issue." *National Catholic Reporter*, July 26, 1996, 7.

Russell, John F. "The Development of Theology of Revelation in the United States in the Decade after *Dei Verbum*: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Theological Writings of Avery Dulles, S.J. and Gabriel Moran, F.S.C." Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1978.

Rynne, Xavier. *Vatican Council II*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1968.

Sabatier, Auguste. *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*. New York: McClure, Philipps, 1904.

Sacrosanctum concilium. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 137-78. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

Sage, Michael M. *Cyprian*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975.

Sanks, T. Howland. *Authority in the Church: A Study in Changing Paradigms*. Missoula, MT: Scholars' Press, 1974.

———. "Cooperation, Co-optation, Condemnation: Theologians and the Magisterium 1870-1978." *Chicago Studies* 17 (1978): 242-63.

———. *Salt, Leaven, and Light: The Community Called Church*. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1992.

Scarth, A. M. E. *The Story of the Old Catholic and Kindred Movements*. London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1883.

Schaeffer, Pamela. "Giants Dissent, Gently, Over Authority." *National Catholic Reporter*, July 2, 1999, 3-4.

———. "In Wake of Ex Corde Theologians Ponder Options." *National Catholic Reporter*, February 25, 2000, 7.

———. "Bishops Approve Ex Corde Norms." *National Catholic Reporter*, December 3, 1999, 6.

- _____. "Academic Leaders Hope to Head Off Bishops' Vote on *Ex Corde* Norms." *National Catholic Reporter*, November 12, 1999, 12-3.
- _____. "Catholic U. Move to Tighten Control Over Religious Studies Faculty," *NCR*, December 17, 1999, 13.
- Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *The Church and Mankind*. Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1965.
- _____. "The Church and Mankind." In *The Church and Mankind*, ed. Edward Schillebeeckx, 69-101. Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1965.
- _____. "Faith Functioning in Human Self-Understanding." In *The Word in History*, ed. T. P. Burke, 41-59. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.
- _____, ed. *Man as Man and Believer*. Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press, 1966.
- _____. *Revelation and Theology*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.
- _____. "The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church." *Theological Studies* 30 (1969): 567-87.
- _____. *Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ*. New York: Crossroads, 1981.
- _____. *Church: The Human Story of God*. New York: Crossroads, 1991.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Church in the New Testament*. London: Burnes and Oates, 1965.
- Schoof, Mark. *Breakthrough: Beginnings of the New Catholic Theology*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970.
- _____. "Dutch Catholic Theology." *Cross Currents* 22 (1973): 415-27.
- Schreiter, Robert J. "The Impact of Vatican II." In *The Twentieth Century: A Theological Overview*, ed. Gregory Baum, 158-72. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1999.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Church Order in the New Testament*. London: SMC Press, 1961.
- Senior, Donald. "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, 18 November, 1965." In *Vatican II and Its Documents*, ed. Timothy E. O'Connell, 122-40. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1986.
- Shaddy, Virginia M., ed. *Catholic Theology in the University: Source of Wholeness*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1998.
- Shannon, William H. "The Catechism of the Catholic Church." *America*, June 5, 1993, 6-10.
- Shecterle, Ross A. *The Theology of Revelation of Avery Dulles, 1980-1994: Symbolic Mediation*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.

- Sheets, J. R. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *America*, March 23, 1974, 224.
- Sirico, Robert A. Review of *The Reshaping of Catholicism*, by Avery Dulles. In *Crisis* 6 (1988): 49-51.
- Soards, Marlon L., *1 Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Spencer, Anthony. "The Future of the Episcopal and Papal Roles." *IDOC International*, May 9, 1970, 63-84.
- St. John-Stevas, Norman. *The Agonizing Choice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Stacpoole, Alberic, ed. *Varican II Revisited: By Those Who Were There*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986.
- Staniford, Maxwell, trans. *Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Robert Baldick and Betty Radice. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Stanley, D.M. "The New Testament Basis for the Concept of Collegiality." *Theological Studies* 25 (1964): 197-216.
- Steger, Carlos Alfredo. *Apostolic Succession in the Writings of Yves Congar and Oscar Cullmann*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1993.
- Steinfels, Peter. "How Catholic Is CTSA?" *Commonweal*, March 27, 1998, 16-7.
- Steinfels, Margaret O'Brien. "In Good Faith." *Commonweal*, September 13, 1996, 5-6.
- Stockmeier, Peter. "The Election of Bishops by Clergy and People in the Early Church." In *Electing Our Own Bishops*, ed. Peter Huizing, 3-9. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.
- Stockwell, Mary. "In the Presence of Tradition: Speculative Catholic Theology in Modern America." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1984.
- Streeter, B. H. *The Primitive Church*. London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Suenens, Leo-Josef. *Coresponsibility in the Church*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- _____. *Memories and Hopes*. Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1992.
- Sullivan, Francis A. *Magisterium: Teaching Authority in the Catholic Church*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- _____. "Magisterium and Theology." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 43 (1988): 65-75.

- _____. "A New Obstacle to Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue." *America*, August 1, 1998, 6-7.
- Sullivan, John. Review of *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, by Avery Dulles. *Heythrop Journal* 38 (1997): 89-90.
- Swidler, Leonard. *Bishops and People*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- _____, ed. *Küng in Conflict*. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- Swidler, Leonard, and Piet F. Fransen, eds. *Authority in the Church and the Schillebeeckx Case*. New York: Crossroads Publishings, 1982.
- Tavard, George H. "The Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII." In *Papal Primacy and the Universal Church*, 105-118. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1974.
- Tefler, W. *The Office of a Bishop*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.
- The Trustees of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. *Anglican-Methodist Unity. Part 2—The Scheme*. London: SPCK and Epworth Press, 1968.
- Theisen, Jerome P. Review of *Models of the Church*, by Avery Dulles. *Worship* 48 (1974): 500-01.
- Thils, G. "The Theology of the Primacy: Toward a Revision." *One in Christ* 10 (1974): 22-3.
- Thomas, Gloria Blanchfield. "Ecclesial Authority: A Study of the Conflicting Perspectives of Leonardo Boff, Liberation Theologian, and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith." Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1988.
- Tierney, B. *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*. Cambridge, UK: University Press, 1955.
- Tillard, Jean-Marie Roger. "Sensus Fidelium." *One in Christ* 11 (1975): 2-29.
- _____. *The Bishop of Rome*. Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1983.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945.
- Tollinton, R. B. *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism*. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- Torrens, James S. "Admiring Cardinal Suenens." *America*, June 22, 1996, 3-4.
- Tracy, David. "The Church." In *Liberty and Justice for All: Discussion Guide*. Washington, DC: N.C.C.B. Committee for the Bicentennial, 1975.
- _____. "The Church Now and the Church to Come." *New York Times*, April 3, 1983, 10.
- Tracy, David, Hans Küng, and Johann B. Metz, eds. *Toward Vatican III: The Work That Needs to Be Done*. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

- Tremblay, Réal. "Donum veritatis: Un document qui donne à penser." *Nouvelle revue théologique* 114 (1992): 391-411.
- Tuchman, Barbara W. *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous 14th Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Tulga, Chester E. *New Testament Baptists and the Nature of the Church*. Chicago: Conservative Baptists Association of America, n.d.
- Tyrrell, George. *Medievalism: A Response to Cardinal Mercier*. London: Longmans, Green, 1909.
- _____. *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*. London: Longmans, Green, 1913.
- Ullmann, W. *The Origins of the Great Schism*. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1948.
- Unitatis redintegratio*. In *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, 341-66. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- Untener, Kenneth. "Local Church and Universal Church." *America*, October 13, 1984, 201-05.
- U.S. Bishops's Committee on Doctrine. "Report: An Ongoing Discussion of Magisterium." *Origins* 9 (1980): 541-51.
- Valiere, Paul. "Tradition." *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. 1987. 15:1-16.
- Vallee, Gerard. *A Study in Antignostic Polemics*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses, 1981.
- Varacalli, Joseph A. *Toward the Establishment of Liberal Catholicism in America*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983.
- _____. "Neo-Orthodoxy, the Crisis of Authority and the Future of the Catholic Church in the United States." *Faith and Reason* 15 (Fall 1989): 171-239.
- Vidler, Alec R. *20th Century Defenders of Faith*. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.
- _____. *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Vidulich, Dorothy. "Weakland: Vatican II Spirit Has 'Spun Itself Out'." *National Catholic Reporter*, October 12, 1990, 7.
- Vorgrimler, H., ed. *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- _____. "Karl Rahner: The Theologian's Contribution." In *Vatican II Revisited*, ed. Alberic Stacpoole, 32-48. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986.
- Vooght, Paul de. "The Results of Recent Historical Research on Conciliarism." In *Papal Ministry in the Church*, ed. Hans Küng, 148-57. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.

- Wallace, Andrew. "Church Is in Crisis of Transition, Needs Changes, Father Dulles Says." *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 7 October 1972, 4.
- Walsh, Michael J. "Pius XII." In *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings, 20-6. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- . "The History of the Council." In *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After*, ed. Adrian Hastings, 35-47. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Ward, Wilfrid. *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. London: Longmans, Green, 1912.
- Warneck, Richard Herman. "Avery Dulles's Advocacy of Reformulation of Dogma and Doctrinal Development." Ph.D. dissertation, Concordia Seminary, 2000.
- Weakland, Rembert. "Reflections for Rome." *America*, April 18, 1998, 8-13.
- . "It Will Lead Only to Public Bickering." *National Catholic Reporter*, December 3, 1999, 7.
- Weigel, George. *Catholicism and the Renewal of American Democracy*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- . *Witness to Hope: The Biography of Pope John Paul II*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1999.
- Weigel, Gustave. *Catholic Theology in Dialogue*. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Weisheipl, J. A. "Neo-Scholasticism and Neo-Thomism." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 1967. 10:337.
- Williams, George H. *The Mind of John Paul II*. New York: Seabury Press, 1981.
- Winter, Michael M. "Masters in Israel: VI. Yves Congar." *Clergy Review* 55 (1970): 275-88.
- . *Whatever Happened to Vatican II?* London: Sheed and Ward, 1985.
- Wittstadt, Klaus. "On the Eve of the Second Vatican Council (July 1-October 10, 1962)." In *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, 1:405-500. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Wright, John H. "That All Doubt May Be Removed." *America*, July 30, 1994, 16-9.
- Wright, Wendy M. "'Searching for God's Will Together': A Response to Archbishop Quinn." In *The Exercise of the Primacy*, ed. Phyllis Zagano and Terrence W. Tilley, 89-106. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1998.
- Zagano, Phyllis, and Terrence W. Tilley, eds. *The Exercise of the Primacy: Continuing the Dialogue*. New York: Crossroads, 1998.