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ANATHEMA & DIALOGUE: ECUMENISM FROM AQUINAS TO RAZINGER

Anthony E. Clark, Ph.D., Whitworth University

Introduction

In his reflection on human happiness, St. Augustine (354-430) muses on why it is that, “truth gives birth to hatred.” Augustine laments that when he speaks the truth he “incurs the enmity” of others; for as he writes, “They love the light of truth, but hate it when it shows that they are wrong.” He argues “the only true state of happiness” is “to rejoice in the truth.” But truth engenders enmity, and so we find ourselves in a position to decide whether we are willing to endure the discomfort of genuine dialogue in hopes of attaining the “true state of happiness” Augustine refers to in his Confessions. I have been asked to remark on the topic of Christian ecumenism, which Heinrich Beck refers to as “dialogue and co-operation”; I shall center on the ecumenical call for dialogue, since the goal of dialogue is Christian unity, and unity is the bedrock of co-operation. Beck’s decidedly Catholic understanding of ecumenism locates dialogue principally in the arena of truth, and truth seeking; this emphasis is sometimes unpopular in the minds of those who, wittingly or unwittingly, elevate co-operation to a status above truth.

When the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) issued their Decree on Ecumenism in 1964, Unitatis Redintegratio, they stressed that ecumenism is mainly intended to restore the unity of the Church, to reintegrate all Christians into one “mystici corporis Chirsti,” or “Mystical Body of Christ” under one pastor, the Bishop of Rome. The Decree asserts that, “in ecumenical dialogue” theologians “must proceed with love for the truth, with charity, and with humility.” Ecumenical dialogue with this understanding is ultimately an act
of obedience to Christ, who appealed to his Father, “That they may all be one.”⁴ I should note at the outset that the term “ecumenism” has undergone a semantic shift from its earlier usage. Before the Second Vatican Council, the term “ecumenism” was still evolving into its current meaning; more commonly, the term “ecumenical” was employed by Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Christians to refer to Church Councils. “Ecumenical” was used to distinguish between two types of convocations of bishops. Generally, the word “synod” denoted a gathering of local bishops to deliberate pastoral concerns, whereas an “ecumenical” gathering of bishops was convened from the whole world.⁵ Properly speaking, the word derives from the Greek, oikoumene, which means “the entire inhabited world,” and was used to describe, as the 1908 edition of The Catholic Encyclopedia asserts, an assembly of bishops “under the pope or his legates.”⁶ Many Catholics today still maintain that “ecumenism” should only refer to “the Church’s universality,” which is one of the traditional four marks used to articulate the nature of the Catholic Church.⁷ While this remains one of the Catholic understandings of ecumenism, its meaning has been expanded considerably, and has grown less contentious. The fact remains, however, that ecumenism as it relates to inter-ecclesial dialogue seeks to attain two primary aims: First, the discernment of truth; and second, the unity of all Christians into one, undivided, ecclesial community.

Protestant denominations have labored with their Orthodox and Catholic brothers and sisters to initiate and promote the twentieth century ecumenical movement. Combining the two terms historically used by Catholic and Orthodox Christians to distinguish bishops’ convocations, “synodal” and “ecumenical,” an international organization of Calvinist churches established the Reformed Ecumenical Synod in 1946, which located its headquarters at Grand Rapids, Michigan, and grew to a worldwide membership of around twelve million. The Presbyterian Church (USA) has assembled a General Assembly
Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Relations to, as it asserts: “articulate the Reformed and Presbyterian identity in the midst of our ecumenical commitments . . . and promote the unity of the church as an exhibition of the kingdom to the world.”

Ecumenism, then, has evolved to suggest many things, but at the center of this movement is the unity of Christians. From at least the Catholic point of view – I cannot speak for non-Catholics, as I am a Catholic – the cornerstone of ecumenical dialogue is truth; and since the Church was founded by Christ, and since the health and destiny of souls matters, there is no room for equivocation. There is no charity in dishonesty, and it does not build God’s kingdom to misrepresent his will. John Calvin (1509-1564) is said to have once exclaimed, “A dog barks when his master is attacked. I would be a coward if I saw that God's truth is attacked and yet would remain silent.”

As long as God’s truth remains its guiding principle, ecumenism is among the most important activities of the modern Christian, for without unity we lose credibility as a religion; just after Christ appealed to his Father that “they all be one,” he explained that it is precisely this unity that will allow “the world to believe that you sent me.”

I would like to within the short scope of this talk bookend the conceptual framework of Christian ecumenism between two great theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) and Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI, b. 1927), tracing inter-ecclesial dialogue from its era of truculent anathemas to its more congenial era in the wake of the Second Vatican Council.
Anathema

Given the scandals and abuses of the Roman Church during the life of Martin Luther (1483-1546) its no wonder that he declared to his interlocutors at the Diet of Worms (1521):

Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason (for I do not trust either in the pope or in councils alone, since it is well known that they have often erred and contradicted themselves) I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is captive to the Word of God.11

And it is also no wonder that the Roman Church responded unfavorably to Luther’s antagonistic literary style. “Dost thou hear this O Pope,” he wrote in his Address to the German Nobility, “Would that God would hurl thy chair headlong from heaven, and caste it down into the abyss of hell!”12 Stinging from Luther’s invectives the Church marshaled its resources, convened a Council at Trento, Italy, and inaugurated a four-centuries-long tradition of hurling its own invectives back at Protestants in the form of ecclesial anathemas.

Ecumenism as we imagine it today was still in the distant future when the Council Fathers at Trent systematically refuted – or so they thought – the theology and ecclesiology of Luther and his contemporary, John Calvin. This was not an era of dialogue; it was an era of condemnation. The Roman Church responded to the Protestant Reformers with a litany – not one of saints – of anathemas, which are defined in the 1907 edition of The Catholic Encyclopedia as “that which is cursed and condemned to be cut off or exterminated.”13 Councils have employed this term as a pronouncement against heretics, especially Protestants, who they viewed as a particular threat to Church unity. In 1566 the Roman
Catechism was commissioned by the Council Fathers to clarify the Roman Church’s position vis-à-vis Protestant Reformers. In rather direct, or harsh, language, the catechism asserts:

That all, therefore, might know which is the Catholic Church, the Fathers, guided by the Holy Spirit, added to the Creed the word “Apostolic.” For the Holy Spirit, who presides over the Church, governs her by no other ministers than those of Apostolic succession. . . . And just as this one Church cannot err in faith or morals, since it is guided by the Holy Spirit; so, on the contrary, all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of “church,” must necessarily, because guided by the spirit of the devil, be sunk in the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral.¹⁴

Little room is left here for negotiation; Protestantism is not only described as “guided by the spirit of the devil,” but it is denounced for its “pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral.”

Three centuries after the Council of Trent (1545-1563), Catholic and Protestant exchange still revolved around mutual denunciation. When some theologians suggested that Protestant Christianity was “nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion” as the Roman Catholic Church, Pope Pius IX (1792-1878) issued another anathema, condemning this view as an error in his 1864 Syllabus Errorum.¹⁵ Protestant denunciations were also added to the mêlée of inter-Christian hostilities. In his Tracts, John Calvin had earlier asserted that the Church of Rome was the “forge of all craft and trickery.”¹⁶ And in a letter to Cardinal Jacob Sadoleto (1477-1547), who had written an appeal to the people of Geneva to return to the Roman Church, Calvin expressed his belief that his Reformed church, rather than the Catholic one, was the genuine church of antiquity:

You know, Sadolete, . . . not only that our agreement with antiquity is far closer than yours, but that all we have attempted has been to renew the ancient form of the
Church, which, at first sullied and distorted by illiterate men of indifferent character, was afterward flagitiously mangled and almost destroyed by the Roman Pontiff and his faction.¹⁷

More than four centuries later, another Protestant disputant, Professor Loraine Boettner (1901-1990), inherited Calvin’s assessment of the Catholic Church. Attacking virtually every Catholic position in his 1962 monograph, Roman Catholicism, Boettner suggests that the Roman Church is so counter-Christian that it, “carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction.” And in the concluding sentence of his book, he asserts that the Catholic Church “must be judged to be a false church.”¹⁸ Evidence of mutual condemnation and anathema could consume my entire talk; let us move now to my consideration of Aquinas and Ratzinger’s ideas as they relate to contemporary ecumenism.

Anyone who has read even small portions of St. Aquinas’ Summa Theologica knows how concerned he was with the accurate use of terms. Ecumenical dialogue is too often mired in misinterpretation; as Yves Congar (1904-1995) once said of ecumenical discourse, “How many discussions have dragged on because people have confused the terms of the argument, thinking they are talking about the same thing, whereas in fact they are doing so under different aspects.”¹⁹ Understanding each other’s use of terms must precede effective dialogue, and despite some contemporary impressions that Aquinas harshly dismissed his interlocutors, we must acknowledge that his actual advice and practice was to begin any discussion with a thorough investigation of the intentio auctoris of his opponent’s actual implications. That is, the authentic ecumenical spirit of St. Thomas Aquinas was to meticulously study intricacies and nuances of an author’s intentions before engaging in
disputation. Aquinas did not dislike his opponents, but as a lover of truth he quite certainly disliked their errors.

Even though an opponent may be in error, Thomas considered his or her contributions to the debate meritorious. In his *Commentary on Metaphysics*, he wrote: “We must love them both; those whose opinion we follow and those whose opinion we reject. For both have labored to discover the truth, and have helped us at that task.”20 Here we see the two central elements of St. Thomas’ vision of what we today would think of as the ecumenical template – first, that truth is the aim of dialogue, and second, that anyone who sets out to seek that truth is a co-operator with the work of the Holy Spirit. Catholic theologians during the Medieval era often quoted Ambrosiaster’s conviction that “*omne verum, a quocumque dicitur, a Spiritu Santo est*,” or “Every truth, by whomever it is said, is from the Holy Spirit.”21 This openness to the truth found in otherwise “errant Christians,” or even non-Christians, allowed Aquinas to engage in gracious and affable dialogue that was less concerned with disagreement than a mutual and hopeful exchange, intended to identify truth. What good is knowledge of things sacred, Aquinas wondered, if what we know is not shared and discussed? “It is better to deliver to others contemplated truths,” he asserted, “than merely to contemplate them.”22 Despite St. Thomas’ openness to theological dialogue, he nonetheless lived during an era of ecclesial anathemas. From Aquinas until the popes of the early twentieth century, Catholic condemnations of Protestant ideas continued to be published, and Lactantius (240-320) was often quoted, who said to dissenting voices that, “The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this the house of Faith, this the Temple of God.”23 Aquinas’ twofold approach of charitable engagement with his interlocutors, along with his commitment to the ecclesiology of the Catholic Church, extended through the Second Vatican Council, and the thought and
theology of Joseph Ratzinger has grown to be among the most influential guiding principles of modern Christian ecumenism, as an inheritor of the methods of Scholastic disputatio.

Dialogue

The ecumenical theology of Joseph Ratzinger, which is nothing more or less than the ecumenical theology of the Catholic Church, might appear litigious to some who place the apparent harmony of an imagined Church without boundaries or distinctions over the authentic harmony of the actual Church, which has unambiguous boundaries and distinctions. I should state here that on the matter of boundaries, Catholic and Orthodox Christians are closest in their respective ecclesiologies; each holds that only its Church is the “one, true Church founded by Christ.” Orthodox representatives, however, sometimes confound the Catholic position for falsely including Orthodoxy into some formless “Catholic” communion. The only significant distinction between Orthodox and Catholic ecumenists in general is that Catholics are less inhibited by their ecclesiology from entering into dialogue. For some Orthodox, ecumenism is a heresy. In his book, Our Orthodox Christian Faith, Athanasios Frangopoulos places ecumenism on the same level as Arianism. He states: “Ecumenism is a new heresy that has appeared in our days … we Orthodox must stand far apart. Indeed, we ought to fight against it by enlightening those Orthodox who are ignorant of ecumenism and what it entails.”

While one might argue that some Catholics have offered a watered down, perhaps even misleading, version of its ecclesiology in ecumenical dialogue, the Church has in fact not veered from its official commitment to the definition and nature of the Church according to Holy Tradition. This is unfortunate because it obfuscates what the Catholic Church has always and still teaches about the historical Church founded by Christ. True charity summons all who claim the identity of
Christian to be interlocutors in the Scholastic sense; Christ’s clear call to unity now leads Catholics, Protestants, and many Orthodox Christians to open dialogue, viewing authentic ecumenism as the work of erasing heresies rather than perpetuating them.

Like Thomas Aquinas, Joseph Ratzinger’s approach to dialogue is anchored in truth and the convinced historical and theological belief that disputation should be open to the candid exchange of both points of view and strive toward Christian unity. In his homily delivered on 17 December 2005, the newly elected Pope Benedict XVI exhorted the bishops of Poland to, “take care to interpret ecumenism correctly. It must always consist in the search for the truth and not easy compromises that could cause Catholic movements to lose their own identity.” And after admonishing them to keep truth at the forefront of ecumenical dialogue, Ratzinger also urged the bishops to “be on guard against being closed to the situation that surrounds them.” Centralizing truth suggests that whether one is Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox, he or she must set aside any desire to please the world, or each other for that matter.

The current intellectual community has become overly concerned with easy agreement, and has surrendered to a perennial “tension between two views” rather than the assent of a single, correct view. Joseph Ratzinger has acknowledged the Church’s difficult position between joyful messenger of the Gospel to all people and fearless guardian of Christ’s authentic teachings:

Some are unhappy because the Church has conformed too much to the standards of the world; others are angry that she is still very far from doing so. Most people have trouble with the Church because it is an institution like many others, which as such restricts my freedom.
The Church, according to Ratzinger, exists in a place similar to the one Christ occupied when he was tried, condemned, and executed because the society around him found his teachings incompatible to their personal views. Ecumenism, he suggests, must ever bear in mind that to give our assent to Christ’s teachings is to incur the same enmity that he experienced.

One example of Ratzinger’s ecumenical model, one that insists on courageous and honest dialogue, is his consistent affirmation of the Catholic view of papal primacy. In his work, Called to Communion, which confronts the important question of what precisely constitutes the Church founded by Christ, he states that, “The primacy of Peter is recognizable in all major strands of the New Testament is incontestable.” “The real difficulty arises,” Ratzinger suggests, “when we come to the second question: Can the idea of a Petrine succession be justified?” For both Catholic and Orthodox Christians, this is no tangential question, for if the papacy functions as an authoritative voice, or perhaps the authoritative voice in the Christian community, then Christians can only be fully ordered, and fully in communion, once all members of Christ’s Body submit the pope’s authority. Ecumenism, from Ratzinger’s point of view, should not dodge even the most divisive questions, such as papal authority, for anything short of Christian unity results in the relativism, that “does not recognize anything as definitive and has as its highest value one’s own ego and one’s own desires.” “The Church” he asserts, “must withstand the tides of trends and the latest novelties.” Ecumenism, if it does not serve truth does not serve God.

However austere this commitment to truth and authority might seem, the era of Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox anathemas has largely evolved into a new form, one with less jagged contours, one within which, we should not merely “agree to disagree,” but more
agreeably disagree. In an address he delivered in Jerusalem during his 2009 pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Ratzinger exclaimed to members of other denominations and religions:

Together we can proclaim that God exists and can be known, that the earth is his creation, that we are his creatures, and that he calls every man and woman to a way of life that respects his design for the world.

Perhaps the difference between the era of ecclesial anathemas and inter-denominational dialogue is a recognition that disputation need not include resentment, and if truth functions as our guiding principle we can engage each other with a spirit of optimism. In this same Jerusalem address, he continued:

Truth should be offered to all; it serves all members of society. It sheds light on the foundation of morality and ethics, and suffuses reason with the strength to reach beyond its own limitations in order to give expression to our deepest common aspirations. Far from threatening the tolerance of differences or cultural plurality, truth makes consensus possible and keeps public debate rational, honest and accountable, and opens the gateway to peace.  

Some have noted that Christian ecumenism means today that we no longer assert with cold hearts that only does the Orthodox, Catholic, or Protestant communities co-operate with the truth, but that we now co-operate with each other in our search or better understanding of that truth, that is God himself.

After praying for Christian unity during a Liturgy of Vespers in 2006, Pope Benedict XVI, Joseph Ratzinger, quoted the words of Jesus in the Gospel of St. Matthew: “If two persons agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in
heaven.” The word the Evangelist uses for “agree,” Ratzinger notes, is *synphonesosin*. Christ is thus referring to a “symphony” of Christian hearts. “Agreement in prayer is therefore important as it is welcomed by the Heavenly Father.” Most significant was his acknowledgement that, “Asking together already marks a step toward unity.” This shift from anathema to dialogue is an encouraging step toward the goal of ecumenism, though nothing, not even friendship between persons, cultures, and nations, should cause us to turn away from Christ and his authentic teachings. The postmodern, or linguistic, turn away from the apprehension of language does not serve humanity if it becomes a convenient way to turn away from the *Logos*, Word, of God. From Aquinas to Ratzinger, the source and conclusion of dialogue is knowing God, and by knowing him we know truth.

**Conclusion**

I began my talk with Augustine’s assertion that genuine happiness is found only in the truth, and that when we speak that truth we shall inevitably confront the enmity of those who would prefer an alternative, more self-affirming, “truth.” If God’s truth is inconvenient, we are indeed free to invoke the banner of “*Non serviam.*” But this is folly, and we are better served by serving God who is the only hope for human accord. As Aquinas said in one of his most summoning poems, “How can we live in harmony? First we need to know we are all . . . in love with the same God.”

Saints Augustine and Aquinas, and Joseph Ratzinger, would all agree that Christ is the truth, and to be fully Christian is to surrender to that truth, and the ecumenical understanding of the Roman Catholic Church centers on the conviction that whether one’s tools are anathemas or dialogue, genuine ecumenism does not imply the passive acceptance of error, and more to the point, it does not justify or condone the deliberate revision of
God’s Word in Sacred Scripture. I conclude here with an unavoidable candid appraisal of the Christian community in our era. It is true that Christians have indulged in the uncharitable and often ignorant censorship of secular thought and scholarship; but now Christians seem to indulge in a new uncharitable and ignorant censorship of Christianity. We have turned on ourselves – no, we have turned on Christ – in order to protect our own self-affirming interests. We are no longer happy because our dialogue seeks to avoid enmity rather than know the truth. Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) once wrote that, “It is as much a crime to disturb the peace when truth prevails as it is a crime to keep the peace when truth is violated.”34 The key to ecumenical dialogue between Christians, and indeed the world, is to remember what is means to love God: “If anyone says, ‘I love God,’ and hates his brother,” says St. John, “he is a liar.”35 Christianity begins with love, which does not exist outside of truth.

________

“Never forget that we are still the ‘early Christians.’ The present wicked and wasteful divisions between us are, let us hope, a disease of infancy; we are still teething.”36

C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

________
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1 See St. Augustine, *Confessions* X. 23.
4 John 17.20.
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21 Ambrosiaster, quoted in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q. 172, a. 6 arg. 1. Ambrosiaster is the name of a fourth-century commenter on the epistles of St. Paul. These commentaries were erroneously attributed to St. Ambrose (340-397); Ambrostiaster literally means, “would-be-Ambrose.”
23 Perhaps the most recent pope to quote Lactantius was Pius XI (1857-1939) in his encyclical, *Mortalium Animos*, published on 6 January 1928. See *Mortalium Animos*, 11.
25 After his episcopal consecration in 1977, the newly ordained Bishop Joseph Ratzinger took as his motto, *Cooperatores Veritatis*, or “co-worker of the truth,” taken from the third Epistle of St. John: “We therefore ought to receive such: that we may be fellow helpers of the truth / *nos ergo debemus suscipere buiusmodi ut cooperatores simus veritatis.*” 3 John 1.8.
31 Matthew 18.19.
34 Quoted in von Hildebrand, The Charitable Anathema, 1.
35 1 John 4.20.