

The 2012 Figel Lecture
Washington Theological Consortium; Washington, DC
2 February 2012

by **Margaret O’Gara**

A DIALOGUE OF TRANSFORMATION

I am honored to receive the Washington Theological Consortium’s Ecumenism Award tonight. I have worked with some of those who received this award before me and with many others of you here tonight, and this makes me especially pleased to join you for this occasion. I am especially grateful to Mr. Jack Figel, whose donation assists the Washington Theological Consortium to mark the continuing importance of ecumenism for theological schools and the churches they serve.

I. How Ecumenical Dialogue Is a Dialogue of Transformation

In my talk tonight I want to focus on the way that ecumenical dialogue is a dialogue of transformation, and to draw on my experience of bilateral ecumenical dialogues to show how this is so. In our worship service, we have just celebrated how the victory won by Christ’s paschal sacrifice means that everything will be changed before the coming of the Kingdom of God. Paul wrote, “we will all be changed” (1 Cor 15:51) because of the victory given us by our Lord Jesus Christ. In Canada our French translation of this theme affirms that all must be “transformé” by Christ’s victory, and this transformation is a common experience among those who enter into dialogue between the churches.

The Second Vatican Council also recognized that changes would be needed before the unity for which Christ prayed was achieved. In the *Decree on Ecumenism*, the Catholic Church taught that the discord and disunity among Christians “openly contradicts the will of Christ, provides a stumbling block to the world, and inflicts damage” on the proclamation of the Gospel. The Council taught that the ecumenical movement is the work of the Holy Spirit because it seeks to

overcome this discord and disunity.¹ But the Council recognized that “there can be no ecumenism worthy of the name without a change of heart.”² It set the Roman Catholic Church on the path of dialogue with other churches toward the full unity for which Christ prayed, but the Council also affirmed explicitly that a change of heart was needed before this goal could be attained. Dialogue between the churches must be a dialogue of transformation or it is not really ecumenical dialogue at all.

How are Christians to reach such a transformation as they enter into dialogue with each other? In his 1995 encyclical on ecumenism, Pope John Paul II underlined that repentance precedes transformation--- a repentance that leads us to “change our way of looking at things.” Only then are Christians ready, he says, to “reexamine together their painful past and the hurt which that past regrettably continues to provoke even today.”³ John Paul II believed that repentance of this kind could lead to “a calm, clear-sighted and truthful vision of things, a vision enlivened by divine mercy and capable of freeing people’s minds and of inspiring in everyone a renewed willingness, precisely with a view to proclaiming the Gospel to the men and women of every people and nation.”

But what is this “calm, clear-sighted and truthful vision of things” of which John Paul II speaks, and why does it “change our way of looking at things”? A few years ago I heard a talk by Constance Fitzgerald that helped me understand this change, this transformation, more fully. In her reflection on the Dark Night of the Soul, Fitzgerald notes that the Carmelite mystic John of the Cross called this dark night “the purification of memory,” which she also relates to the experience of impasse. She explains, “In the deeper reaches of a contemplative life, a kind of unravelling or loss of memory occurs which can be more or less conscious. Then one’s usual way of harboring memories is incapacitated.”⁴ While a person may continue to have memories from the past, they are somehow “uncoupled from the self” so that “they do not mean what one thought they once did.”⁵ What and how one remembers are called into question in a painful experience in which one feels that one is losing one’s very identity and hold on the truth. But John of the Cross believes that, in the Dark Night of the Soul, the “memory is being

deconstructed or dispossessed in a redemptive movement whereby the incredibly slow appropriation of theological hope gradually displaces all that impedes new vision, new possibility, the evolution of a transformed self . . .”⁶

In her application of these insights, Fitzgerald argues that the Dark Night has societal, not just individual, implications. But of course I thought as well of its ecumenical implications. In dialogue, the memory of our church tradition as we have known it gives way to a kind of Dark Night in which that earlier memory is deconstructed and only very slowly replaced by a new vision. As with an individual, so also with dialogue between Christians: steps toward transformation are painful and frequently disorienting, accompanied at times by fear, denial, or anger. But gradually, when the historical memory of Christians is purified and a new vision of oneself and the other church traditions emerges, it is an experience not just of information but of transformation, of conversion.

II. Aspects of Transformation

In this talk, I want to share with you my experience of this transformation by talking about five different bilateral dialogues in which I have participated. Each dialogue shows a different aspect of the transformation that is required before the unity of the Church can be achieved.

1. Rereading Our History Together

In one dialogue I experienced, the Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue both in the United States and at the international level, the transformation involved a rereading of our common history. The great example of such a rereading in the Western Church is the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*.⁷ When I was a member of the U.S. Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue’s Continuation Committee, we helped to ratify and receive this important breakthrough document, signed by the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation in 1999. Because of new developments, the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* explains, both Lutherans and Roman Catholics are now obligated to see divisive questions and historic condemnations “in a new light.” To see “in a new light” is almost a summary of ecumenical

work, and the *Joint Declaration* is quite precise about what this new light reveals. While the earlier doctrinal condemnations of the sixteenth century on justification appear in this “new light,” the signers declare, nothing is “taken away” from their “seriousness.” Some of these condemnations were not “simply pointless” and “they remain for us ‘salutary warnings’ to which we must attend in our teaching and practice.”⁸ While the *Joint Declaration* is able to overcome earlier controversial questions and condemnations, this does not mean that the churches involved “take the condemnations lightly” nor that they “disavow their own past.”

It seems that the *Joint Declaration* is referring to that “necessary purification of memories” of which John Paul II had spoken and to which John of the Cross also referred, a reorientation that allows the two churches to recognize that past positions once thought to be contradictory can now be seen as complementary. And this is just how the *Joint Declaration* is able to understand the different emphases of Roman Catholics and Lutherans. For example, God’s forgiveness of sins and the imparting of new life in Christ, once seen as contradictory points, are now presented as simultaneous acts of God in justifying.⁹ Or again: to recognize that we depend completely on God for our justification and salvation---as Lutherans emphasize---is not to deny that believers are fully involved in their faith and, moved by grace, give their consent---as Roman Catholics emphasize.¹⁰

In a similar way, the *Joint Declaration* shows how complementary understandings of faith and works, the *simul iustus et peccator*, and the five other areas of dispute between Lutherans and Roman Catholics need no longer divide the partners today because they now see these historic positions “in a new light.”

While the *Joint Declaration* is the best known example of rethinking history together by Lutherans and Roman Catholics, it is by no means the only one. In *Hope of Eternal Life*, completed in 2010, careful historical work on the teachings of each church by the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue led us to recognize a common belief in the possible need for purgation of the justified after death, giving a new slant to the arguments about purgatory and indulgences that had helped to set off the Reformation in the sixteenth century.¹¹ And similarly careful

historical work led the Lutheran-Roman Catholic International Commission on Unity in 2006 to find parallel descriptions of a cluster of instruments for God's revelation in both Luther's thought on Gospel practices and in the work of Vatican II on tradition, each with the recognition of Scripture's primacy in matters of faith.¹²

I remember very clearly when members of the International Commission recognized the importance of showing readers *how* we had reread our history together. We decided that earlier dialogues had sometimes given readers only the *results* of their study, without walking with them through the steps that led toward a changed perspective. By rereading history together, we were led to a transformation, seeing each other in a new light; and we wanted to share this experience with our readers.

2. Correcting Misunderstandings

A second aspect of transformation can be found in the correction of misunderstandings. Pope John Paul II was quite blunt when speaking of misunderstandings that different churches have harbored about each other. We have not known each other well, he believed, and therefore we have inherited misunderstandings and prejudices about each other from the past.¹³ Our churches have some bad memories about each other. Sometimes these bad memories are true, sometimes they are distorted---a kind of false-memory syndrome. But none of these bad memories and prejudices, John Paul II believed, should be ignored. They should be faced and purified.

In my exchanges with colleagues in the Disciples of Christ-Roman Catholic International Commission for Dialogue, I have had a strong experience of how the correction of misunderstandings can transform our vision of each other. Because the Disciples of Christ began as a free church movement that broke away from the Presbyterian tradition in the nineteenth century, they had little direct knowledge of Catholic teaching on the eucharist and little experience of Catholic devotional practice. But Disciples place the eucharist at the center of their self-understanding, and so they already shared something important with Roman Catholics when we entered into our dialogue.

Our shared commitment to the eucharist allowed us to unearth a set of misunderstandings about the eucharist. The first concerned the attitude of Disciples toward the word “transubstantiation.” Studying Thomas Aquinas together for the first time, the Dialogue members saw that Aquinas had “used transubstantiation both as a means to counter materialist views of the Eucharist, and to affirm the real change of bread and wine . . .” Aquinas intended “not a local or material change, but a supernatural change.”¹⁴ But by the sixteenth century, “substance” was taken to mean “materially present,” which was just the opposite of what Aquinas had intended when he used the term “transubstantiation” to oppose materialist understandings of the eucharist.¹⁵

When the Disciples of Christ came into existence in the nineteenth century, they understood their celebration of the Lord’s Supper to be “more than a recollection” of the Last Supper, but they found the term “transubstantiation” to be “unnecessarily metaphysical.”¹⁶ In addition, Disciples had been shaped by another philosophical tradition in which what Aquinas described as “accidents” and the Council of Trent as “species” were understood to constitute the real; and what Aquinas and Trent called “substance” was seen as an unnecessary abstraction. The use of Aristotle’s philosophical perspective by Aquinas had been an effective apologetic strategy in the thirteenth century, but that perspective no longer had the same meaning in the sixteenth century. And by the nineteenth century, within the completely different philosophical framework where the Disciples were formed, it was simply incomprehensible. I will never forget the moment of realization that we all had together on the International Commission when this misunderstanding was discovered. It was a moment of breakthrough when the blinders fell from our eyes. With the Disciples’ philosophical framework, “transubstantiation” was taken to mean “almost the opposite of what Aquinas had intended.”¹⁷ Thinking that “transubstantiation” meant the material, spatial presence of Christ in the eucharist, the Disciples rejected this term precisely in order to preserve the mystery of the real presence, which they affirm. While Disciples would hardly choose to begin using the word “transubstantiation,” the dialogue helped them to recognize their misunderstanding of it and to underline their agreement with Roman Catholics

both in affirming the mystery of Christ's real presence in the eucharist and in opposing "reductionist understandings that see Christ's presence as simply materialist or figurative."¹⁸

Of course, misunderstandings held by Roman Catholics also helped to shape this conclusion. We Catholics had allowed ourselves to focus too narrowly on the presence of Christ in the elements of consecrated bread and wine and to ignore his presence in the proclaimed Word of God and in the gathered assembly celebrating the memorial of his once-for-all sacrifice on the Cross. In our dialogue with Disciples, the Catholic members came to recognize the distinctive ways that Disciples recognize Christ's real presence: as host at the eucharistic feast, as present at communion, as present in the bread and wine which "by the power of the Holy Spirit . . . become for us, through faith, the Body and Blood of Christ," as the Disciples affirmed to us.¹⁹ Hence, the Commission concluded that both churches "affirm the mystery of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, especially in the bread and wine," an agreement they could reach only, they explained, "through the elimination of mutual misunderstandings."²⁰

3. Exchanging Gifts

A third aspect of transformation is the exchange of gifts. To be able to receive a gift from someone whom you have opposed for centuries is a form of transformation, and I have experienced this gift exchange in my dialogue with Mennonites in a Catholic-Mennonite movement for dialogue called "Bridgefolk."

Bridgefolk is a North American movement, but its work was assisted by the significant steps forward taken by the international dialogue between Mennonites and Roman Catholics, the first of its kind since the Reformation. This was an especially painful dialogue, especially for the Mennonite members, because of the painful history of martyrdom that lies in the memory and indeed the identity of the Mennonite community. I remember one of the very first times that I attended a dialogue meeting with Mennonites, a dialogue about the Anabaptist martyrs of the sixteenth century. I met a colleague who said bluntly to me and the other Catholics at the meeting: "Your forefathers and foremothers killed my forefathers and foremothers. You are in

the Church that made my ancestors into martyrs.” This was such a deep memory for this Mennonite that it shaped his entire identity and his perspective on my identity as well, whereas this history was something I knew almost nothing about. In its agreed statement, the international commission noted that “the danger of persecution for martyrdom became a part of the Mennonite identity.”²¹ This perspective also led Mennonites and Roman Catholics to remember only negative things about each other: as the statement observed, “we have sometimes restricted our view of the history of Christianity to those aspects that seemed to be most in agreement with the self-definition of our respective ecclesial communities.”²²

But members of the international commission found that rereading their common history together, though painful, was also “invaluable.”²³ They thought it allowed a new interpretation of the past that they would hold in common, a shared new memory “that can free us from the prison of the past.”²⁴ Together they also found a way to ask forgiveness from each other for the sins of their past.

This work of the international commission affected the atmosphere of the discussions in North America taking place at Bridgefolk. In an atmosphere of partial reconciliation, Mennonites and Roman Catholics were drawn to Bridgefolk with different desires. Each wanted to receive a different gift from the other. The Mennonites came to Bridgefolk because they wanted to retrieve the rich liturgical heritage largely lost to them at the time of the Reformation. Roman Catholics were drawn to Bridgefolk in order to deepen their commitment to peacemaking.

At Bridgefolk I met Mennonites who for years had been attracted to the monastic practice of morning and evening prayer, and they also were drawn by the richness of the eucharistic liturgy they found in Catholic churches. Some of these Mennonites had developed a prayer book for saying morning and evening prayer in the Anabaptist tradition,²⁵ and they longed to enrich their own tradition of eucharistic celebration. When Bridgefolk Mennonites and Catholics were unable to celebrate eucharist together because we are not in full communion, we began more frequent and longer celebrations of the footwashing that is deep in the Anabaptist tradition and

remains a part of the Holy Thursday liturgy for Roman Catholics. Mennonites were eager to receive liturgical gifts from their Roman Catholic partners, and even to rediscover their own liturgical heritage.

For their part, Roman Catholics came to Bridgefolk because they found an authentic witness to peacemaking in the long Anabaptist tradition of nonviolence. When Mennonites heard from Roman Catholics how much the “just war” tradition is being reinterpreted in papal teaching, they were very excited. Learning that Pope John Paul II applied the criteria for a just war very strictly, Mennonites found that they often were in *de facto* agreement with the position of their Roman Catholic partners on questions of peace and of the justice required for peace. I myself found Mennonite perseverance in peacemaking to be an inspiring witness, and this witness drew me to my first meeting of Bridgefolk just as the United States began to enter into war in Iraq. I thought that perseverance in peacemaking was an important gift that Roman Catholics could receive from Mennonite partners.

In my book on the ecumenical gift exchange,²⁶ I reflect on this idea: that ecumenical dialogue can be understood as an exchange of gifts. But unlike a family gift exchange, where we must give up the gift we bring to receive one, the ecumenical gift exchange allows everyone to keep their gift while receiving others from our partners in dialogue. George Tavard notes that these gifts are really the gifts given by the Holy Spirit for the whole of the Church: in dialogue, we receive back some of the gifts we have been missing since our separation. I find Mennonite-Roman Catholic dialogue interesting because the gifts are not the usual doctrinal gifts that one associates with ecumenical work, but rather gifts of prayer and of discipleship.

4. Transforming Church Structures of Authority

The fourth aspect of dialogue focuses on another kind of transformation: the transformation of church structures of authority. In the dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, we see the growing recognition that each has a structural aspect of teaching authority that is essential to the life of the Church but is not adequately possessed by the other.

This mutual recognition of a structural strength in another church and a structural weakness in one's own has been well documented by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's work on teaching authority. The Roman Catholic members recognized their church's need for a greater exercise of collegiality among bishops and conciliarity within the whole Church, which should be exercised in balance with the primacy given to the bishop of Rome. At the same time, Anglicans on the International Commission could join Roman Catholics in acknowledging that "the primacy of the bishop of Rome can be affirmed as part of God's design for the universal communion."²⁷ In their third agreed statement on teaching authority, Anglicans can even speak of the papacy as a "gift" God wants to give the Church, while Roman Catholics can affirm their need to incorporate a genuine practice of synodality into their structures.²⁸ And since both Anglicans and Roman Catholics recognize the need for a balance between papacy and conciliarity, the international commission also crafted a carefully articulated theology of infallibility that affirms both the authority of conciliar or papal teaching and the need for that teaching to be received by the whole Church.²⁹

During my eighteen years as a member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, we were often called to assist the International Commission in its work. We clarified the nature of infallibility in a 1982 agreed statement, and we commented on the "legitimate" range of "theological opinion that exists within the Roman Catholic Church" which we felt that the Vatican's 1991 *Observations* on ARCIC's work had often overlooked.³⁰ At the same time, we noted that in Canada Anglicans and Roman Catholics had many experiences of widespread collaboration together in their pastoral care for interchurch marriages, seminary education, and social ministries. I notice that this experience continues. No matter how acerbic or remote the official relationships between our two churches appear at times, the relationships among colleagues and students in ecumenical consortia like the Toronto School of Theology--and I suspect the Washington Theological Consortium--remain warm and interdependent. In Toronto, we could not carry out adequate theological education without each other, and we all know it.

The dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics demonstrates something important about ecumenism today, however, because it shows us that structural transformation may be more difficult than the transformation of our ideas. It was not easy to see justification in a new way, or to recognize something once misunderstood about the eucharist. But perhaps it is still harder for us to recognize what the structures of teaching and decision-making in our respective churches lack and to seek it from the partner church. Today this difficulty is illustrated more sharply in dialogue between the two communions. Debates on the exercise of authority characterize current internal tensions within both communions. The Anglican communion debates authority issues surrounding same-sex marriage, while the Roman Catholic communion discusses the proper exercise of papal ministry in relationship to collegiality---for example, in the translation of liturgical texts or the role of episcopal conferences. The establishment of an Anglican ordinariate to welcome disaffected Anglicans into full communion with the bishop of Rome adds new structural problems to the discussion. In my judgment, difficulties over the exercise of teaching authority are the most difficult ones in ecumenical dialogue today, not because we do not have the understanding of what structural changes are needed but because we do not yet have the will to make them.

Members of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue always experienced a strong sense of trust and an informal mutual recognition of each other's faith and ministries. In my eighteen years on this dialogue, I observed the growing trust at laughter over meals, at sincere shared prayer, and in frank conversations late into the night over a beer or two. I remember the drama of one late-night conversation when our two bishop co-chairs, Anglican and Roman Catholic, confessed to one another the serious problems with authority that their own church communions were experiencing and wondered aloud how they would ever be resolved. This moment of frankness and trust extended far beyond the formality of the scheduled discussions; and it is this kind of transformative experience that the entirety of both Anglican and Roman Catholic churches must experience if we are to overcome the structural differences that divide us. This would require the mutual recognition, as the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue said when

discussing structural differences, that each of us is “wounded” in our structures of teaching authority.³¹

5. Transforming for Mission

The fifth and final aspect of dialogue that I will talk about tonight is transformation for mission, and I’ve learned a lot about this from my experience of dialogue with evangelicals. I experienced the “shock of recognition” at my first dialogue with evangelicals and Pentecostals at the Collegeville Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research in 1982. Arrogantly, I thought I had nothing to learn from these groups, only to be brought up short with the clear acknowledgement that I shared with them both the same fundamentals of Christian faith and the same restlessness within our church homes, all of which we recognized were in need of reform.

Evangelicals and Roman Catholics today are recognizing their common commitment to the doctrinal and moral core of the Gospel, and this has received a lot of media attention. But in the newly formed Evangelical-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, I have learned to recognize some other shared areas that are sometimes overlooked. One is rich variety in interpreting the Scripture. At our meetings, we have spent hours in spontaneous prayer and group *lectio divina* of the Bible with a sense of comfortable familiarity in each other’s prayer styles. But perhaps more distinctive is the sense of shared mission. Catholics and evangelicals share a commitment to evangelization that transforms their experience of each other. In an increasingly secular culture, the two groups discover each other more often as allies than competitors. While this can become a shallow instrument for simple political goals, at its deepest level I believe it indicates the continuing sense in each tradition that the unity of the Church is meant to serve its mission to the world.

Sometimes we Catholics and evangelicals have mutual criticisms to offer each other on our styles of evangelization. This mutual criticism is also a part of dialogue. Last year my Pentecostal colleague said he saw no point in continuing the dialogue with Catholics if they did not believe that only Christians could be saved. So I gently explained to him the teaching of the Catholic Church: that Jesus Christ is the only savior, but that some can be saved without explicit

faith in Christ if they follow their conscience where God is speaking to them. I said to him: isn't the fact that we disagree about this a good reason for continuing the dialogue? He was persuaded and he continued to participate in the transforming prayer and discussions of our group. But long after our discussion had ended, I found myself humbled by his zeal for the Gospel. I think often of the balanced words of the Second Vatican Council in its *Decree on Non-Christian Religions* when first speaking of other religions throughout the world: "The Catholic Church rejects nothing which is true and holy in these religions. She looks with sincere respect upon those ways of conduct and life, those rules and teachings which, though differing in many particulars from what she holds and set forth, nevertheless often reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all men. Indeed, she proclaims and must ever proclaim Christ, 'the way, the truth, and the life' (John 14:60, in whom men find the fullness of religious life, and in whom God has reconciled all things to Himself (cf. 2 Cor 5:18-19))."³²

Conclusion

I have been talking about five different ways that ecumenical dialogue contributes to transformation. Like the Dark Night of the Soul, such transformation can be first experienced as painful and disorienting, accompanied at times by fear, denial or anger. But gradually the dialogue among Christians can help us (i) to reread history, (ii) to correct misunderstandings, (iii) to receive rich gifts and (iv) to correct structural weaknesses in the exercise of authority. But a major purpose of these transformations is the fifth and last one of which I spoke: it is the great transformation that would allow us (v) to proclaim the Gospel together to a world that longs to hear this good news. In our present discord and division, Vatican II said rightly, "we openly contradict the will of Christ, provide a stumbling block to the world, and inflict damage on the proclamation of the Gospel."³³ In our present sorry state of internal division, we don't make a very effective argument for the unity God seeks with humankind. As one of my colleagues on the Evangelical-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada put it recently, the poor and weak of the world *need* the churches to be unified; in our present state of division, we are of little help to

those who depend on our concerted response to the impoverishment of their bodies, minds, and spirits.

Fortunately, as Vatican II teaches, the dialogue among Christians is the work of the Holy Spirit. When Paul writes of the ultimate transformation at the world's end, Paul assures his hearers that God "gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ (I Cor 15:57)." But, he exhorts his hearers, "be steadfast, immovable . . . because you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain (I Cor 15: 58)." Perhaps this can be a source of hope for us in the continuing challenges we face in ecumenical work. Our labor is not in vain because victory is given to us through our Lord Jesus Christ. May we know the sweetness of this word from the Lord.

¹Vatican II, *Unitatis redintegratio*, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter Abbott, New York: America Press, 1966, #1.

²Ibid., #7.

³John Paul II, *Ut unum sint*, *Origins* 25 (1995): 49, 51-72; see #2.

⁴Constance Fitzgerald, "From Impasse to Prophetic Hope: Crisis of Memory," *Catholic Theological Society of America Proceedings* 64 (2009): 21.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁷Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2000.

⁸Ibid., #42.

⁹Ibid., #23.

¹⁰Ibid., #19-21.

¹¹U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue, *The Hope of Eternal Life*, 2010, <http://old.usccb.org/seia/The-Hope-of-Eternal-Life.pdf>

¹²Lutheran World Federation and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. *The Apostolicity of the Church*. Minneapolis: Lutheran University Press, 2006.

¹³*Ut unum sint*, #2.

¹⁴Disciples of Christ-Roman Catholic International Commission for Dialogue, *The Presence of Christ in the Church, with special reference to the Eucharist*, #33. [This document, the Dialogue's fourth agreed statement, was originally completed on 30 June 2009 and completed with revisions on 16 June 2012. In the near future it will be published in the newsletter of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.]

¹⁵Ibid., #34.

¹⁶Ibid., #37.

¹⁷Ibid., #37.

¹⁸Ibid., #45.

¹⁹Ibid., #43.

²⁰Ibid., #45.

²¹*Called Together To Be Peacemakers: Report of the International Dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Mennonite World Conference, 1998-2003*, ed. Willard Roth and Gerald Schlabach, Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press, 2005, #47.

²²Ibid., #48.

²³Ibid., #26.

²⁴Ibid., #27.

²⁵Arthur Paul Boers *et al.*, *Take Our Moments and Our Days: An Anabaptist Prayer Book*, Scottsdale, Pennsylvania and Waterloo, Ontario: Herald Press, 2007.

²⁶Margaret O’Gara, *The Ecumenical Gift Exchange*, Collegetown, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1998.

²⁷*Authority in the Church II: An Agreed Statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, 1981 (http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/arcic/doc/e_arcic_authority2.html), #15.

²⁸*Authority in the Church III: An Agreed Statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, 1998 (http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/arcic/doc/e_arcicII_05.html), #60.

²⁹Ibid., #41-#44.

³⁰Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, “Reply to the Vatican Response to the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (1993),” in *Common Witness to the Gospel. Documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations 1983-1995*, ed. Jeffrey Gros *et al.*, Washington, DC: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1997, 78-104, #54-#69. See also Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue of Canada, “A Response to *The Gift of Authority*,” 2008 (http://www.oikoumene.ca/faith_dialogues).

³¹U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue, *The Church as Koinonia of Salvation: Its Structures and Ministries*, 2004 (<http://old.usccb.org/seia/koinonia.shtml>), #103.

³²*Nostra Aetate*, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, #2.

³³See above, note 1.