

From Crete to Korea

The direction of Faith and Order from its Plenary Commission in 2009 to the WCC Assembly in 2013

John St-Helier Gibaut, Director of the Faith and Order Commission
of the World Council of Churches

Words of Thanks

First of all a word of thanks to my colleague, the Revd Peter Colwell, for his invitation to me to be present at this meeting of the CTBI Senior Representatives' Forum. The WCC's Commission on Faith and Order is both aware and appreciative of the partnership we share with CTBI, especially the Theology and Unity department. You work with us on a number of important projects such as the preparation of the texts for the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity; your own adaptation and translation of these texts into the different languages of Britain and Ireland is a model of what can be done with this material. Faith and Order is grateful for the thoughtful, multilateral response from CTBI to our ecclesiological statement, *The Nature and Mission of the Church*. You were well represented at the Faith and Order Plenary Commission in Crete last October. And, I even note that you have a link to the Faith and Order webpage from the Theology and Unity pages of your own website. Of course, the person with whom I work most closely is your Director of Programmes, Peter Colwell, and in whom my staff and I have found a supportive, encouraging and insightful colleague.

Introduction

In his invitation to speak at this event, Peter asked for my "reflections on the present shape of the ecumenical movement and where I see things going in the future." The reflections I would offer are from the limited perspective of the World Council of Churches and its Commission on Faith and Order. This is a global perspective that cannot do justice to the local or regional. It is primarily a focus on that part of the ecumenical movement which understands its purpose as the quest for Christian unity in terms of the "visible unity of the Church in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship."

But the work of Faith and Order—and of theological ecumenism more broadly—occurs within a context which can only be described as the best of times and the worst of times. It is the **best of times** because this is such an exciting time in the history of the ecumenical movement: we stand as heirs and successors of a century of ecumenical engagement with one another, which has changed the face of Christianity. The many centenary celebrations are important opportunities to take stock of the journey the churches have been on together. There is a maturity to the movement, and an ease and trust in ways that churches work with one another. There are new expressions of Christian unity in things like the Global Christian Forum, or the Receptive Ecumenism movement emerging in England. There are new ecumenical relationships between churches around the world. I think of the movements towards organic unity in some of the churches of South Africa that were once dismembered by the laws of apartheid. This

year marks the creation of the World Communion of Reformed Churches out of WARC and the Reformed Ecumenical Council. The place of ecumenical diakonia is enhanced in new mergers such as ACT Alliance this year. There is fresh impetus for dialogue with new partners, such as the Pentecostal churches. The urgent demands of interreligious dialogue call for a fresh coherence amongst the churches. The new demands, new challenges, the remarkable heritage and achievements make this an exciting time to be engaged in the ecumenical enterprise, at any level.

It is also the **worst of times**: there are undeniable feelings of fatigue, lethargy, disillusionment, and even hostility towards the ecumenical movement. Within the movement, there is an apparent lack of clarity about its goals: is it good relations and judicious cooperation, or the organic unity of the churches, or something in between? There are new church-dividing issues, often around ethical questions, which not only further divide the divided churches from one another, but which also threaten unity within churches or communions of churches with surprising speed and ferocity. A time of financial crisis such as the one through which we are currently living, affects budgets of churches at the local, national and world levels, with ecumenical engagement and partnerships being amongst its first victims.

Within this context, the mission of Faith and Order “to proclaim the oneness of the church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and common life in Christ, in order that the world may believe” is as urgent today as it has ever been. As the new General-Secretary of the WCC, Dr Olav Fykse Tveit, often reminds us, Christian unity is not an option, but a gospel imperative.

So, within the broad spectrum of the Ecumenical Movement today, my reflections are limited to this particular aspect. I have entitled this presentation from “From Crete to Korea”, because it looks at the trajectory of Faith and Order work from our Plenary Commission last year towards the next Assembly in Busan, Korea, in 2013. This is a *very* limited perspective indeed. But when I think about our Plenary Commission, who was there, what we said and did, and the work that emerged from it for the next three years, I do see a clear “snap-shot” of theological ecumenism at this time.

Faith and Order Plenary Commission, October 2009

The Commission on Faith and Order is comprised of 120 representatives of the WCC member-churches, as well as Roman Catholic, Pentecostal, and Evangelical traditions. It is the largest forum for multilateral theological dialogue in the world. Meetings and consultations of the Commission also include representatives of CWCs, REOs, specialists from the academic world, and other ecumenical partners.

The methodology of Faith and Order is dialogue: informed conversations about church-dividing issues that seek to find common ground, mutual understanding, and to discover consensus or agreement on such issues that will further the visible unity of the Church. The results of these dialogues are published in the ongoing series of Faith and Order

Papers, which are sent to the churches for response and reception. Through study and theological dialogue, Faith and Order has been able to propose to the churches convergence or consensus texts that have profoundly contributed to the unity of the Church; *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* continues to represent the most important instance of such convergence, with consequences which continue to shape the ecumenical landscape.

The Plenary Commission only meets once between Assemblies of the World Council of Churches; that is, every seven or eight years. Nonetheless, its meetings are important sign posts along the path to Christian unity. Those who were present at Crete in October 2009 were given an insight or experience of the present shape of the ecumenical movement, and where it is going in the future.

The participants in the meeting were the 120 Standing and Plenary Commission members, as well as guests and consultants from the Christian World Communions, faculties of theology and ecumenical institutes, younger theologians, and others. Meeting in Crete, Greece, we were pleased to welcome students and professors from the faculties of theology of the Church of Greece and the Church of Crete. The Orthodox context of our meeting was one of the riches of the 2009 meeting. The opening presentation was by His All Holiness Bartholomew I, the Ecumenical Patriarch, himself a former member of Faith and Order.

When I arrived in Geneva in 2008 I was told that the Plenary Commission was comprised mostly of European academics, mostly men, mostly in their sixties. What a pleasant surprise to discover that its members come from all over the world, in a balance of men and women, younger and older; in fact, the median age was 47. Of the 157 gathered, 45 were in university or seminary teaching positions, of whom half were younger than 40, and only half were men; they have formed themselves into the “Academic Circle of Faith and Order” to assist the commission with their resources, expertise, and abilities to communicate our work to countless others through teaching and publication. The group photograph says vast things about theological ecumenism today: women and men, ordained and lay, diversity of age, diversity of traditions, diversity of region, diversity of ecumenical experience, and diversity of language. This is all very hopeful. For CTBI it will be of interest to note that there were twelve people from Britain and Ireland.¹

The theme of the meeting was “Called to be the One Church”, from the statement on Christian unity from the Porto Alegre Assembly in 2006. The Plenary Commission gathering last year was very much a working meeting in which the commission members, along with guests and consultants, engaged directly in the work of the three study projects: *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, Moral Discernment in the Churches, and Sources of Authority; Tradition and traditions. Each of these studies was at a critical stage, and the next steps will be shaped by the Plenary Commission and the pages of reports and feedback that it created. Our work took place in the context of daily prayer and Bible study. We carried out our work in plenary sessions, as well as in twelve small

¹ 6 commissioners; 6 guests and consultants

working groups. We gathered in confessional and regional caucuses during which particular concerns and contexts were shared.

The Nature and Mission of the Church

I think that the most important long term study is on ecclesiology, focused right now on revising the 2005 *Nature and Mission of the Church* in time to present a new text at the 2013 Assembly at Busan.

For some, ecclesiology is the most crucial aspect of the ecumenical project today. If the divided churches cannot say enough common things about the nature of the church, it is impossible to work towards the unity of the Church. If our ecclesial self-understandings are so different from one another, it becomes equally impossible to recognize one another as churches, and to receive one another as churches.

To use an imperfect analogy from the world of information technology, ecclesiology is like a church's operating system. If we are using incompatible operating systems, it will not be possible to share texts, programs, or even to communicate with one another. "Ecclesiology" is such a specialized term, that I tend not to use it outside of an academic or Faith and Order context, because too many people, even those engaged in the ecumenical movement, are frightened off by the very word! And yet, like an operating system, which is as equally frightening to some of us, it is requisite if we are serious about the visible unity of the Church in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship.

The subtitle of *The Nature and Mission of the Church—A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement*—indicates that it is a provisional text, a work in progress that seeks to express common convictions about the church and to identify the ecclesiological issues which continue to divide the churches today. The text will be revised, refined, enriched as the Commission takes into consideration the responses received since 2006 from the churches and ecumenical partners (like CTBI).

The introduction to the 1999 text on ecclesiology, *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*, identified the responses as "essential as Faith and Order continues its work to develop a common agreed statement on the nature and purpose of the Church" (p. 8). The introduction to *The Nature and Mission of the Church* remarks on the responses received to the earlier text:

Faith and Order is grateful to those who responded to this invitation but is conscious that the responses were not fully representative of all the churches. Nevertheless, we hope that the changes occasioned by the suggestions will be evident. One of the frequent suggestions was to strengthen the text's emphasis on mission. In making this change both in the title and in content we have tried to ensure that these changes confirm the continuity with the previous work, but also to meet the new concerns. (Page 11)

The comment illustrates both a tone of regret at the lack of response, and signals the purpose of responses: to affirm a direction taken, to propose avenues of change.

The dialogical methodology of Faith and Order reflected in the ecclesiological texts is consistent with that taken with BEM from the 1960s to 1982. The text evolves in dialogue with the churches. The success of Faith and Order's ecclesiological work depends on both the representative quantity of the responses, as well as their quality. Simply put: the better the responses, the better the next text.

By the end of March 2010, nearly 80 responses had been received by Faith and Order; of these, *only* 24 were from the churches!² We all have to wonder how to interpret the low response rate from the churches to the text, and what this tells Faith and Order about *The Nature and Mission of the Church* itself, or more broadly, the concerns of the churches for ecumenical ecclesiology; if for some, ecclesiology is the issue on which the next stages of the ecumenical movement depend, for many others it is not a concern at all. I would be interested to hear your thoughts on this.

The responses from the churches and others are as varied as the churches themselves. Some are very brief; one or two pages long, while others are much longer, up to 62 pages in one instance. Some are very general in nature, others are far more specific. Some follow the series of four questions posed by Faith and Order on page 12 of *The Nature and Mission of the Church*; others follow different sets of questions.

It is not possible to include every detail of the responses in this presentation. But, on the whole, the responses received have been positive and encouraging. No one has told us that we are on the wrong track, completely. The responses generally indicate what is appreciated about the text, as well as areas of concern and recommendations for future work.

We are pleased by the responses of the mission organizations, and especially by the encouraging response from our sister commission in the WCC, the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. The shift in name from *The Nature and Purpose of the Church* to *The Nature and Mission of the Church* has ushered in a new spirit of cooperation between Faith and Order and those engaged in mission, especially the WCC's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, to our mutual advantage.

Because of the low response rate from the churches, the Standing Commission on Faith and Order wanted to engage the members of the Plenary Commission at Crete in an evaluation of the NCM; they are, after all, officially nominated by their respective churches.

Again, the responses were varied and mixed. On the whole, they too were positive, but clear that the NCM is not yet a convergence text. They also gave us some guidance not

² From the churches associated with CTBI, responses were received from: the Church of England, the Religious Society of Friends in Britain, and the Church of Scotland. Other relevant responses were received from CTBI, and a single Anglican theologian (Dr Paul Collins).

just on the content of the text, but the kind of text we should be looking for at the end of the day: one about half the length of the present text, and one that has the accessibility and directness of “Called to be the One Church”, the depth and breadth of the NMC, that is, something that feels more like BEM than the current text.

The other clear message that we received was about the place of *context*. One of our speakers was HE Metropolitan Geevarghese Mar Coorilos from India (Syrian Orthodox Church), the current moderator of the CWME. He spoke passionately about taking context seriously when we do ecclesiology, a clear criticism of the methodology used in the NMC. His Eminence’s presentation was excellent but provocative, especially to his fellow Orthodox participants. But what was interesting and indicative of a methodological sea-change taking place was the response from the commission to his presentation: almost a 5 minute standing ovation, and from everyone. Clearly, a nerve had been touched.

Moral Discernment in the Churches

The study on “Moral Discernment in the Churches” looks like a departure from the more classical themes of Faith and Order, but is a continuation of the previous work of Faith and Order that has focused on issues of morality and ethics. More specifically, this study builds on the important insights gleaned in two previous studies: 1997 *Ecclesiology and Ethics* and 2005 *Christian Perspectives on Theological Anthropology*. It addresses the new church-dividing issues which are / have been? driven by moral or ethical issues. Much of the focus of moral disagreement today is on human sexuality. Because moral discernment is so much broader, we made the decision to look at ethical issues around economics, science and religion and proselytism, along with sexuality.

We are using a case study methodology to analyze instances of moral decision-making that are or have been church-dividing. They include: WARC and Globalization, the Anglican Communion and homosexuality, the debate in Germany between the EKD and the Episcopal Conference of Catholic Bishops over stem cell research, and the North American disagreement on proselytism in countries of the former Soviet Union. The purpose of using case studies is to provide a descriptive account of an issue that offers examples of how particular communities of Christians engage in moral discernment in relation to a particular moral question. They are not position papers on an issue, but descriptions of processes. The purpose of this study is to seek an understanding of our common commitments and core values as followers of Christ in the midst of disagreement on moral issues over which communities of faithful Christians hold principled disagreements.

Using the four case studies the members of the commission engaged in an analysis of the disagreement, focusing on mapping the underlying nature and root causes of disagreement in ways that help us understand others with whom we disagree, while helping us to build a foundation for continuing theological dialogue and conversation across lines of difference. It is not the business of the WCC or Faith and Order to resolve any of these or other ethical questions; this is the business of the churches. We believe,

however, that it is our task to help the churches to understand why they differ, and to propose an ecumenically recognized methodology. And to recall, as the WCC did in its 2006 Assembly Statement on the Church, that:

Each church is called to mutual giving and receiving gifts and to *mutual accountability*. Each church must become aware of all that is provisional in its life and have the courage to acknowledge this to other churches. Even today, when eucharistic sharing is not always possible, divided churches express mutual accountability and aspects of catholicity when they pray for one another, share resources, assist one another in times of need, make decisions together, work together for justice, reconciliation, and peace, hold one another accountable to the discipleship inherent in baptism, and maintain dialogue in the face of differences, refusing to say "I have no need of you" (1 Cor.12:21). Apart from one another we are impoverished.³

Some of these conversations were more successful than others; some commissioners came away with a greater understanding of the divisive nature of moral disagreement. One American Pentecostal member in an interview noted how much he resented being in a group which was appointed to study homosexuality in the Anglican context, and would much rather have talked about proselytism in the post-Soviet Union countries. But, he engaged in the assigned task, and came away with an unexpected appreciation for the project and the process. He understood that the real threat to the Anglican Communion is not human sexuality, but the profound methodological anomalies and discontinuities, which could be applied to any moral issue for any church.

A final study document is to be developed for the WCC Assembly at Busan that will offer a constructive response to conflict over moral issues that includes concrete resources to help communities negotiate principled disagreement over moral issues, and will outline specific suggestions to the Churches for dealing with conflict over moral issues in hope that the churches may discern a common mind on ethical questions, and if they cannot, to understand and respect how different churches arrive at different responses, an understanding that may keep disagreement from become church-dividing.

Sources of Authority: Tradition and traditions

The foremost aim of the study on Sources of Authority is to enable churches to identify together the historic and contemporary sources of authority by which they make ethical, pastoral and theological decisions today.

The initial stage in this long-term study is a common discernment of the role of early teachers of the Faith as common sources of authority for the churches today. The aim of this first stage of the study was to build on the work begun by the WCC in the 1960s and,

³ "Called to be the One Church," #7.

<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/assembly/porto-alegre-2006/1-statements-documents-adopted/christian-unity-and-message-to-the-churches/called-to-be-the-one-church-as-adopted.html>

by paying particular attention to the teachers and witnesses of the early Church, to explore further the possibility of discovering, re-discovering or re-receiving some particular sources of authority which might help us together on the way to the unity of the Church. The first such consultation, held at Westminster College, Cambridge (1-6 September 2008), examined the place of the Church Fathers as sources of theological authority: "The Teachers and Witnesses of the Early Church as a Common Source of Authority: Various Received?" Particular attention was given to an examination of how the classical fathers and mothers of the Church read and interpreted the Bible.

The most eloquent statement about this study comes from one of its co-moderators, the Revd Dr Susan Durber, Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge. At the Plenary Commission she said:

At the heart of our discussions was the question of authority. We were not concerned only to share with one another our levels of interest in the teachers and witnesses of the early church, to engage in an intellectual exchange of ideas about them or even to reveal to one another their spiritual significance for us. Though these things happened, the testing ground of our discussions was around questions of authority. In what ways do they speak to us with authoritative voices? And, how does their authority compare with or relate to other significant forms of authority upon which we draw as we seek to speak of the Gospel? We did not take it for granted that we knew even what authority meant and we spent time in careful discussion and reflection. We all had a strong sense of unity in describing true authority as being something rooted in authenticity and integrity, rather than in anything like naked political power. True authority does not need to force itself, but is revealed from within. We shared together our convictions that the teachers and witnesses of the early church have authority for us because of their very 'earliness', as being among the first generations of Christians, and the first of those who began both to gather and to interpret the Scriptures. But they also have authority deriving from lives lived with integrity and holiness, often suffering or even dying for their faith. Though we did not want to romanticize the earliest teachers and witnesses or to erase their reality as human beings in particular contexts, we became aware that they often witnessed in times and circumstances we can barely imagine, that they were the pastors and practical theologians of their times, and that their witness was often made in blood and tears as well as in the joy of the Gospel.

Susan brought her presentation to a close with the following:

There is a proper place for all the critiques and suspicions to which we have learned to listen, but there is also a place for a hermeneutic of trust. And I have learned that the treasures of the Holy Spirit can indeed come to us carried in earthen or even cracked vessels. I learn this from the Bible of course, and it is also

true of the teachers and witnesses of the early Church, and of the slightly later Church, and of the Church that is yet to be.⁴

We tested the experience of the Cambridge consultation with the commissioners. The 157 participants engaged in what we would like to think was the world's largest patristic-study. The working groups were given an excerpt from Ambrose of Milan (4th century CE), Gregory the Theologian (4th century CE) or Isaac of Nineveh (7th century CE), representing Greek, Latin, and Syrian traditions. Commissioners reflected on how the particular patristic texts might be received in their churches in general and in their local ecclesial context in particular as a source of authority.

For some, the study was a return to safe and comfortable ground; for others, it was entirely new territory, which was in itself an ecumenical learning. But the commissioners did "catch" something of what Susan described in her introduction.

A report of this study will be presented at Busan in 2013, as well as the next sources of authority that Faith and Order will examine in what will be a lengthy, but important study.

Clearly, Sources of Authority and Moral Discernment in the Churches will come together, for the sources to which we appeal is part of the larger question of methodology by which the churches make ethical, pastoral and theological decisions today.

Reception

Part of the success or failure of this or any other Faith and Order meeting, or of any of the bilateral dialogues for that matter, is not the success of the commissioners in finding and articulating common ground, or reaching new convergence or consensus on church-dividing issues. This is the easy part. The real challenge is how the results of our conversations are communicated and received by the churches.

The theme of Reception is an increasingly important one in the contemporary theology, and more particularly, within ecumenical theology and the broader ecumenical movement. For instance, it was a significant part of the 2005 report of the Eighth Report of the Joint Working Group of the Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches. In its reflection on "The Nature and Purpose of Ecumenical Dialogue", the JWG states:

"Reception" is the process by which the churches make their own the results of all their encounters with one another, and in a particular way the convergences and agreements reached on issues over which they have historically been divided. As the report of the sixth forum on bilateral dialogues notes: "Reception is an integral part of the movement towards that full communion which is realized when 'all the

⁴ <http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/wcc-commissions/faith-and-order-commission/other-documents-from-conferences-and-meetings/plenary-commission-meeting-crete-2009/tradition-and-traditions-rev-dr-susan-durber.html>

churches are able to recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church in its fullness'.⁵ Thus reception is far more than the official responses to the dialogue results, although official responses are essential. However, even though they are not concerned with the full range of interchurch relations, the results of the international theological dialogues are a crucial aspect of reception, as specific attempts to overcome what divides churches and impeded the unity willed by our Lord.⁵

The identification of Reception as a major study of the present Ninth Session of the JWG follows from the recommendations of its predecessor.

The churches have not kept pace with their official and formal bilateral and multilateral agreed statements, too many of which lie dormant on the desks of ecumenical officers, archives and libraries. After nearly half a century, not enough of these agreed statements have been formally received, let alone received as ecumenical learning. This is discouragingly clear to us all. I agree with Mary Tanner that it is not the dialogues that have failed—they have, on the whole, been quite successful—but rather the process of reception has been the stumbling block.⁶ Faith and Order has suffered from this in the non-response of so many of the churches to the NCM. And yet within this context the *Eighth Report* of the JWG says,

If the agreements reached through ecumenical dialogue are to have an impact on the life and witness of the churches and lead to a new stage of communion, then careful attention needs to be paid to processes for receiving the agreements so that the whole community might be involved in the process of discernment.⁷

Take note as we gather in 2010 that during the past two years there has been an unprecedented energy within the churches for moving ahead with the project of receiving the agreed statements. This is a *new* development. For instance, the PCPCU has already undertaken a careful study of the dialogues between the Catholic Church and its Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist and Reformed ecumenical partners. The harvesting of the results of these dialogues culminated in the publication of a 2009 text by Cardinal Kasper called *Harvesting the Fruits: Basic Aspects of Christian Faith in Ecumenical Dialogue*, followed by a superb conference on the same this past February in Rome.

At the Eighth Forum on Bilateral Dialogue under the auspices of Faith and Order, in March of 2008 in Breklum, Germany, representatives of the bilateral dialogues promoted a similar vision of reception. The Breklum Statement says to the churches:

We believe that it would be profitable to keep in mind right from the beginning of

⁵ "The Nature and Purpose of Ecumenical Dialogue" in the Joint Working Group between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, *Eighth Report* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 2005), pp. 82-83.

⁶ Mary Tanner, "From Vatican II to Mississauga—Lessons in Receptive Ecumenical from the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue Process," in Murray, *Receptive*, pp. 262 ff.

⁷ JWG, *Eighth Report*, p. 82.

any phase of dialogue the reception of its results. As each dialogue is in some way a “learning process,” each needs to consider how this learning process may be shared with the wider membership of the two communities involved.

Only an abiding commitment to the ecclesial reception of ecumenical texts can allow these statements of convergence or consensus to have a reconciling and transforming effect in the life of our churches.⁸

An important parallel, or perhaps it would be more correct to say, concurrent movement, is that which is known as “Receptive Ecumenism” issuing forth from the Centre for Catholic Studies at the University of Durham, under the leadership of Dr Paul Murray. Instead of addressing questions around the formal reception of ecumenical agreed statements arising from theological bilateral or multilateral dialogue, Receptive Ecumenism asks, “What, in any given situation, can one’s own tradition appropriately learn with integrity from other traditions?”⁹ Rather than “what can another tradition learn from us” is of tremendous ecumenical and ecclesiological significance.

In practice, receptive ecumenism and ecumenical learning are not new; in one form or another they have been with us for a long time in varying degrees. What is new is the naming of Receptive Ecumenism as such, with a robust theological rationale, and the claiming of its ground as vital for contemporary ecumenism.

In short, and in conclusion, an essential present and future direction of theological ecumenism is reception in the broadest sense of the word, including Receptive Ecumenism. It must also include the narrow, concrete sense of dealing with the agreed statements arising from the multilateral and bilateral dialogues which the churches support at great cost, and which are overlooked at great cost.

The issue of reception will be part of the report on the Ninth Session of the JWG to be presented at Busan. It will also be the agenda of the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogue in 2012. And it is here that CTBI can play a significant role in supporting this initiative, and modeling it, as you do with the texts of the WPCU to other REO and councils of churches around the world.

⁸ “The Breklum Statement” of the Ninth Forum on Bilateral Dialogue, Recommendation 2, <http://www.oikoumene.org/fileadmin/files/wcc-main/documents/p2/breklum-statement.pdf>

⁹ In Paul Murray, “Receptive Ecumenism and Catholic Learning—Establishing the Agenda,” in Paul D. Murray, ed., *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), p. 12